

2007

# A Study of Publication Performance in ACPHIS Identified Journals

Carmine Sellitto

Victoria University, [carmine.sellitto@vu.edu.au](mailto:carmine.sellitto@vu.edu.au)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://aisel.aisnet.org/acis2007>

---

## Recommended Citation

Sellitto, Carmine, "A Study of Publication Performance in ACPHIS Identified Journals" (2007). *ACIS 2007 Proceedings*. 123.  
<http://aisel.aisnet.org/acis2007/123>

This material is brought to you by the Australasian (ACIS) at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in ACIS 2007 Proceedings by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact [elibrary@aisnet.org](mailto:elibrary@aisnet.org).

## A Study of Publication Performance in ACPHIS Identified Journals

Carmine Sellitto  
Centre for International Corporate Governance Research  
Victoria University  
Melbourne, Australia  
Email: [carmine.sellitto@vu.edu.au](mailto:carmine.sellitto@vu.edu.au)

### Abstract

*This paper reports on a study that used DEST data from 14 Australian universities to determine the historical publishing performance of academics against a set of ACPHIS identified quality journals. The research identified that between 2000 and 2005— 140 articles were published in 39 of the 61 ACPHIS journals. A relatively low number of articles (N=12) were published in 7 of the 10 Level A journals whilst only 4 articles were published in 2 of the proposed premier profession group of journals. A total of 67 articles were published in 14 of the level B journals with the Australasian Journal of Information Systems (AJIS) publishing the greatest number of articles (N=25) in the group. The research identified that a relatively high number of overseas authors (39.1%) were affiliated with papers published in the Level A journals— suggesting that Australian IS academics may need to collaborate with overseas scholars in order to increase the likelihood of publishing in such journals.*

### Keywords

Australia, information systems, academic, DEST data, ACPHIS, journal, RQF

### Introduction

Journal publication has evolved as the generally accepted manner in which an academic community can disseminate knowledge— an important emphasis being placed on internationally accepted peer-reviewed journals. Academic publication tends to not only to form a foundation for furthering a discipline, but is also used as a gauge of scholarly success. Moreover, publishing success invariably influences academic promotion and employment tenure, profession standing within a discipline and the success of research grant applications (Katerattanakul, Han & Hong 2003; Mylonopoulos & Theoharakis 2001; Peffers & Hui 2003; Rainer & Miller 2005; Vokurka 1996). Hence, for many scholars, the decision to publish their research entails selecting an appropriate journal outlet that provides a suitable conduit that will allow their work to be noted, recognised and potentially cited.

Academics are not the only ones that have an interest in where research is published— so do university administrators and government policy makers. From an Australian academic's perspective the introduction of a new research quality framework (RQF) for universities was confirmed in November 2006— to take affect from the commencement of 2008. A basic tenet underlying the Australian Government's introduction of the RQF is the way that research is assessed— moving from a quantitative to a qualitative focus. The new RQF aims are admirable and include the comparison of academic research with international benchmarks, as well as endeavouring to assure that public money is achieving the appropriate research outcomes (Bishop 2006). The impacts of the RQF on individual academics are numerous— however, one important issue when it comes to journal output is a notable shift from productivity to quality. In the context of the pending introduction of the RQF, this study examines the output from 14 Australian universities that published IS-related articles between 2000-2005. Moreover, the study evaluates this journal output against the Australian Council of Professors and Heads of Information Systems (ACPHIS) proposed list of ranked IS journals to determine the historical performance of academics against this quality list. The study uses university-supplied data that was part of their submission to the Australian Government's Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) journal collection scheme— a collection scheme that has stringent compliance requirements that makes the data an extremely reliable resource on which to explore journal performance. The author takes his opportunity to stress to the reader that this paper *is not* about the appropriateness of the RQF, its administration or subjectivity— commentary on these RQF issue can be gauged from DAGRQF (2006), Dowham (2006), Steele (2006) and Illing (2007).

