11-2011

Assessing Researcher Publication Productivity in the Leading Information Systems Journals: A 2005–2009 Update

Jan Guynes Clark

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio, jan.clark@utsa.edu

Yoris A. Au

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Diane B. Walz

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

John Warren

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/cais>

Recommended Citation

Clark, Jan Guynes; Au, Yoris A.; Walz, Diane B.; and Warren, John (2011) "Assessing Researcher Publication Productivity in the Leading Information Systems Journals: A 2005–2009 Update," *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*: Vol. 29 , Article 26.

DOI: 10.17705/1CAIS.02926

Available at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/cais/vol29/iss1/26>

This material is brought to you by the AIS Journals at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in Communications of the Association for Information Systems by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

Communications of the Association for Information Systems

Assessing Researcher Publication Productivity in the Leading Information Systems Journals: A 2005–2009 Update

Jan Guynes Clark

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

jan.clark@utsa.edu

Yoris A. Au

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Diane B. Walz

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

John Warren

Information Systems and Cyber Security, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract:

This study is an update of a previous scientometric study that examined the leading Information Systems (IS) researchers, their university affiliations, and the universities that supply them. We provide geographical comparisons of researcher affiliations for the AIS regions and for North American versus global institutions, along with a comparison of prior and current results. Our analysis shows that coauthorship is increasing in the top three IS journals and that most of the leading researchers continue to affiliate with institutions in North America. However, the proportion of publications from North American researchers in the top three journals has decreased slightly over time. This research contributes to the scientometric literature by identifying a more broad and inclusive set of leading IS publications and by providing benchmarks for the productivity of IS scholars. These results can be valuable for deans and department chairs making tenure and promotion decisions. Prospective students and faculty can use these results to identify universities which match their personal research goals. This study also helps to define and expand the boundaries of the IS discipline due to its use of a broader set of leading journals.

Keywords: Information Systems, Information Systems research, research productivity, academic research, tenure, promotion, IS discipline; scientometric study

Volume 29, Article 26, pp. 459-504, November 2011

The manuscript was received 5/27/2010 and was with the authors 5 months for 3 revisions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Publication productivity is a viable and relatively objective measure of faculty research performance, particularly in the business and social science disciplines. Universities and research centers must assess the research productivity of faculty for tenure, promotion, and workload decisions. These assessments are typically concerned with aspects of the publication records of their faculty/researchers.

The assessment of publication productivity based on the quality of the outlets in which a researcher publishes is a common method of assessment and corresponds well to the measurement of research productivity within a particular timeframe. This approach, however, requires accurate and reliable measures of the quality of the journals in which faculty publish. Scientometrics is the study of science. Scientometric studies address important research questions relevant to the process and progress of scientific endeavor, i.e., the creation of knowledge. This includes methods of measuring the scientific impact of publications and researchers as well as techniques for evaluating journals to assess the productivity of individuals and institutions. Such studies also examine theoretical issues, such as how knowledge is created, managed, and disseminated by scholars [Straub, 2006].

Scientometric findings also help to signal an organization's standards for research. This information also represents important metrics for the assessment of an institution's progress toward stated goals. In addition, these findings can be important in the search processes of prospective faculty and students who seek institutions that match their own goals and, thus, which tend to value their talents and subsequent productivity. Findings based on a broad enough set of top journals can be particularly relevant for explaining prior tenure decisions and, potentially, future tenure decisions, in a world of changing goals. In his 2010 Presidential Address for the Academy of Management, Walsh [2010] described the secular notions behind the evaluation of management faculty research. He suggests that the current environment for faculty in business schools has evolved from an "audit culture," which uses very specific measures of the quality and quantity of faculty publications to evaluate faculty research. Walsh concludes that the public nature of these measures adds to the already significant pressure to produce increasing quantities of research papers aimed at "top" journals.

Since its emergence as an academic discipline and field of research [Culnan and Swanson, 1986], IS has suffered from the perception that there is a paucity of elite publication outlets. Largely as a result of this perception, the Senior Scholars Forum issued a formal statement in 2007 [AISNET, 2010] identifying a collection of six journals as top journals in the IS field. The journals identified are *MIS Quarterly* (MISQ), *Information Systems Research* (ISR), *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (JAIS), *Journal of Management Information Systems* (JMIS), *European Journal of Information Systems* (EJIS), and *Information Systems Journal* (ISJ). The Senior Scholars encouraged the evaluators of faculty and institutional research productivity to use this "basket" of six journals (referred to as the AIS-6) to improve the measurement of research performance. The Senior Scholars also stated that *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* (JSIS) and *Journal of Information Technology* (JIT) could be included in the IS journal list without impacting the quality of the list.

The purpose of this study is to address the following questions with respect to the 2005–2009 time period, using an inclusive set of leading IS journals:

1. Is coauthoring of articles in the top IS journals changing over time? If decreasing, we might infer that the practice of devaluing coauthored work is being revived. If increasing, we might infer that coauthoring has value within the research system.
2. Does the number of articles published annually differ within the Select-11 basket of journals?
3. Who are the top IS researchers as measured by the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals? Where are they affiliated? Where did they earn their doctorate?
4. How do the rankings of the top IS researchers vary across the three sets of journals?
5. In which of the Select-11 journals are the top IS researchers publishing?
6. Which universities supplied the graduates who published the most articles in the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals?

7. Which universities had the most doctoral students who published in the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals?
8. For which universities did the affiliated faculty/staff publish the most articles in the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals? Are there differences across the journal sets?
9. Do the geographic researcher affiliations differ across the three sets of journals? Are they changed from the previous studies [Clark and Warren, 2006; Clark, Warren, and Au, 2009]?
10. With which countries are the Select-11 authors most represented?

To create a list of top journals for their original study, Clark and Warren [2006] reviewed four publications from the ISWorld website [Saunders, 2010]. The journals studied in these publications met the criteria for publishing “pure IS” research, but did not use citation indices to produce rankings [Rainer and Miller, 2005; Lowry, Romans, and Curtis, 2004; Peffers and Tang, 2003; Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis, 2001]. Clark and Warren [2006] first identified the top “pure IS” journals from Rainer and Miller [2005] and Peffers and Tang [2003]. The studies by Lowry et al. [2004] and Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis [2001] included publication outlets from a variety of disciplines. From these studies, Clark and Warren [2006] identified the top 10 “pure IS journals.” Five journals—*MISQ*, *ISR*, *JMIS*, *Decision Support Systems (DSS)*, and *Information & Management (I&M)*—ranked among the top 10 “pure IS” journals in each of the four studies. Clark and Warren [2006] also included *Communications of the Association for Information Systems (CAIS)* and *Journal of the Association for Information Systems (JAIS)* because, even though they were both very new journals, they ranked in the top ten 50 percent of the time. *CAIS*, in particular, plays an important role in communication within the IS discipline, as it offers a high quality outlet for research which may not be strictly within the mainstream of many of the traditional research outlets.

Data collected for Clark and Warren [2006] included journal name, issue, and a list of all of the authors associated with each article. For each article, Clark and Warren [2006] collected the following information: professional rank of each author at time of publication, university in which each author obtained their doctorate, university in which each author was working at the time of their article publication, and university in which each was working as of spring, 2006. In a subsequent update of this article, Clark et al. [2009] also included *EJIS* and *ISJ*, based on the 2007 formal statement from the AIS Senior Scholar Forum [AISNET, 2010]. This is in line with the result of a citation-based analysis by Katerattanakul and Han [2003], which compared eleven well-recognized IS journals to four European IS journals and found that *EJIS* and *ISJ* were comparable in quality to *MISQ* and *ISR* on four of their eight citation-based indices.

We did not attempt to identify a specific number of top ranked journals in our process of selecting the journals for this study. Instead, we aimed to identify clusters of journals based on the ratings. Quality rankings are ordinal, and illustrate only ordinal differences. Quality ratings, however, identify sets of journals that are comparable on measurable dimensions related to quality. Thus, we are not striving for a specific number of journals, but we want to ensure that the journals in this study are comparable with respect to quality.

We expanded the set of journals in the current study from the journals studied in Clark et al. [2009] and its precursors. We added *JSIS* and *JIT* (identified by the AIS Senior Scholars Forum [AISNET 2010]) to the nine highly rated journals included in the previous study [Clark et al., 2009]. Because all of the journal ranking studies identified *MISQ*, *ISR*, and *JMIS* as the top three journals, Clark et al. [2009] labeled these journals the Top-3. The AIS-6 basket of journals identified by the Senior Scholars contains the Top-3 plus *JAIS*, *EJIS*, and *ISJ*. The Select-11 basket of journals contains the AIS-6 plus *DSS*, *CAIS*, *I&M*, *JIT*, and *JSIS*. Of these, *DSS*, *CAIS*, and *I&M* were in the original Select-7 [Clark and Warren, 2006], and *JSIS* and *JIT* were the aforementioned additional journals identified by the Senior Scholars (see Figure 1). Thus, the Select-11 basket, by design, contains a cluster of the IS journals which are considered to be the top journals.