## Australian Academic Journal Publication

Journal publication output has been alluded to as being one of the more significant indicators of research productivity for the modern day IS scholar (Koh 2003). Within the realms of Australian university operations, it has been suggested that academic research productivity can have a multi-dimensional aspect that addresses parameters such as quality, importance, impact and quantity— attributes that could be used to evaluate research performance (Harris 1990; Ramsden 1994). Harris (1990) indicates that impact can be a measure of influence that is reflected in the citation counts to an author's work. Quality is the perceived value of an article in the eyes of *knowledgeable peers*— whereby a quality judgement is made by these peers, whilst an article's importance requires the passing of time for it to be recognised as contributing to, or extending knowledge. Finally, quantity is related to the number of scholarly publications produced as either counts and/or total pages. In terms of the above parameters, quantity is the simplest to gauge and determine and is one that reflects scholarly productivity at an individual and institutional level. Indeed, in the Australian academic sphere, the quantity approach has been the traditional measure research performance.

The process of capturing academic productivity has required Australian universities to undertake an annual Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC), that groups scholarly works into four types— books, book chapters, journal articles and conference publications. In effect the data collection reflects the scholarly publishing activities of Australian academics for which their university receives a compensatory return from the Australian government (DEST 2006). The historical funding of research has been based on quantitative measures such as the number of publications, external research income and research student enrolments/completions. Inherent in this funding arrangement with respect to publications has been the perception that these quantitative research measures have some form of quality dimension— the greater academic output was equated with some form of quality notion. With the introduction of the RQF, academic publication performance will embrace a quality dimension. The RQF in essence, seeks to introduce a broadly applicable and expert-based way to measure research output that can be evaluated from a quality and impact perspective. Part of the ongoing implementation of the RQF is the formation of workshops and advisory groups representing the diverse number of academic disciplines— groups that make recommendations on suitable measures for recognising quality and impact (DAGRQF 2006).

It is within this realm of discipline advisory group that ACPHIS, in collaboration with the Australasian Association for Information Systems (AAIS), has proposed a list of 61 journals that can be viewed as meeting different standards of academic quality in the IS sphere (AAIS 2006). ACPHIS was founded in 1995 and is viewed as the peak body to represent Australian information systems academics in matters of national and international importance. Moreover, ACPHIS fosters informed debate within the information systems discipline acting as a mediating channel for collaboration between university IS departments (ACPHIS 2004). With respect to journal quality recommendations, ACPHIS formulated a draft of journals in late 2006— a list that was subsequently referred to the Australian IS community for comment. The journals identified by ACPHIS (2006) were a reformulation of a set initially proposed by the AAIS (2006) to cover the broad publishing sphere relevant to its technology, computing, computer science and systems engineering members. In effect the ACPHIS group can be viewed as the *knowledgeable peers* that Harris (1990) refers to when it comes to determining perceived journal quality— a value of quality based on the group's expertise, knowledge and understanding of IS research. This study uses the currently available journal listing and assumes significant changes to that list will not occur— finalisation is expected late in 2007. The ACPHIS (2006) journals are structured in different levels of quality based on their perceived ranking status— Level-A & B; Non-ranked and Premier Professional Journals— with the proposed list summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: ACPHIS proposed journals (N=61) and levels of perceived quality

<p><b>Level A Journals (N=10)</b> Decision Sciences Decision Support Systems European Journal of Information Systems Information Systems Journal Information Systems Research Information and Management Journal of Management Information Systems Management Science MIS Quarterly Operations Research</p> <p><b>Level B Journals (N=20)</b> Australian Journal of Information Systems Behaviour and Information Technology Communications of the Association for Information Systems Data and Knowledge Engineering Database Electronic Markets European Journal of Operations Research Human computer interaction Information and Organisation (formerly, Accounting, Management and IT) Information Systems (Elesvier) Information Technology and People International Journal of Electronic Commerce Journal of the Association for Information Systems Journal of Computer Information Systems Journal of Database Management Journal of IS (ACCT) Journal of Information Technology Journal of Strategic Information Systems Journal of the Operational Research Society Scandinavian Journal of IS</p>	<p><b>Non Ranked (NR) Journals (N=24)</b> Asia-Pacific Management Review Business Intelligence Journal Computer Supported Cooperative Work E-Commerce Research and Applications Information and Organisation Information Resource Management Journal Information and Software Technology Information Technology and Management Information Technology Theory and Applications International Journal of Data Warehousing and Mining International Journal of Human Computer Studies International Journal of Information Management Journal of Org Computing and Electronic Commerce Journal of Systems and Software Journal of Research and Practice in Information Technology MISQ Discovery Journal of IT Theory and Applications (JITTA) Journal of IT Cases and Applications (JITCA) Journal of Knowledge Management Theory and Practice Journal of Global Information Technology Journal of Information Systems Education Journal of Information Systems Management Journal of Decision Systems Journal of End user computing</p> <p><b>Premier Professional Journals (N=7)</b> Academy of Management Executive Communications of the ACM California Management Review Harvard Business Review Interfaces MIS Quarterly Executive Sloan Management Review</p>
--	--

Source: Adapted from ACPHIS (2006)

Academic publishing performance associated with each level of journal quality is also addressed by ACPHIS and is summarised in Table 2. This perceived publishing performance guide is in effect a peer value judgement by the ACPHIS members that can be used as a guide by IS academics as part of determining their scholarly standing when it comes to publishing in journals.

Table 2: ACPHIS perceived publish performance within each journal level

<p><b>Level A Journals</b></p> <p>These are the journals we all should aspire to publish in, but it is not expected that many scholars in Australia will have more than one or two articles in these journals. Those that do will have a deservedly outstanding reputation as the best in their field.</p>	<p><b>Non Ranked (NR) Journals</b></p> <p>Journals in this group are of varying quality, and are likely to constitute the majority of publications for most. This group is the broadest and covers the leading national journals in Australia and New Zealand. Some are newly established journals, still developing their reputation. Publication in these journals will be less frequent for established scholars.</p>
<p><b>Level B Journals</b></p> <p>These are still top quality journals, and cover a broad range of fields, but they are not strictly in the top tier. Good scholars can be expected to publish fairly often at this level</p>	<p><b>Premier Professional Journals</b></p> <p>Are high quality journals with broad circulation that are highly visible within the practitioner community and can potentially have high impact.</p>

Source: Adapted from ACPHIS (2006)

## Method

Australian universities have historically gathered their journal publication data through an annual Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) process. Each Australian university is required to submit an annual publication summary to the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) whilst the full data set resides with each University and must be maintained for at least three years for auditing purposes. Some Universities publish their DEST details in the public sphere, whilst others do not. The university data collection process involves the grouping of publications into divisions that address a research field, educational course and/or an academic discipline (RFCD). This study used DEST-collected data as the basis for identifying the publication output of academics who published journal articles in the computing sphere. The data of interest related to refereed journal publications (commonly coded E1 or C1) that had been grouped in the divisions associated with Information, Computing and Communication Sciences division (RFCD 280000), Business Information Systems (RFCD 350202) and Electronic Commerce (RFCD 350213). It can be assumed that many

of the IS academics that are represented by ACPHIS will register their publications within these RFCDD divisions.

The 38 Australian Universities that were able to participate in the study were identified via the Australian Universities Network website (<http://www.australian-universities.com/list/>). The study was explorative seeking to determine the diverse nature of academic publication— hence, neither individual authors or universities are identified; furthermore, no individual university is compared to another university. The Australian Council of Professors and Heads of Information Systems (ACPHIS) has proposed a listing of IS journals that are perceived to have a recognised quality dimension. Hence, the focus of the research was on the historical performance of universities (and academics but implication)— across this identified set of ACPHIS journals. Historical performance was determined as a measure of the number of times that academics have published articles in these journals.

## Results and Discussion

Fourteen of Australia's 38 universities responded to a request to provide data for the study— representing a 36.8% participation rate. A total of 1449 journal articles were identified across the 14 universities as having published on a broad range of computing-related themes. Collectively, the articles identified in this study and published in the 2000-2005 period represent a total of 60 years of academic journal output in the computing-sphere— shared across 14 universities. The total number of journal records supplied by each university was variable and reflected the relative computing activities within that university. It can only be assumed that universities that had a large and well-established sphere of computing activity had a greater output than those universities in which computing studies had a secondary or low research focus. Collaboration by authors across the set of published papers also varied between universities, however there was a close grouping of individual university averages around the median author-per-paper value of 2.54. Some highly collaborative papers were published and included one that was associated with 23 authors. There was a significant variation amongst individual universities in terms of the average number of journal articles published per year with the greatest number of articles published being 61.0 and the least 6.3. The average number of journal articles published across the 14 universities was 24.15 articles per year. An analysis of the 1449 articles found that 140 articles (9.7%) were published in the ACPHIS proposed journals— journals that were perceived as having an Information Systems quality value. Table 3 summarises the journal publication data associated with university output in general and the ACPHIS set of journals.