Dean, Lowry, and Humphreys [2011] found that the AIS-6 plus *JIT* and *JSIS* explained actual tenure decisions better than standards which included only *MISQ* and *ISR*. The expanded set of journals in the current study (i.e., the Select-11) is intended to make this study more inclusive, broad, and, ultimately, more useful for tenure and promotion decisions, organizational evaluation, and comparisons within the IS discipline.

The majority of the articles in the Select-11 journals used in this study have multiple authors. Authors may be credited for publications by either the full count (also known as the normal count) or the partial count methods. The full count gives a credit of one to all authors. The partial count method assigns to each author a credit of one divided by the total number of authors. Both methods assume equal credit for all authors on a given paper. (See also Clark and Warren, 2006; Lee and Bozeman, 2005; Lindsey, 1980; and Pradvic and Oluic-Vukovic, 1986). The partial count method, however, also assumes that articles are similar with respect to the complexity and difficulty of each project.

If this is the case then, the amount of work, effort, creativity, and/or knowledge required is constant across research articles. The full count method is more appropriate if one assumes that articles vary with respect to complexity and difficulty. If so, then the amount of work, effort, creativity, and/or knowledge needed will vary, with more coauthors involved in the more complex and difficult projects.

Figure 1. Depiction of the AIS-6 and Top-3 as Subsets of the Select-11

Coauthorship is the norm in the physical sciences, and has become more prevalent in the field of IS. (We address the increase in coauthorship in our first research question.) The top journals in IS publish a limited number of articles. In fact, for the top journals, IS has half of the per-capita publishing opportunities when compared to other disciplines [Dennis, Valacich, Fuller, and Schneider, 2006; Valacich, Fuller, Schneider, and Dennis, 2006]. Thus, considerable competition to publish exists. As a result, the standards for both the quality and the scope of research have risen, and the amount of work required to publish in a top IS journal has increased significantly. Laudel [2001, 2002] notes that coauthorship is a product of the division of labor among participants and is necessary for projects with many tasks and/or projects which require the integration of multiple knowledge domains. Walsh [2010] suggests that authors are perhaps more outcome-driven, and choose to work in teams to minimize risk and facilitate the production of more papers in top journals.

Modern ethical standards for publishing demand full contributions from each coauthor. According to the Association for Information Systems (AIS) Code of Research Conduct [AISNET, 2009]:

Since authorship implies a claim to, and readiness to take public responsibility for, the intellectual activity involved in a publication, only those who have made a substantial intellectual contribution to the research should be listed as authors. Submitting a manuscript to which non-participating authors are added, for whatever purpose, is a form of misrepresentation.

In studies of researcher productivity, the assignment of full credit to coauthors is increasingly common. Dennis et al. [2006] and Valacich et al. [2006] use full counts to measure researcher productivity. Dean et al. [2011] used a full count to measure the productivity of IS faculty from graduation to the present.

Because research articles vary with respect to difficulty and level of effort, we assume that the level of difficulty and amount of effort are correlated with the number of coauthors to allow for a division of labor. Thus, for this study, we used the full count method in our analyses.

We used various subsets of the Select-11 journals, using a full-count measure for coauthorship, to assess the research performance of individuals and institutions. For institutions, we assessed both the overall research performance of the faculty as well as the performance of the institution's doctoral students and graduates. We believe the findings of this study will help to broaden the boundaries of "elite" IS research. We reviewed geographic

affiliation to determine whether it was changing over time. For the geographic research questions, we employed the AIS categories, which divide the academic community into three regions. Region 1 contains North, South, and Central America; Region 2 consists of Europe, Africa, and the Middle East; Region 3 consists of Asia (except for the Middle East) and the Pacific [AISNET, 2010].

In Section II, we provide a survey of relevant scientometric research related to academic journals in the IS field. Because the current study is an update and extension of Clark et al. [2009], which extended Clark and Warren [2006], we include both the background studies and relevant updates and advances within this literature. In Section III, we specify the types of publications we included and did not include in the study, and we identify the data collected for the authors of each included research article from the Select-11 journals during calendar years 2005 thru 2009. We present the analysis of the data formatted to address the research questions (1–10) in Section IV. We include a summary of these results and discuss conclusions and implications for the IS academic profession in Section V.

II. PRIOR SCIENTOMETRIC RESEARCH ON IS JOURNALS

An important question addressed by scientometrics in the IS field is the assessment of the research performance of individual researchers. Reliable scientific measures of research productivity are both relevant and important in faculty tenure and promotion decisions.

Assessment of the performance of institutions is also critical. Prospective faculty and prospective students may use these scientometric assessments as input in the selection of universities and programs. Institutional assessment based on the goals of the college or university will help to identify whether the institution's publication record is consistent with its goals.

For assessment of the quality of individual or institutional research, a critical aspect of scientometric studies in IS has been the assessment of journal quality [Chua, Cao, Cousins, and Straub, 2002; Huang and Hsu, 2005; Karuga, Lowry, and Richardson, 2007; Clark, Warren, and Au, 2007; Lowry, Karuga, and Richardson, 2007; Clark et al., 2009]. Scientific research aimed at measuring the quality of IS publication outlets has taken one (or more) of five basic strategies:

1. *Reputational Survey.* In reputational surveys, the researchers survey relevant IS faculty and professionals, asking them to classify the quality of each of a set of journals. Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis [2001] requested classifications of a predetermined journal list. Peffers and Tang [2003] also used this method. Lowry et al. [2004] asked survey respondents to nominate four journals.
2. *Citation Analysis of Research Impact.* Citation analysis has been used in IS to evaluate the impact of individual IS researchers and the impact of specific journals. The primary source for citation data, the ISI Web of KnowledgeSM *Journal Citation Reports*® [Thomson Reuters, 2010], contains only about 40 percent (or less) of the core IS publications. Katerattanakul, Han, and Hong [2004] ranked 27 IS and Computer Science (CS) journals using citation data. Anne-Wil Harzing [Harzing, 2010] manages a website that includes resources useful for the measurement of research quality and journal quality. The website also provides a downloadable system, *Publish or Perish*, which uses Google Scholar [Google, 2010] data to compute and report basic statistics and a variety of citation metrics, including Hirsch's h-index [Hirsch, 2005]. The h-index has been criticized for relying too heavily on sustained productivity and less on individual highly-cited publications. While not universally accepted as a measure of research quality for journals or of research performance for individuals and institutions, the h-index is receiving attention. Harzing and van der Wal [2009] compared the Google Scholar h-index and the ISI Journal impact factor for over 800 journals. They found significant agreement, even though Google Scholar contains many journals not included in the ISI data. They also suggest that the h-index provides a broader and more comprehensive measure which should be considered as a supplement to ISI data.

Google Scholar [Google, 2010] and Scopus® [Elsevier, 2010] data, however, include nonscholarly citations and data problems exist [Jasco, 2008a, 2008b]. Journals that are cited in books, proceedings, technical reports, working papers, or policy documents will receive higher scores. Google Scholar contains phantom citations and inconsistent author names. For many journals, Scopus® has coverage only from the early 2000s; for others the coverage is not consistent.
3. *Composite Ranking Based on a Set of Published Rankings.* Rainer and Miller [2005] aggregated the journal rankings from nine studies published between 1991 and 2003 and produced a composite ranking of the top fifty journals across these nine studies. The journals included in their study, however, were not only IS journals. They also included Management, Operations Research, and CS journals. See Saunders [2010] for a broad review and links to published studies of IS journal quality.

Mingers and Harzing [2007] used sixteen journal rankings from the Harzing data set [Harzing, 2010] to develop a combined ranking, based on statistical analysis. The results showed a high degree of conformity within the rankings, with the exception of the citation index. The authors also clustered the data into four groups for comparison with the United Kingdom's Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) rankings and compared the four quality groups to the original individual rankings. For the top quality groups, the results were similar.

4. *Using Institution Quality to Measure Journal Quality.* Ferratt, Gorman, Kanet, and Salisbury [2007] proposed the Author Affiliation Index (AAI) as a means of assessing journal quality. The AAI is based on the percentage of academic authors who publish in a given journal and are affiliated with a high-quality academic institution. Thus, the quality of a journal is based on the quality of the affiliations of the authors who publish in the journal. A problem associated with this is how to determine the quality of a given institution.
5. *Focus on Research Areas and Peer Review.* Willcocks, Whitley, and Avgerou [2008] proposed a strategy for publications focused on selecting journals that map to the department's goals and mission as revealed in its prevalent research areas and associated research questions, designs, and methods. Willcocks et al. [2008] also stressed the importance of peer review of both journals and individuals' articles as a method for evaluating IS journals.

Extensive research on the quality of journals (as described above) is an integral part of the measurement of the performance of researchers and institutions. Scientific research in this area tends to be of two varieties:

1. *Citation Analysis of Research Impact.* While technical problems related to data quality and difficulties in matching name-variants are critical issues, Clarke [2008] suggested that the citation frequency of researchers' publications is still an important aspect of the measurement of research performance. Chua et al. [2002] studied the rates of researcher publication in a set of fifty-eight IS journals, analyzed the citation data of the research from this set of journals and tested the reliability of researcher-productivity measures. Lowry et al. [2007] assessed IS researcher contributions based on the number of times their publications were cited. Specifically, they reviewed the number of citations for articles published between 1990 and 2004 for *MISQ*, *ISR*, and *Management Science (MS)*. The authors included only the IS-related articles from *MS*. Truex, Cuellar, and Takeda [2009] examined the same publications as in the Lowry et al. [2007] study, but applied Hirsch-family indices in evaluating the scholarly productivity of IS researchers. They also compared scholarly productivity of researchers residing in North America versus those residing in other parts of the world.
2. *Direct Counts of Publications in an Established List of Top Journals.* Prior to the AIS Senior Scholars announcement of the AIS-6, Clark and Warren [2006] studied IS researcher productivity during calendar years 2001–2005, based on seven leading IS journals: *CAIS*, *DSS*, *I&M*, *ISR*, *JAIS*, *JMIS*, and *MISQ*. Selection of these journals was based on an accumulation of prior rankings of IS journals [Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis, 2001; Peffers and Tang, 2003; Lowry et al., 2004; Rainer and Miller, 2005]. The Clark and Warren [2006] list contains four of the AIS-6 journals. Clark et al. [2009] updated that study, based on calendar years 2003–2007. They maintained the original journals, but added *EJIS* and *ISJ*, the two journals in the AIS-6 that the authors did not include in the original study. Thus, they studied the productivity of IS researchers publishing in nine IS journals (referred to as the Select Nine) during calendar years 2003–2007.

Both types of productivity research rely on the relative rankings of journals. Thus, productivity research introduces a bias into the IS research environment. Researchers aspire to publish in journals considered "top" journals on the lists, so that they might be considered highly productive, high quality researchers. In spite of this, Lewis, Templeton, and Luo [2007] found that studies that rated or ranked IS journals did provide reasonable measures of the relative quality of journals and the results were consistent over time. However, Gallivan and Benbunan-Fich [2007] criticized former scientometric studies of IS scholars, purporting that the journals used in the studies were biased toward North American researchers. They reviewed research publications in twelve IS journals (eight of which are in our Select-11 basket), focusing on researchers with three or more publications in these journals during 1999 thru 2003. North American researchers dominated the list. Over 70 percent of the authors and publications were from North American institutions.

Adams and Johnson [2008] describe the history, motivation, and outcomes of the use of IS Journal Lists within the University of Houston's C.T. Bauer College of Business. Three reasons initially proposed for using journal lists were to identify top IS journals for faculty research, to facilitate cross-disciplinary research, and to reduce or eliminate departmental politics with respect to journals. While the authors found that the use of the journal list has simplified the annual merit review process, there appeared to be no effect on inter-disciplinary research or intra-departmental

politics concerning the journals. In addition, faculty had varying ideas and were generally unsure about the process of using the lists for merit review.

In the next section, we describe the data collection for the current study. We define the types of articles that we included from the Select-11 journals and specify the attributes collected for each author.

III. DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

For the current study, we collected information for the articles in the Select-11 set of journals during calendar years 2005 thru 2009. We collected the following for each article: the name of the journal, issue number, publication year, name(s) of all authors, and number of authors per article. For each author, we collected the author affiliation, rank, and doctoral degree-granting institution (if relevant). Any author information that was not provided in the article's author biography required a search of other sources, including but not limited to university websites, AISNET, dissertation abstracts, publication databases, and the biographical statements from the author's other publications. Confirmation of doctoral degree and doctoral granting institution was the most difficult part of the data collection. Even so, we were able to obtain complete data on more than 99 percent of the authors.

Chua et al. [2002] suggested that researcher productivity was not uniform over time, but resembles a Poisson distribution, since a researcher may publish several articles in one year and nothing for the next year or two. Thus, as in the previous studies, we analyze a five-year period of publications to allow for the variability of the publication process. We included only research articles in the data collection. As in our previous studies, we did not include notes, columns, tutorials, comments, and letters to the editor. Note that CAIS did not differentiate among columns, tutorials, and research articles until 2008.

We aggregated the data to produce ranked frequencies, which address the questions described above. We report results for the Select-11 set of journals for this time period. We also report results for Top-3 (*MISQ*, *ISR*, and *JMIS*) and the AIS-6 (Top-3 plus *J AIS*, *EJIS*, and *ISJ*) for comparison purposes. In addition, we compare the current results to those found in Clark et al. [2009].

In the next section, we provide tables which summarize the data and which contain the ranked frequencies for each question and discuss the results. A majority of these tables are located in the Appendix and cited in the section.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

During calendar years 2005–2009, the Select-11 basket of IS journals published 2,544 articles with 4,051 associated authors (Table 1). Since many authors published more than one article in the sample, we also counted the number of appearances of authors. For the 2005–2009 time period, there were 6,721 appearances of authors in the Select-11 basket of journals.

Table 1: Articles and Authors Published Each Calendar Year

Journal	2005 art/auth	2006 art/auth	2007 art/auth	2008 art/auth	2009 art/auth	Total art/auth	Author Ratio
CAIS	93/241	85/251	98/282	53/152	73/164	402/1090	2.71
DSS	104/285	156/420	158/442	153/422	118/343	689/1912	2.78
EJIS	30/73	49/124	55/136	40/96	39/119	213/548	2.57
I&M	61/157	78/185	55/149	62/157	56/143	312/791	2.54
ISJ	18/39	15/48	19/44	26/59	23/60	101/250	2.48
ISR	21/56	23/59	24/60	25/76	29/76	122/327	2.68
J AIS	14/36	30/80	32/77	31/106	31/93	138/392	2.84
JIT	19/43	21/34	28/56	22/47	25/62	115/242	2.10
JMIS	42/113	41/116	40/108	41/112	37/105	201/554	2.76
JSIS	20/45	14/33	18/34	16/43	14/33	82/188	2.29
MISQ	27/62	42/105	30/77	34/95	36/88	169/427	2.53
Total	449/1150	554/1455	557/1465	503/1365	481/1286	2544/6721	2.64

There was an average of 2.64 authors per article. As shown in Clark and Warren [2006] and Clark et al. [2009], there were differences among the journals with respect to the number of articles published annually. The number of articles published per journal per year has also varied somewhat over the time period. However, we note that the decrease in CAIS research articles can be partially attributed to the method they currently use to list articles. As previously stated, we did not include letters to the editor, columns, teaching cases, tutorials, and the like.

The Prevalence of Coauthoring in the Top IS Journals over Time

Our first research question is: Is coauthoring of articles in the top IS journals changing over time? For the time period studied in Clark and Warren [2006], Clark et al. [2009], and the current study, the average number of authors per article is increasing for all of the journals with two or more observations (Table 2). The diagram in Figure 2 clearly shows the trend. Note that the journals vary considerably with respect to the number of articles published annually.

Table 2: Average Authors to Articles Ratios

	2001–2005 Clark and Warren [2006]	2003–2007 Clark et al. [2009]	2005–2009 The current study
<i>CAIS</i>	2.36	2.62	2.71
<i>DSS</i>	2.57	2.69	2.78
<i>EJIS</i>	*	2.37	2.57
<i>I&M</i>	2.26	2.39	2.54
<i>ISJ</i>	*	2.34	2.48
<i>ISR</i>	2.48	2.56	2.68
<i>JAIS</i>	2.25	2.44	2.84
<i>JIT</i>	*	*	2.10
<i>JMIS</i>	2.64	2.73	2.76
<i>JSIS</i>	*	*	2.29
<i>MISQ</i>	2.38	2.46	2.53
Average	2.42	2.56	2.64
*Data not available

Figure 2. Average Authors to Articles Ratios in Different Periods

We further tested whether coauthorship was changing over time by using a dependent sample t-test (Table 3) to determine whether the number of authors per article from our first study (2001–2005 data) was statistically different from the number of authors per article found the 2005–2009 data for the same set of journals. Note that the statistical comparison did not include *EJIS*, *ISJ*, *JIT*, and *JSIS* because they were not included in the Clark and Warren [2006] study. As shown, the p-value for a two-tailed test was .004. Thus, we conclude that there is a statistically significant increase in coauthorship of *CAIS*, *DSS*, *I&M*, *JAIS*, *JMIS*, *ISR*, and *MISQ* research since 2001.