Table 3: Summary of Australian university publications (general and ACPHIS focussed)

Uni Code	Data collection period	Number of articles published (N)	Average number of journal articles per year	Articles published in ACPHIS identified journals (N)	Articles published in ACPHIS identified journals as a proportion of:	
					All articles (N=140) published in ACPHIS journals (%)	All computing articles published by each University (%)
A	2000-2005	305	61.0	17	12.14%	5.57% (-)
B	2001-2005	280	56.0	27	19.29%	9.64% (-)
C	2001-2005	160	32.0	21	15.00%	13.13% (-)
D	2002-2005	116	29.0	12	8.57%	10.34% (+)
E	2000-2005	110	18.3	9	6.43%	8.18% (+)
F	2000-2005	84	14.0	6	4.29%	7.14% (+)
G	2004-2005	80	40.0	14	10.00%	17.50% (+)
H	2001-2005	76	15.2	17	12.14%	22.37% (+)
I	2001-2005	70	14.0	7	5.00%	10.00% (+)
J	2004-2005	64	32.0	2	1.43%	3.13% (+)
K	2001-2005	31	6.2	0	0.00%	0.00%
L	2002-2005	29	7.3	5	3.57%	17.24% (+)
M	2002-2005	25	6.3	1	0.71%	4.00% (+)
N	2004-2005	19	9.5	2	1.43%	10.53% (+)

In this sub-set of 140 articles 13 of the 14 universities are represented. University K whose academic output included 31 articles, did not publish one article in any of the 61 identified ACPHIS journals. Conversely, University H had some 22% of the total number of IS-related articles accepted into journals that were on the ACPHIS list.

Notably, universities that published a relatively high number of articles (eg University A, B, and C) across the broad RFCD computing divisions where the greatest source (N=65 of 140) of articles published in the ACPHIS set of journals. However, some of these high-output universities when comparing the number of ACPHIS published journals as a proportion of their overall computing article output had a relative diminished position (last column of table). This observation may be due these universities focussing on non-IS areas such as computer science/engineering which would have been part of the total university computing article output—effectively leading to the diminished proportional positioning. Another view could be that academics from these universities may have focussed on article quantity— as rewarded by the DEST scheme— with journal quality being a secondary consideration.

There were some universities (eg University G, H and L) that published a relatively small number of articles in ACPHIS identified journals that represented a significant proportion of their overall article output. Just as the high-output university performance may have been influenced by the journal publication output of the computer science/engineering area— these low-output universities may have had dominant IS Schools or Departments that contributed a relatively high number of IS article counts to total university computing article output. Conversely, academics from these universities may have concentrated on publishing articles in the quality journals such as those identified by ACPHIS.

Having identified a sub-set of 140 articles from the DEST-derived data the historical performance of academic publishing against the various journal levels proposed by ACPHIS can be determined.

### Articles in Level A Journals

Twelve articles were published in 7 of the A level journals. The authors (N=23) involved with the articles published in this set of journals were associated with 12 different discipline areas as noted by their affiliated faculty, school or area of research. Seven universities had at least one author that published an article in Level A journals. No Australian authors published in more than one of these journals and 7 of the 12 articles had collaborating authors that were based at a non-Australian university— 9 of the 23 authors (39.1%) were overseas based. Five of these overseas authors were from the USA, whilst Hong Kong, Italy, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands were the declared locations of the remaining overseas authors. Table 4 summarises the characteristics associated with the Level A journals.

Table 4: ACPHIS Level A Journals Article characteristics

Journals	Articles published	Number of authors per article	Average length of article*	Source (University Code)
Decision Support Systems	2	2 & 2	19.0	E, L
European Journal of Information Systems	2	2 & 2	14.0	B, D
Information Systems Journal	3	1, 2 & 2	29.3	B, C, L
Information Systems Research	1	2	21	B
Information and Management	2	1 & 2	12.5	A, D
Journal of Management Information Systems	1	3	29	I
MIS Quarterly	1	2	23	A

No articles were published in the following ACPHIS identified A level journals— Decision Sciences, Management Science or Operations Research. \*Non-standardised pages. If only one article published then actual number of pages reported.

This set of Level A journals is consistently noted as a group of quality journals in various ranking studies (AIS 2007). Moreover, given the relatively low number of articles that are annually published by each journal, it is commendable that these Australian authors have been successful in publishing articles in this group of journals in what is undoubtedly a competitive IS publishing sphere. Arguably, the commensurate reward for having published in these types of journals should be one of significant recognition of scholarly status by the Australian IS community. Although ACPHIS has suggested that Australian IS academics should aspire to publish in these journals, in reality, it is likely that only high achieving academics will publish a small proportion of their articles in these journals across their careers. Indeed, for some academics the publishing of an article at this level might well be associated with the pinnacle of their career.

### Articles in Level B Journals

A total of 67 articles were published in 14 of the level B journals. Eleven universities reported articles that had been published in this group of journals. The average number of authors per article was 2.44, whilst the total number of authors across all 67 articles was 164—the top collaborating paper having 7 contributors. There were a total of 1141 pages published across all articles, with each article being on average 17.03 pages long—the longest article was 39 pages in length (CAIS) and the shortest 7 pages Australasian Journal of Information Systems (AJIS). The AJIS published the greatest number of articles (N=25) and had a total of 51 authors contributing to these articles. Ten different universities reported academic output that was published in the AJIS. A relatively high number of different disciplines (N=21) were found to be affiliated with authors that had articles published in level B journals. Some of these disciplines included expected areas such as Information Systems, Management, Computer Science, Accounting and Software Engineering, however, there were a small number of lesser-anticipated areas such as Economics, Mathematics and Engineering. Several Australian based authors published in more than one of these journals and 23 of the 67 articles had collaborating authors that were affiliated with an overseas university. Indeed, these overseas contributors represented 22.6% (37) of the authors of the total of 164 authors that were associated with all papers. Table 5 summarises the characteristics associated with the Level B journals.

Table 5: ACPHIS Level B Journals Article characteristics

Journals	Articles published	Average number OR number of authors per article*	Average length of article**	Source (University Code/Number of articles)
Australian Journal of Information Systems	25	2.0	11.48	A, B (3), C (3), D (4), E, F (2), G, H (5), I (3), J (2)
Behaviour and Information Technology	2	2 & 7	15.0	B
Communications of the Association for Information Systems	6	2.3	23.5	B (2), C (2), D, H
Data and Knowledge Engineering	5	2.4	25.8	C, D, E (2), G
Database	2	2 & 3	13.5	B, C
European Journal of Operations Research	2	3 & 5	24.5	A, G
Information and Organisation	1	3	20	C
Information Systems (Elesvier)	1	3	18	G
Information Technology and People	2	1 & 2	18.0	A, C
International Journal of Electronic Commerce	2	4 & 4	24.0	A, D
Journal of Computer Information Systems	1	1	10	G
Journal of Database Management	3	1.7	26.0	B, G (2)
Journal of Information Technology	10	2.4	13.0	A (4), B (3), C (2), M
Journal of Strategic Information Systems	5	3.6	24.4	B (3), G, I

No articles were published in the following ACPHIS identified B level journals— Electronic Markets, Human Computer Interaction, Journal of the Association for Information Systems, Journal of IS (ACCT), Journal of the Operational Research Society or the Scandinavian Journal of IS. \*Repeat authors across the set of 67 articles not identified. \*\*Non-standardised pages. If only one article published then actual number of pages reported.

ACPHIS propose that this group of journals are also top quality journals in which good scholars would be expected to publish *fairly often*. The results indicate that five journals—the *Australian Journal of Information Systems*, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *Data and Knowledge Engineering*, *Journal of Information Technology* and the *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*— are popularly targeted by academics. Arguably, many of the remaining level B journals reflect a low output option for academics with one or two-off articles being published over a 5 year period. There appears to be a core set of journals in this ACPHIS group that indeed constitute the publishing sphere in which good IS academics publish *fairly often*.