Table 3: Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences			t	df	Significance (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Y2001_5—Y2005_9	-.27143	.16036	.06061	-4.478	6	.004

This result is not surprising. As described above, as researchers compete for journal space, research projects have become larger and more complex. Coauthorship is a natural trend for projects in which there are many tasks and which cover multiple knowledge domains [Laudel, 2002]. Recent research suggests that there is an increasing trend for coauthorship in IS research (see Zhang, Feng, Li, Zheng, and Zhang, 2010; Oh, Choi, and Kim, 2006; Chua and Yang, 2008). Although the methodologies in these studies differed from ours, the findings were consistent in that the trend toward collaboration has indeed increased.

Relative Quantity of Articles Published in the Top IS Journals

Our second research question is: Does the number of articles published annually differ for the Select-11 basket of journals? Table 4 lists the yearly percentages of total publications for each journal and the overall percentage for the five-year period. We derived these percentages from Table 1. *DSS* publishes the most articles annually, averaging 27 percent (689) of all articles (2544) in the sample. *CAIS* and *I&M* averaged 16 percent (402) and 12 percent (312) of the articles, respectively. *EJIS* and *JMIS* each averaged approximately 8 percent (213 and 201, respectively). *JSIS* accounted for only about 3 percent (82) of all articles.

Table 4: Yearly Percentage of Publications per Journal 2005–2009

Journal	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	5-Year Average
<i>CAIS</i>	20.7	15.3	17.6	10.5	15.2	15.9
<i>DSS</i>	23.2	28.2	28.4	30.4	24.5	26.9
<i>EJIS</i>	6.7	8.8	9.9	8.0	8.1	8.3
<i>I&M</i>	13.6	14.1	9.9	12.3	11.6	12.3
<i>ISJ</i>	4.0	2.7	3.4	5.2	4.8	4.0
<i>ISR</i>	4.7	4.2	4.3	5.0	6.0	4.8
<i>JAIS</i>	3.1	5.4	5.7	6.2	6.4	5.4
<i>JIT</i>	4.2	3.8	5.0	4.4	5.2	4.5
<i>JMIS</i>	9.4	7.4	7.2	8.2	7.7	8.0
<i>JSIS</i>	4.5	2.5	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.3
<i>MISQ</i>	6.0	7.6	5.4	6.8	7.5	6.6

The five-year averages range between 26.9 (*DSS*) and 3.3 (*JSIS*). We conclude that the number of articles published annually is different across the journals in the Select-11 basket of journals. This result is consistent with that found in the previous study [Clark et al., 2009] and with the prediction of Walsh [2010] for the management discipline.

Top IS Researchers

Our third research question is: Who are the top IS researchers as measured by the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals? Where are they affiliated? Where did they earn their doctorate? We calculated the number of articles associated with each of the authors in the data set and reported university affiliation, as well as representation in the AIS Regions.

Table A-1 (see Appendix A) lists the IS researchers with five or more research articles in the Select-11 journals during calendar years 2005–2009. Also included are their current affiliation (as of Spring 2010) and the university from which they obtained their doctorate (usually a Ph.D.). The top three researchers based on the number of articles are Hsinchun Chen (University of Arizona), Izak Benbasat (University of British Columbia), and H. R. Rao (State University of New York at Buffalo). These same three researchers topped the list in the previous study [Clark et al., 2009].

Of the 200 researchers listed in Table A-1 (see Appendix A), ten are currently (as of Spring 2010) affiliated with Georgia State University, six with City University of Hong Kong, and six with University of Houston. Of these researchers, sixteen received their doctorate from the University of Minnesota, eleven from the University of Arizona, and nine from Purdue University. Furthermore, fifty-three (i.e., 27 percent) of these researchers were affiliated with universities outside of North America: twenty-four in Region 2 and twenty-nine in Region 3.

Table A-2 (see Appendix A) lists the IS researchers with three or more publications in the AIS-6 (*MISQ*, *ISR*, *JMIS*, *JAIS*, *EJIS*, and *ISJ*) during 2005–2009. There are 190 researchers in the list. The top three researchers in this table are Izak Benbasat (University of British Columbia), Robert Kauffman (Arizona State University), and Mark Keil (Georgia State University). Professors Kauffman and Keil tied for second place. In Clark et al. [2009], the top three researchers in this category were Izak Benbasat (University of British Columbia), Kalle Lyytinen (Case Western Reserve University), and Robert Kauffman (Arizona State University).

Regarding university affiliation, Georgia State University again leads with the greatest number of researchers represented (eight). This is followed by the University of Texas at Dallas (six). The University of Minnesota again has the largest number of graduates (eleven), followed by the University of Arizona (nine) and Carnegie Mellon University (seven). Of the 190 researchers in the list, forty-four are currently (as of Spring 2010) affiliated with non-North American universities: sixteen from Region 2 and twenty-eight from Region 3.

Table A-3 (see Appendix A) lists the IS researchers with three or more publications in the Top-3 (*MISQ*, *ISR*, and *JMIS*) during calendar years 2005–2009. During this time frame, 889 researchers published one or more research articles in the Top-3 basket of IS journals. Since some participated in more than one article, the total number of author appearances was 1,308. Ninety-three researchers have three or more research articles in the Top-3. The leading researchers in this basket are Izak Benbasat (University of British Columbia), followed by Ritu Agarwal (University of Maryland), Arun Rai (Georgia State University), and Andrew B. Whinston (University of Texas at Austin) for a 3-way tie for second place. In Clark et al. [2009], the top researchers in this category were Izak Benbasat (University of British Columbia), Andrew B. Whinston (University of Texas at Austin), and Robert Kauffman (Arizona State University) and Jay F. Nunamaker, Jr. (University of Arizona) who tied for third place.

The University of Texas at Dallas has the most researchers (six) represented in Table A-3. Four universities (Georgia State University, University of Arizona, University of Minnesota, and University of Pittsburgh) have four researchers each represented in the table. On the other hand, University of Arizona, University of Minnesota, and University of Texas at Austin have the greatest number of doctoral graduates represented in Table A-3, each with seven graduates. Only eleven of the ninety-three (i.e., 12 percent) researchers in the list are affiliated with a university outside North America. Also, only six (i.e., six percent) researchers in the table received their doctorates from universities outside of North America. We expected to see large percentages of North American researchers since the Top-3 journals are based in North America.

Our fourth research question is: How do the rankings of the top IS researchers vary across the three baskets of journals? Table A-4 (see Appendix A) lists alphabetically the top ninety-three IS researchers with three or more publications in the Top-3 basket of journals, along with their numbers of publications and ranks in the Select-11 and AIS-6 journals. The table shows that some top IS researchers rank consistently high across the three baskets. These researchers include Izak Benbasat (Select-11, rank 2; AIS-6, rank 1; Top-3, rank 1), Andrew B. Whinston (Select-11, rank 5; AIS-6, rank 4; Top-3, rank 2), and Robert Kauffman (Select-11, rank 8; AIS-6, rank 2; Top-3, rank 5). Other researchers tend to focus on a more narrow range of journals. These researchers include Ritu Agarwal (Select-11, rank 38; AIS-6, rank 8; Top-3, rank 2), Hsinchun Chen (Select-11, rank 1; AIS-6, rank 57; Top-3, rank 24), and H. R. Rao (Select-11, rank 3; AIS-6, rank 11; Top-3, rank 24).

Our fifth research question is: In which of the Select-11 journals are the top IS researchers publishing? Table A-5 (see Appendix A) provides a further breakdown regarding the number of publications per journal associated with the IS researchers. Mark Keil exhibited the greatest diversity in publication outlets by publishing in eight of the Select-11 basket of journals. Eleven other researchers published in seven of the Select-11 journals during calendar years 2005–2009. Interestingly, of the leading eighty-two authors listed in the table, only eleven have articles in *JIT* and only fifteen in *JSIS*. Conversely, fifty-one of these eighty-two authors have articles in *CAIS*, fifty in *JMIS*, forty-six in *DSS*, forty in *MISQ*, thirty-eight in *JAIS*, thirty-three in *EJIS*, thirty-two in *I&M*, thirty in *ISR*, and twenty-one in *ISJ*.

Top IS Universities for Research Output (Faculty and Graduates)

Our sixth research question is: Which universities supplied the graduates who published the most articles in the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 journals? Since approximately 90 percent of the IS researchers in this study either have or are seeking doctorates, we analyzed the data to determine the doctoral programs that produced graduates who published in leading IS journals. Six hundred and eleven universities from across the world have one or more graduates who published in one or more of the Select-11 journals during calendar years 2005–2009, whereas 328 universities supplied graduates who published in the AIS-6 and 168 in the Top-3.