### Articles in the Premier Professional journals

Only 4 articles were published in 2 of the premier profession group of journals. Article characteristics published in these journals are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6: ACPHIS Premier Professional Journals Article characteristics

Journals	Articles published	Number of authors in articles	Average length of article*	Source (University Code/Number of articles)
Communications of the ACM	2	3 & 2	3.5	N, C
MIS Quarterly Executive	2	3 & 3	15.5	B (2)

No articles were published in the following ACPHIS identified premier level journals— Academy of Management Executive, California Management Review, Harvard Business Review, Interfaces and the Sloan Management Review. \*Non-standardised pages.

There appears to have been a relative poor historical performance within this group of ACPHIS identified journals. Only 3 universities are represented, and a total of 11 different authors collaborated across the 4 articles— three of these authors were overseas based. The background of the 11 authors involved in these articles was associated with 8 different disciplines. The ACPHIS group alludes to this set of journals as embracing attributes associated with quality and broad circulation— with the inference that there is a relatively high propensity that articles published in such journals will be read by the IS practitioner community. Arguably, high circulation and the associated readership of a journal will potentially result in an article having a high impact amongst the readership. A further characteristic of this set of journals is the publishing of articles in a magazine-type style— a style that can be quite diverse when compared to the verbose, structured and at times descriptive academic form of writing. Indeed, these articles tend to also be relatively shorter and to-the-point which requires an academic to modify the way they formulate and write articles. Given the relative article output of academics in this set of journals, it may be a reflection on the different presentation styles required to write articles for publication in this set of journals. Arguably, academics in targeting this set of high circulation journals would be well positioned to disseminate their work to a diverse and broad audience. Unfortunately, this does not appear to have occurred.

#### Articles in the Non Ranked (NR) Journals

Fifty-seven articles were published in 16 of the 24 proposed NR group of journals. Eleven universities reported articles that had been published in this group of journals with each article being on average 14.86 pages in length— the shortest article was 5 pages (*Journal of Research & Practice in Information Technology*) and longest was 34 pages (*Journal of Decision Systems*). A total of 847 pages were published in this NR group of journals. The average number of authors per article was 2.51, whilst the total number of authors across all 57 articles was 143— with the number of collaborating authors across articles ranging between 1 and 4. As with the set of Level B journals, several Australian based authors published in more than one of these NR journals, whilst 18 of the 57 articles had collaborating authors that were affiliated with an overseas university. The non-Australian university authors represented 20.9% (30) of the total of 143 authors that were associated with all papers. Article characteristics published in these journals are summarised in Table 7.

Table 7: ACPHIS Non ranked journals Article characteristics

Journals	Articles published	Average number OR number of authors per article*	Average length of article**	Source (University Code/Number of articles)
Asia-Pacific Management Review	1	2	22	B
E-Commerce Research and Applications	4	3.0	14.5	A (2), C, D
Information and Organisation	1	3	20	C
Information Resource Management Journal	1	3	22	L
Information and Software Technology	11	2.6	12.5	A, C, E (2), G (2), H (5)
Information Technology and Management	3	3.0	21.3	A, B, F
Information Technology Theory and Applications	1	2	23	F
International Journal of Data Warehousing and Mining	1	4	25	G
International Journal of Information Management	1	1	12	B
Journal of Decision Systems	3	2.0	31.7	B, E, H

Journals	Articles published	Average number OR number of authors per article*	Average length of article**	Source (University Code/Number of articles)
Journal of End user computing	2	1 & 2	12.0	C (2), L
Journal of Information Systems Education	2	2 & 3	6.5	L, F
Journal of IT Theory and Applications (JITTA)	6	2.2	13.3	B (2), C (3), I
Journal of IT Cases and Applications (JITCA)	1	3	15	F
Journal of Research and Practice in Information Technology	9	2.3	14.2	A (3), B, C, D (2), E, I
Journal of Systems and Software	10	2.7	12.2	E, G (3), H (5), N

No articles were published in the following ACPHIS identified Non-Ranked journals— Business Intelligence Journal, Computer Supported Cooperative Work, International Journal of Human Computer Studies, Journal of Global Information Technology, Journal of Information Systems Management, Journal of Knowledge Management Theory and Practice, Journal of Org Computing and Electronic Commerce and MISQ Discovery. \*Repeat authors across the set of 57 articles not identified. \*\*Non-standardised pages. If only one article published then actual number of pages reported.

The ACPHIS body suggest that the NR level journals have a variable degree of quality and will tend to constitute the broadest publishing sphere for most IS academics. It was observed that thirty articles were published by three journals— *Journal of Research and Practice in Information Technology* (N=9), *Information and Software Technology* (N=10) and the *Journal of Systems and Software* (N=11) with the last two journals having an obvious focus on computing software related topics. Arguably, this observation is not in keeping with the ACPHIS suggestion that this group of journals will have the broadest coverage of leading local journals. Indeed, the results suggest that many of the articles that have been published in a small number of overseas-focussed publications, with the *Journal of Research & Practice in Information Technology* being the only Australian-based journal.

### Summary of Publication Features in ACPHIS Identified Journals

A summary of features associated with the 140 articles published in 37 ACPHIS identified journals are detailed in Table 8. The summary of features across the articles published in ACPHIS identified journals allows several interesting observations. There appears to be a high degree of overseas authors affiliated with papers published in the high quality journals. This may suggest that Australian IS academics in order to publish in what are well known, international journals may need to engage collegial collaboration with overseas scholars to facilitate this process. Another observation is the average number of pages per article noted in higher quality journals— suggesting that IS academics may need to structure highly argumentative and verbose articles if they wish to publish in these high quality journals (this observation needs to be interpreted against the use of data that has not been standardised for journal page size). The majority of articles (88.6%) were published in the Level B and NR level journals.

Table 8: Summary of articles (N=140) published in ACPHIS journals

Features identified	Level A (N=10)	Level B (N=20)	NR (N=24)	PP (N=7)	Totals
Different journals in which articles published	7	14	16	2	39
Number of articles	12	67	57	4	140
Most popular journal(s)	<i>Information Systems Journal</i>	<i>Australian Journal of Information Systems</i>	<i>Information and Software Technology</i>	<i>Communications of the ACM &amp; MIS Quarterly Executive</i>	-
Total number of authors**	23	164	143	11	341
Number of universities reporting articles (N=14)	7	11	11	3	-
ACPHIS articles as a proportion of all ACPHIS articles (N=140)	8.6%	47.9%	40.7%	2.9%	100%
ACPHIS articles as a proportion of all computing articles (N=1449)	0.8%	4.6%	3.9%	0.3%	9.7%

Features identified	Level A (N=10)	Level B (N=20)	NR (N=24)	PP (N=7)	Totals
Average number of authors/paper***	1.92	2.44	2.51	*	-
Number of overseas authors	9 (39.1%)	37 (22.6%)	30 (20.9%)	*	-
Average number of pages/paper	19.42	17.03	14.86	*	-
Total number of pages	233	1141	847	*	-

\* Insufficient articles published in the Premier Professional journals for meaningful results. \*\* Repeat authors across articles not identified. \*\*\*Non-standardised pages.

## Conclusion

This study examined DEST data from 14 of Australia's universities in an endeavour to determine the historical publishing performance of Australian academics against a set of ACPHIS identified quality journals. An analysis of 1449 articles found that 140 articles (9.7%) were published in the ACPHIS proposed journals—journals that were perceived as having an Information Systems quality value. Across the 61 proposed ACPHIS journals, the 140 articles were published in 39 of these journals.

A relatively low number of articles were published in Level A journals reflecting the competitive nature of authors having articles accepted by top journals. Arguably, the commensurate reward for having published in these types of journals should be one of significant recognition of scholarly status in the Australian IS community. Indeed, for some academics the publishing of an article at this level might well be associated with the pinnacle of their career. Only 4 articles were published in 2 of the proposed premier profession group of journals—a finding that possibly highlights missed opportunities by Australian academics to publish in outlets that have a general broad circulation amongst IS academics and practitioners. 67 articles were published in 14 of the level B journals with the *AJIS* publishing the greatest number of articles (N=25) in the group and having a total of 51 authors contributing to these articles. Eleven universities reported 57 articles that had been published in the NR group of journals—with a total of 143 authors contributing to the articles. As with the set of Level B journals, several Australian based authors published in more than one of these NR journals, whilst 18 of the 57 articles had collaborating authors that were affiliated with an overseas university.