Table A-6 (see Appendix A) lists, alphabetically, the doctoral programs whose graduates published at least thirteen research articles in the Select-11, six in the AIS-6, or three in the Top-3 basket of journals. The top three universities in the list, based on number of articles by graduates publishing in the Select-11 journals, are University of

Minnesota, University of Arizona, and Purdue University. Those who ranked highest in the AIS-6 journals include University of Minnesota, Carnegie Mellon University, and University of Arizona. Carnegie Mellon University and University of Arizona tied for second place. Those who ranked highest in the Top-3 journals include University of Minnesota, Carnegie Mellon University, and University of Arizona. Note that thirty of the 109 (i.e., 27 percent) universities in the list are outside of North America. Of these, thirty are located in non-North American universities, twenty-two are located in Region 2, and eight are in Region 3.

Universities with the greatest number of graduate publications do not necessarily have the highest publication ratios. For example, although only one University of Missouri–Kansas City graduate published in the Select-11 journals, it has the highest productivity rate per graduate (9.0). Beijing University, Polytechnique Paris, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, and University of Waikato tied for second place, with a publication ratio of 6.0. Each of these universities also had only one graduate publishing in the Select-11. Among the AIS-6 journals, the universities with the highest publication ratio are University of Cincinnati (6.50), State University of New York at Binghamton (5.0), IT University of Copenhagen (4.0), Polytechnique Paris (4.0), University of Miami (4.0), and University of North London (4.0). Of these, all but University of Cincinnati had only one graduate publishing in the AIS-6 basket. Polytechnique Paris (one graduate) had the highest publication ratio in the Top-3 journals (4.0). This was followed by Case Western Reserve University, Syracuse University, and University of Manchester. Each had a publication ratio of 3.0 in the Top-3 journals.

A further look into Table A-6 reveals some interesting observations. The top five universities whose graduates published in one or more of the Top-3 journals are also the top five universities in the AIS-6 journals and are among the top seven universities in the Select-11 journals. Thus, IS researchers from the most productive doctoral programs (in terms of graduates who publish) are major contributors to each basket of IS journals. Note that North American universities consistently ranked highest in number of graduates publishing, but not in the average number of publications per graduate.

Our seventh research question is: Which universities supplied the most doctoral students who published in the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals? Five hundred and twenty-six doctoral students from 228 universities published articles in one or more of the Select-11 journals during calendar years 2005–2009. The total number of doctoral student appearances was 576. We classified researchers as doctoral students if that was their rank at or near the time of publication. Some researcher classifications changed with subsequent publications. For example, they might be a doctoral student in one publication and an assistant professor for subsequent publications. Note that the number of doctoral students may actually be higher than this. Doctoral students did not always identify themselves as such in the journal publications. If they listed themselves as both professors or lecturers and doctoral students, we counted them as doctoral students. If we later discovered that they were doctoral students at the time of publication, we counted them as doctoral students.

Table A-7 (see Appendix A) lists, alphabetically, the universities whose doctoral students published at least three articles in the Select-11, two in the AIS-6, or three in the Top-3 basket of journals during calendar years 2005–2009. Note that some doctoral students coauthored publications with other doctoral students. If doctoral students from two or more different universities published an article, we credited each affiliated university. The three universities with the greatest number of doctoral students publishing in the Select-11 journals are University of Arizona, Georgia State University, and National University of Singapore.

In the AIS-6 journals, the top ranked universities are Clemson University, Georgia State University, HEC Montréal, University of British Columbia, and University of Oslo (three-way tie for third place). In Clark et al. [2009], the top universities in this category were Clemson University and University of Arizona, followed by Georgia State University, Indiana University, University of British Columbia, University of Minnesota, and University of Oslo, which had a five-way tie for third place.

University of Arizona had the greatest number of doctoral students publishing in the Top-3 basket. City University of Hong Kong, Georgia State University, University of British Columbia, University of Minnesota, University of Oslo, and University of Texas at Dallas tied for second place. In the previous study [Clark et al., 2009], the top universities in this category were University of Arizona and Indiana University, followed by University of Minnesota and University of Oslo, which tied for third place.

Of the sixty-seven universities in Table A-7, twenty-seven (40 percent) are outside of North America: thirteen are from Region 2 and fourteen are from Region 3. Few doctoral students from any of the three AIS regions published in either the AIS-6 or Top-3 baskets.

Our eighth research question is: Which universities supplied the faculty/staff who published the most articles in the Select-11 journals, the AIS-6 journals, and the Top-3 IS journals? Are there differences across the journal sets? Table A-8 (see Appendix A) lists the top 104 universities whose faculty or staff published at least fifteen articles in the Select-11, seven articles in AIS-6, or four articles in the Top-3 basket. The top three universities in the list, based on number of articles by faculty or staff publishing in the Select-11 journals are Georgia State University, City University of Hong Kong, and University of Maryland. In the AIS-6 journals, the top three universities are Georgia State University, University of British Columbia, and University of Maryland. In the Top-3 journals, the highest ranked universities are University of Maryland, University of British Columbia, and Georgia State University. Twenty-nine of the 104 (i.e., 28 percent) universities in the list are outside of North America: eleven are from Region 2 and eighteen are from Region 3. Note that the three leading universities in both the Top-3 and AIS-6 are also ranked first, third, and sixth in the Select-11 basket of IS journals.

In terms of the average number of faculty/staff publications in the Select-11 journals, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Georgia State University, and Netherlands Defense Academy had the highest ratios (6.0, 5.21, and 5.0, respectively). However, note that only one faculty member at either University of Colorado at Colorado Springs or Netherlands Defense Academy published in the Select-11 journals. In the AIS-6 basket, University of British Columbia had the highest publication ratio (5.14), followed by Case Western Reserve University, Georgia State University, and University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (three-way tie for second place with ratio of 4.0). University of Limerick had the highest publication ratio in the Top-3 (4.0), followed by University of British Columbia (3.71), and Long Island University—C. W. Post Campus, National Central University, National Tsing Hua University, and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (four-way tie for third place with ratio of 3.0). However, all but University of British Columbia had only one faculty member publishing in the Top-3.

Geographic Representation of the IS Researchers

Our ninth research question is: Do the geographic researcher affiliations differ across the three sets of journals? Have they changed from the previous studies (i.e., Clark and Warren, 2006; Clark et al., 2009)? Table 5 provides comparisons of author appearances in the Select-11, AIS-6, and Top-3 baskets of IS journals during calendar years 2003–2007 with those in the same set of baskets during calendar years 2005–2009.

For the AIS-6 category, the percentage of researchers affiliated with North American (and Region 1) universities for the 2005–2009 period is not different from that found for the years 2003–2007 (i.e., 68 percent versus 67 percent). We found no significant difference between the two time periods for the AIS-6 journals for Region 2 (both were 21 percent). For Region 3, the difference between 11 percent and 12 percent is not significant. We tested each pair of values using the statistic for comparison of two binomial proportions, using an alpha of 0.05. The computed p-values for comparison of Regions 1, 2, and 3 were 0.277, 0.7502, and 0.2056, respectively. We also compared the frequencies obtained from the two time periods for the AIS-6 for Regions 1, 2, and 3 together, using a Chi-Square test to compare the two groups. The estimated Chi-square was 1.832, giving a p-value of .394. For an alpha = 0.05, this result also signifies no significant differences between the proportions obtained in the two time periods.

For the Top-3 journals, however, the North American (and Region 1) percentage fell from 84 percent to 79 percent. For Region 2, the percentage rose from 6 percent to 8 percent. For Region 3, the percentage rose from 10 percent to 13 percent. Each of these pairs of values was tested using the statistic for comparison of two binomial proportions. The p-values for comparison of Regions 1, 2, and 3 were 0.0008, 0.0378, and 0.013, respectively. Using alpha = 0.05, this implies that the Top-3 journal results from the 2003–2007 time period were significantly different from the 2005–2009 results. Specifically, we found an increase in the proportion of Top-3 publications of faculty affiliated in Regions 2 and 3 and a decrease in the proportion of Top-3 publications from faculty in Region 1. We also compared the frequencies obtained from the two time periods for the Top-3 journals for Regions 1, 2, and 3 together, using a Chi-Square test to compare the two time periods. The estimated Chi-square was 11.336, giving a p-value of 0.0047. This result also signifies that the proportions of articles in the Top-3 journals have changed significantly over time, across the three regions.

Note that researchers publishing in the Top-3 basket continue to be predominantly from North American universities, signifying the region's dominance in the top-tier IS journals. As reported by Willcocks et al. [2008], some universities outside North America place less emphasis on publishing in the Top-3 journals. Instead, they tend to adopt a more diverse journal list based on their underlying academic research approach and goals. This could be based, in part, on the differences in the tenure and promotion process in North American universities versus those outside of North America. The significant decrease in the proportion of researchers from North America publishing in the Top-3 journals (with corresponding increases in the proportions for Regions 2 and 3) may be an early sign of change. Standards for universities outside of North America may be changing with regard to publishing at the highest level, the Top-3 journals. It is important to note, however, that more researchers from Region 3 published in Top-3

journals, compared with those from Region 2, although the results are opposite for the AIS-6 basket. This is most likely because AIS-6 includes two European journals (*EJIS* and *ISJ*).