The research identified that a relatively high number of overseas authors were affiliated with papers published in the quality journals suggesting that Australian IS academics may need to collaborate with overseas scholars in order to increase the likelihood of publishing in such journals.

## References

- AAIS 2006, *Current AAIS Initiatives: Ranking of IS Journals and Conferences - Urgent IS Community Action*, Australasian Association for Information Systems, viewed 12/4/2007 2007, <<http://www.aaisnet.org/initiatives.html>>.
- ACPHIS 2004, *ACPHIS Overview*, Australian Council of Professors and Heads of Information Systems (ACPHIS), viewed 22-3-2007 2007, <[http://www.acphis.org.au/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=view\\_category&Itemid=28&subcat=3&catid=13&limitstart=0&limit=10](http://www.acphis.org.au/index.php?option=com_docman&task=view_category&Itemid=28&subcat=3&catid=13&limitstart=0&limit=10)>.
- 2006, *Draft Journal Ranking Document*, Australian Council of Professors and Heads of Information Systems (ACPHIS), Melbourne.
- AIS 2007, *MIS Journal Rankings*, Association for Information Systems, viewed 18/4/2007 2007, <<http://www.isworld.org/csaunders/rankings.htm>>.
- Bishop, J 2006, *Australian Government Endorses Research Quality Framework*, Dept of Education, Science & Training (DEST), Canberra.
- DAGRQF 2006, *Research Quality Framework: Assessing the Quality and Impact of Research in Australia*, Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.
- DEST 2006, *Higher Education Research Data Collection: Specifications For The Collection of 2006 Data, Innovation And Research Systems Group Department Of Education, Science And Training (DEST)*, Australian Government (DEST), viewed 4/11/2006 2006, <<http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/830034E5-326A-4961-A02D-E3F34407A3F7/12781/DraftHERDC2007.pdf>>.

- Downham, R 2006, 'Immeasurable Advantages', *The Australian Higher Education Section*, 22-11-2006, p. 34.
- Harris, GT 1990, 'Research Output in Australian University Economics Departments: An Update for 1984-88', *Australian Economic Papers*, vol. 29, no. 55, pp. 249-60.
- Illing, D 2007, 'Labor to Scrap "Flawed RQF"', *The Australian Higher Education Section*, 21-2-2007, p. 34.
- Katerattanakul, P, Han, B & Hong, S 2003, 'Objective Quality Ranking of Computing Journals', *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 46, no. 10, pp. 111-4.
- Koh, CE 2003, 'IS Journal Review Process: A Survey on IS Research Practices and Journal Review Issues', *Information Management*, vol. 40, no. 8, pp. 743-56.
- Mylonopoulos, N & Theoharakis, V 2001, 'On-Site: Global Perceptions of IS Journals', *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 29-33.
- Peffer, K & Hui, W 2003, 'Collaboration and Author Order: Changing Patterns in IS Research', *Communications of the AIS*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 166-90.
- Rainer, K & Miller, M 2005, 'Examining Differences Across Journal Rankings', *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 91-4.
- Ramsden, P 1994, 'Describing and Explaining Research Productivity', *Higher Education*, vol. 28, pp. 207-26.
- Steele, C 2006, 'Research with Purpose', *The Australian Higher Education Section*, 7-6-2006, p. 42.
- Vokurka, RJ 1996, 'The Relative Importance of Journals Used in Operations Management Research: A Citation Analysis', *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 345-55.

## Copyright

Carmine Sellitto © 2007. The author assigns to ACIS and educational and non-profit institutions a non-exclusive licence to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The authors also grant a non-exclusive licence to ACIS to publish this document in full in the Conference Proceedings. Those documents may be published on the World Wide Web, CD-ROM, in printed form, and on mirror sites on the World Wide Web. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the authors.