Table 5: Comparison of Researcher Affiliations				
Years	Researcher Affiliations	Select-11	AIS-6	Top-3
2003–2007	Global	N/A	2033	1144
	North America	N/A	1390 (68%)	965 (84%)
	Region 1*	N/A	1390 (68%)	965 (84%)
	Region 2**	N/A	417 (21%)	69 (6%)
	Region 3 ***	N/A	226 (11%)	110 (10%)
2005–2009	Global	6721	2498	1308
	North America	3974 (59%)	1668 (67%)	1034 (79%)
	Region 1*	4011 (60%)	1670 (67%)	1035 (79%)
	Region 2**	1411 (21%)	522 (21%)	107 (8%)
	Region 3***	1299 (19%)	308 (12%)	167 (13%)
* Includes North America, South America, and Central America. ** Includes Europe, Middle East, and Africa. *** Includes Asia (except for the Middle East) and the Pacific. Note: We counted each appearance of a researcher.				

Our tenth research question is: With which countries are the Select-11 authors most represented? The dataset contained publication data on faculty and staff from 912 universities in sixty-one different countries. As previously stated, the sample consisted of 4,051 IS researchers and 6,721 appearances of these authors. Table 6 shows that the vast majority of the author appearances (54 percent) were from the United States.

Table A-6 provides a global ranking of graduate publications. To serve the global AIS community better, we also provide regional rankings (Table A9) of graduate publications. Since each region has different publication rates, we adjusted the criteria for each region. Universities in Table A-9 met one or more of the criteria described in Table 7. The next three paragraphs are based on regional data in Table A-9.

The top ranked Region 1 universities, based on graduate publications in the Select-11 basket, were University of Minnesota, University of Arizona, and Purdue University. These same universities were also the highest globally ranked universities in this category. The top ranked Region 2 universities were London School of Economics, University of Manchester, and University of Jyväskylä. Globally, they ranked 14, 19, and 33, respectively. National University of Singapore, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, and City University of Hong Kong were the top ranked Region 3 universities. Their global rankings were 26, 36, and 48, respectively.

University of Minnesota had the highest Region 1 and global rankings in the AIS-6 basket. Carnegie Mellon University and University of Arizona tied for second place, both in Region 1 and globally. In Region 2, London School of Economics ranked first, University of Jyväskylä ranked second, and University of London and University of Oslo tied for third place. Globally, they ranked 13, 25, 27, and 27, respectively.

National University of Singapore, University of Queensland, and Monash University were the highest ranked Region 3 universities. Their global rankings were 27, 52, and 63, respectively.

University of Minnesota, Carnegie Mellon University, and University of Arizona placed first, second, and third in both the Region 1 and global rankings in the Top-3 basket. University of London, London School of Economics, and Tel Aviv University were the highest ranked Region 2 universities, with global ranking of 40, 46, and 51, respectively. Among Region 3 universities, National University of Singapore, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, and University of Queensland had the highest rankings. Globally, they ranked 23, 46, and 51, respectively.

Table A-10 contains the regional rankings of publishing doctoral students per university. Universities in Table A-10 met one or more of the criteria described in Table 8. The next three paragraphs are based on regional data in Table A-10

The top ranked Region 1 universities, based on doctoral students publishing in the Select-11 basket, were University of Arizona, Georgia State University, and Clemson University. Arizona State University and Georgia State University were also the highest globally ranked universities in this category. Clemson University ranked fourth globally. The top ranked Region 2 universities were University of Oslo, Erasmus University of Rotterdam, and University of Ghent.

Table 6: Countries, by AIS Region, Represented in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009

Region 1: North, South and Central America		Region 2: Europe, Africa and Middle East		Region 3: Asia (Except for Middle East) and Pacific	
Country	Researcher Appearances	Country	Researcher Appearances	Country	Researcher Appearances
United States	3599	United Kingdom	448	China*	679
Canada	370	Spain	136	Australia	234
Brazil	23	Netherlands	133	South Korea	154
Mexico	5	Germany	87	Singapore	138
Venezuela	4	France	78	India	28
Chile	3	Finland	72	New Zealand	26
Colombia	3	Denmark	63	Japan	17
Argentina	2	Belgium	47	Thailand	9
Peru	1	Sweden	45	Malaysia	6
Puerto Rico	1	Norway	44	Russia	4
		Italy	43	Pakistan	2
		Israel	35	Brunei	1
		Switzerland	27	Philippines	1
		Turkey	25		
		Greece	24		
		Portugal	21		
		Austria	18		
		Iran	16		
		South Africa	15		
		United Arab Emirates	5		
		Lebanon	4		
		Luxembourg	3		
		Poland	3		
		Saudi Arabia	3		
		Jordan	2		
		Lithuania	2		
		Slovenia	2		
		Belarus	1		
		Bulgaria	1		
		Cyprus	1		
		Estonia	1		
		Ethiopia	1		
		Hungary	1		
		Nigeria	1		
		Morocco	1		
		Palestine	1		
		Serbia	1		

Table 7: Regional Graduate Publication Criteria

Region	Select-11 Publications	AIS-6 Publications	Top-3 Publications
1—Americas	40 or more	22 or more	20 or more
2—Europe, Africa, Middle East	10 or more	5 or more	4 or more
3—Asia (except Middle East) and Pacific	8 or more	3 or more	2 or more

Globally, they ranked 8, 14, and 27, respectively. National University of Singapore, City University of Hong Kong, and National Central University were the top ranked Region 3 universities. Their global rankings were 3, 5, and 10, respectively.

Clemson University and Georgia State University had the highest Region 1 rankings in the AIS-6 basket. HEC Montréal and University of British Columbia tied for third place. These universities also had the highest global rankings (1, 2, 3, and 3, respectively). In Region 2, University of Oslo and Erasmus University of Rotterdam had the highest rankings, followed by Athens University of Economics and Business, Umeå University, University of Lausanne, and University of Salford (4-way tie for third place). Globally, they ranked 3, 10, 18, 18, 18, and 18,

Table 8: Regional Publishing Doctoral Student Criteria

Region	Select-11 Doctoral Students	AIS-6 Doctoral Students	Top-3 Doctoral Students
1—Americas	4 or more	3 or more	2 or more
2—Europe, Africa, Middle East	2 or more	2 or more	2 or more
3—Asia (except Middle East) and Pacific	2 or more	2 or more	2 or more

respectively. City University of Hong Kong was the highest ranked Region 3 university, followed by National Central University and National University of Singapore (tied for second place). Their global rankings were 10, 18, and 18, respectively.

In the Top-3 basket, University of Arizona ranked first, both regionally and globally. Georgia State University, University of British Columbia and University of Minnesota had a three-way tie for second place in Region 1. They also tied for second place in the global rankings. University of Oslo and University of Lausanne were the highest ranked Region 2 universities. They tied for second place globally, along with several other universities. All other Region 2 universities had less than two doctoral students publishing in the Top-3 basket. Among Region 3 universities, City University of Hong Kong had the highest ranking, with three doctoral students. All other Region 2 universities had less than two doctoral students publishing in the Top-3 basket. City University of Hong Kong tied with other universities for second place globally.

Regional rankings of faculty and staff publications are in Table A-11. Universities in Table A-11 met one or more of the criteria described in Table 9. The next three paragraphs are based on regional data in table A-11.

Table 9: Regional Faculty and Staff Student Publication Criteria

Region	Select-11 Publications	AIS-6 Publications	Top-3 Publications
1—Americas	22 or more	10 or more	7 or more
2—Europe, Africa, Middle East	8 or more	3 or more	3 or more
3—Asia (except Middle East) and Pacific	10 or more	3 or more	2 or more

The top ranked Region 1 universities, based on faculty and staff publications in the Select-11 basket were Georgia State University, University of Maryland, and University of Arizona. Georgia State University was also the highest globally ranked university in this category. Global rankings for these Region 1 universities were 1, 3, and 4, respectively. The top ranked Region 2 universities were University of Manchester, London School of Economics, and Brunel University. Globally, they ranked 7, 12, and 16, respectively. City University of Hong Kong, National University of Singapore, and University of Hong Kong were the top ranked Region 3 universities. Their global rankings were 2, 4, and 19, respectively.

Georgia State University, University of British Columbia, and University of Maryland had the highest rankings for both Region 1 and globally in the AIS-6 basket (1, 2, and 3, respectively). In Region 2, University of Manchester, Brunel University, and London School of Economics were the highest ranked universities. Globally, they ranked 8, 12, and 19, respectively. City University of Hong Kong and National University of Singapore tied for first place among Region 3 universities, followed by University of Melbourne. Their global rankings were 4, 4, and 29, respectively.

University of Maryland, University of British Columbia, and Georgia State University placed first, second, and third in both the Region 1 and global rankings in the Top-3 basket. University of Oslo and University of Limerick were the highest ranked Region 2 universities (tied for first place), followed by University of Munich. Their global rankings were 55, 55, and 72, respectively. Among Region 3 universities, City University of Hong Kong, National University of Singapore, and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology had the highest rankings. Globally, they ranked 6, 12, and 18, respectively.

In the next section, we discuss the relevance of these findings to the IS discipline. We also discuss some implications for the use of the findings and present several suggestions for future research.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this research was to identify the leading IS individual researchers and to identify the universities whose faculty publish in the leading IS journals, i.e., the market, or demand, for IS research. Our research contributes to the scientometric literature by focusing on faculty researchers and their affiliated universities, as well as graduates and doctoral students. We believe this analysis of the graduates and students is important because it provides

information about the types of universities that are producing successful researchers, i.e., the “supply” side of IS research. Our expanded set of IS journals contributes to the scientometric literature by identifying a broader and more inclusive set of top IS journals. This can help to define and expand the boundaries of the IS discipline.

Past research has included several efforts toward identifying research and journal quality, including reputational surveys of IS departments, reviews of university journal lists, analyses of journal ranking studies, citation analyses, investigations of diversity of topics and methodologies, and the creation of quantitative formulas to evaluate journal quality [Adams and Johnson, 2008; Athey and Plotnicki, 2005; Barnes, 2005; Neufeld, Fang, and Huff, 2006; Baskerville, 2008; Chua et al. 2002; Clarke, 2008; Dennis et al, 2006; Ferratt et al. 2007; Huang and Hsu, 2005; Ayanso, Lertwachara, and Vachon, 2007; Mingers and Harzing, 2007; Peffers and Tang, 2003; Rainer and Miller, 2005; Templeton, Lewis, and Luo, 2007]. In this research, we focus on the leading IS researchers, their university affiliations, and the universities that supply them. We selected the journals in this research based on the rankings of IS journals in previous studies, along with the Association for Information Systems (AIS) Senior Scholars’ recommendations. We acknowledge that there are various methods to assess and rank journals and we do not purport that our analysis is the only or best way to assess the research productivity of IS researchers. Institutions should make decisions regarding research productivity based on the goals, strengths, and objectives of their own universities and use studies such as ours to provide information that can offer insights when making decisions that may affect the future of their faculty members.

Clark and Warren [2006] focused on researchers that published in seven journals over a five-year period, from 2001 through 2005. Since the researchers were predominantly affiliated with North American universities, and most of the journals were published in North America, this study might be interpreted as having a “North American” bias. We added *EJIS*, *ISJ*, *JIT*, and *JSIS* for the current study. The majority of researchers publishing in these added journals were affiliated with European universities, either as faculty or students. These additions have resulted in an increased percentage of researchers outside of North America. In our current study, 79 percent of the researchers in the Top-3 journals were affiliated with North American universities. However, only 60 percent of the researchers in the expanded basket of the Select-11 journals were affiliated with North American universities. As previously noted, some universities outside of North America place less emphasis on publishing in the top-tier IS journals. Instead, they tend to adopt a more diverse journal list based on their underlying academic research approach and goals [Willcocks et al., 2008].

To illustrate a global picture of researcher productivity, we provided a breakdown of researchers by AIS Regions (Table 5). We believe the extended journal basket and a more detailed breakdown of research by region increases the relevance of our research to the global IS community.

The determination of an entity’s research productivity must be closely related to the identification of the quality of the journals in which that entity has published, relative to the domain of IS journals. Universities employ various methods to assess the research productivity of faculty. Some universities have clearly defined ranked journal lists, and they only consider publications from these lists. At the other extreme, there are universities that consider all peer-reviewed publications equally, regardless of the journal’s prestige or rigor. It is important that the method for evaluating research should reflect the goals and objectives of the college and/or university. These findings can help to match publishing records to goals by presenting evidence from other universities and scholars.

Many of the IS researchers in this paper exhibit unusually high productivity. It is not realistic to expect those at all academic institutions be held up to the standards of these highly productive researchers. We believe that academic researchers should strive to follow the example of these top producers, but not all universities should require their faculty to publish in such journals. For example, universities that are less research intensive and focus more on teaching and service would not normally expect their faculty to publish in the top journals. Faculty will, however, need to be aware of the top researchers and top programs in order to advise their graduates about doctoral studies, and to help recruit faculty who are a good match for their programs. Still, universities that produce the leading IS researchers can be used as models for other schools seeking to improve their doctoral research programs.

Our results offer suggestions for future scientometric studies of IS journal quality and/or research productivity and quality. We recommend that *JIT* and *JSIS* be included when conducting a scientometric study of the leading IS researchers and journals and that any such research employing surveys should include a worldwide set of IS researchers, taking care to extend data collection beyond North America. We also believe that the IS field is mature enough so that more focused studies of journal quality can make inferences about publication outlets for the various subdisciplines within the IS field.

Future research might include social network analysis (SNA) on the baskets of pure IS journals that we used in this study. It would be interesting to compare the results from an SNA with the results that we found in this study. It might

also be interesting to look at doctoral student publications in relation to the size of the programs (e.g., number of doctoral students in the program or the ratio of students to full-time faculty). This might give a more nuanced view of which universities are producing students capable of publishing early in their careers, and whether the faculty to student ratio has an effect.

Another important research pursuit can focus on how to help universities evaluate research with regard to their goals, when they do not align with publishing in top IS journals. Walsh [2010] has suggested that loftier goals may be lost in the quest for A-level “hits” and great student evaluations. He proposes a system where promotion and tenure decisions are based on more than counts of articles and rankings of journals. One can express a body of work through multiple media and be evaluated on the extent to which it asks important questions and provides quality answers. Determining methods to assess such goals will be increasingly important for universities, whose goals are, as Walsh hopes, more complicated.

REFERENCES

Editor's Note: The following reference list contains hyperlinks to World Wide Web pages. Readers who have the ability to access the Web directly from their word processor or are reading the article on the Web, can gain direct access to these linked references. Readers are warned, however, that:

1. These links existed as of the date of publication but are not guaranteed to be working thereafter.
2. The contents of Web pages may change over time. Where version information is provided in the References, different versions may not contain the information or the conclusions referenced.
3. The author(s) of the Web pages, not AIS, is (are) responsible for the accuracy of their content.
4. The author(s) of this article, not AIS, is (are) responsible for the accuracy of the URL and version information.

Adams, D. and N. Johnson (2008) “The Journal List and Its Use: Motivation, Perceptions, and Reality”, *European Journal of Information Systems* (17)2, pp. 158–162.

AISNET (2009) Research, *AIS Code of Research*, www.aisnet.org (current May 12, 2011).

AISNET (2010) www.aisnet.org (current Sept. 22, 2010).

Athey, S. and J. Plotnicki (2000) “An Evaluation of Research Productivity in Academic IT”, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (3) Article 7, pp.1–20.

Ayanso, A., K. Lertwachara, and F. Vachon (2007) “Diversity or Identity Crisis? An Examination of Leading IS Journals”, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (20) Article 42, pp. 660–680.

Barnes, S. (2005) “Assessing the Value of IS Journals”, *Communications of the ACM* (48)1, pp. 110–112.

Baskerville, R. (2008) “For Better or Worse: How We Apply Journal Ranking Lists”, *European Journal of Information Systems* (17)2, pp. 156–157.

Chua, A.Y. and C.C. Yang (2008) “The Shift Towards Multi-Disciplinarity in Information Science”, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (59)13, pp. 2156–2170.

Chua, C., L. Cao, K. Cousins, and D.W. Straub (2002) “Measuring Researcher–Production in Information Systems”, *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (3)6, pp. 145–215.

Clark, J.G. and J. Warren (2006) “In Search of the Primary Suppliers of IS Research: Who Are They and Where Did They Come From?” *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (18) Article 1, pp. 296–328.

Clark, J.G., J. Warren, and Y.A. Au (2007) “Carnegie Classifications and Institution Productivity in Information Systems Research: A Scientometric Study”, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (19) Article 1, pp. 478–512.

Clark, J.G., J. Warren, and Y.A. Au (2009) “Assessing Researcher Publication Productivity in the Leading Information Systems Journals: A 2003–2007 Update”, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (24) Article 1, pp. 225–254.

Clarke, R. (2008) “An Exploratory Study of Information Systems Researcher Impact”, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (22) Article1, pp. 2–32.

Culnan, M. and E. Swanson (1986) “Research in Management Information Systems, 1980–1984: Points of Work and Reference”, *MIS Quarterly* (10)3, pp. 289–302.

Dean, D.L., P.B. Lowry, and S. Humphreys (2011) “Profiling the Research Productivity of Tenured Information Systems Faculty at U.S. Institutions”, *MIS Quarterly* (35)1, pp. 1–15.

- Dennis, A.R., J.S. Valacich, M.A. Fuller, and C. Schneider (2006) "Research Standards for Promotion and Tenure in Information Systems", *MIS Quarterly* (30)1, pp. 1–12.
- Elsevier (2010) *Scopus*TM, <http://www.scopus.com/> (current Sept. 23, 2010).
- Ferratt, T.W., M.F. Gorman, J.J. Kanet, and W.D. Salisbury (2007) "IS Journal Quality Assessment Using the Author Affiliation Index", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (19) Article 1, pp. 710–724.
- Gallivan, M.J. and R. Benbunan-Fich (2007) "Analyzing IS Research Productivity: An Inclusive Approach to Global IS Scholarship", *European Journal of Information Systems* (16)1, pp. 36–53.
- Google Scholar (2010) <http://scholar.google.com/> (current Aug. 19, 2011).
- Harzing, A.W. (2010) *Research in International Management: Products and Services for Academics*, <http://www.harzing.com/index.htm> (current Aug. 19, 2011).
- Harzing, A.W. and R. van der Wal (2009) "A Google Scholar h-Index for Journals: An alternative Metric to Measure Journal Impact in Economics and Business", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (60)1, pp. 41–46.
- Hirsch, J.E. (2005) "An Index to Quantify An Individual's Scientific Research Output", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* (102) pp. 16569–16573, <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0508025> (current Aug. 19, 2011).
- Huang, H-H. and J. S-C Hsu (2005) "An Evaluation of Publication Productivity in Information Systems: 1999 to 2003", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (15) Article 1, pp. 555–564.
- Jacso, P. (2008a) "The Pros and Cons of Computing the h-index Using Google Scholar", *Online Information Review* (32)3, pp. 437–452.
- Jacso, P. (2008b) "The Pros and Cons of Computing the h-index Using Scopus", *Online Information Review* (32)4, pp. 524–535.
- Karuga, G.G., P.B. Lowry, and V.J. Richardson (2007) "Assessing the Impact of Premier Information Systems Research over Time", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (19) Article 7, pp. 115–131.
- Katerattanakul, P. and B. Han (2003) "Are European IS Journals Underrated? An Answer Based on Citation Analysis", *European Journal of Information Systems* (12)1, pp. 60–71.
- Katerattanakul, P., B. Han, and S. Hong (2004) "Objective Quality Ranking of Computing Journals", *Communications of the ACM* (46)10, pp. 111–114.
- Laudel, G. (2001) "Collaboration, Creativity, and Rewards: Why and How Scientists Collaborate", *International Journal of Technology Management* (22)7/8, pp. 762–781.
- Laudel, G. (2002) "What Do We Measure by Co-Authorships?" *Research Evaluation* (11)1, pp. 3–15.
- Lee, S. and B. Bozeman (2005) "The Impact of Research Collaboration on Scientific Productivity", *Social Studies of Science* (35), pp. 673–702.
- Lewis, B.R., G.F. Templeton, and X. Luo (2007) "A Scientometric Investigation into the Validity of IS Journal Quality Measures", *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (8)12, pp. 619–633.
- Lindsey, D. (1980) "Production and Citation Measures in the Sociology of Science: The Problems of Multiple Authorship", *Social Studies of Science* (10), pp. 145–162.
- Lowry, P.B., G.G. Karuga, and V.J. Richardson (2007) "Assessing Leading Institutions, Faculty, and Articles in Premier Information Systems Research Journals", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (20) Article 16, pp. 142–203.
- Lowry, P.B., D. Romans, and A. Curtis (2004) "Global Journal Prestige and Supporting Disciplines: A Scientometric Study of Information Systems Journals", *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (5)2, pp. 29–77.
- Mingers, J. and A. Harzing (2007) "Ranking Journals in Business and Management: A Statistical Analysis of the Harzing Data Set", *European Journal of Information Systems: Including a Special Section on the Information Systems* 16(4), pp. 303–316.
- Mylonopoulos, N. and V. Theoharakis (2001) "Global Perceptions of IS Journals", *Communications of the ACM* (44)9, pp. 29–33.
- Neufeld, D., Y. Fang, and S.L. Huff (2006) "The IS Identity Crisis", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (19) Article19, pp. 447–464.

- Oh, W., J.N. Choi, and K Kim (2006) "Coauthorship Dynamics and Knowledge Capital: The Patterns of Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration in Information Systems Research", *Journal of Management Information Systems* (22)3, pp. 266–292.
- Peffers, K. and Y. Tang (2003) "Identifying and Evaluating the Universe of Outlets for Information Systems Research: Ranking the Journals", *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application* (5)1, pp. 63–84.
- Pravdic, N. and V. Oluic-Vukovic (1986) "Dual Approach to Multiple Authorship in the Study of Collaborator/Scientific Output Relationship", *Scientometrics* (10), pp. 259–280.
- Rainer Jr., K. and M. Miller (2005) "Examining Differences Across Journal Rankings", *Communications of the ACM* (48)2, pp. 91–94.
- Saunders, C. (2010) <http://ais.affiniscape.com/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=432> (current Aug. 19, 2011).
- Straub, D. (2006) "The Value of Scientometric Studies: An Introduction to a Debate on IS as a Reference Discipline", *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (7)5, pp. 241–245.
- Templeton, G., B. Lewis, and X. Luo (2007) "Author Affiliation Index: Response to Ferratt et al.", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (19), Letter to Editor, pp. 725–731.
- Thomson Reuters (2010) ISI Web of KnowledgeSM Journal Citation Reports[®].
- Truex, D., M. Cuellar, and H. Takeda (2009) "Assessing Scholarly Influence: Using the Hirsch Indices to Reframe the Discourse", *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (10)7, pp. 560–594.
- Valacich, J.S., A. Fuller, C. Schneider, and A.R. Dennis (2006) "Issues and Opinions—Publication Opportunities in Premier Business Outlets: How Level Is the Playing Field?" *Information Systems Research* (17)2, pp. 107–125.
- Walsh, J.P. (2010) "Presidential Address—Embracing the Sacred in our Secular Scholarly World", *Academy of Management Review* (36)2, pp. 215–234.
- Willcocks, L., E.A. Whitley, and C. Avgerou (2008) "The Ranking of Top IS Journals: A Perspective from the London School of Economics", *European Journal of Information Systems* (17)2, pp. 163–168.
- Zhang, Q., Z. Feng, X. Li, X. Zheng, and L. Zhang (2010) "25 Years of Collaborations in IEEE Intelligent Systems", *IEEE Intelligent Systems* (25)6, pp. 67–75.

APPENDIX A

Table A-1: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation**	Total # Articles	Rank ***
Hsinchun CHEN	New York U	U of Arizona	25	1
Izak BENBASAT	U of Minnesota	U of British Columbia	24	2
H. R. RAO	Purdue U	SUNY at Buffalo	22	3
Kalle LYYTINEN	U of Jyväskylä	Case Western Reserve	18	4
Mark KEIL	Harvard U	Georgia State U	15	5
Andrew B. WHINSTON	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Texas at Austin	15	5
David C. YEN	U of Nebraska–Lincoln	Miami U	15	5
Varun GROVER	U of Pittsburgh	Clemson U	14	8
Robert KAUFFMAN	Carnegie Mellon U	Arizona State U	14	8
James D. MCKEEN*	U of Minnesota	Queen's U	14*	8*
Heather A. SMITH*	No Doctoral Degree	Queen's U	14*	8*
William R. KING	Case Western Reserve	U of Pittsburgh	13	12
Joseph S. VALACICH	U of Arizona	Washington State U	13	12
Richard T. WATSON	U of Minnesota	U of Georgia	13	12
Zahir IRANI	Brunel U	Brunel U	12	15
Detmar W. STRAUB	Indiana U	Georgia State U	12	15
Shan PAN	U of Warwick	National U of Singapore	11	17
Thompson S. H. TEO	U of Pittsburgh	National U of Singapore	11	17
James J. JIANG	U of Cincinnati	U of Central Florida	10	19
Lars MATHIASSEN	U of Oslo	Georgia State U	10	19
Arun RAI	Kent State U	Georgia State U	10	19
Balasubramaniam RAMESH	New York U	Georgia State U	10	19

Table A-1: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005-2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation**	Total # Articles	Rank ***
Suprateek SARKER	U of Cincinnati	Copenhagen Business School	10	19
Indranil BOSE	Purdue U	U of Hong Kong	9	24
Andrew BURTON-JONES	Georgia State U	U of British Columbia	9	24
Mark A. FULLER	U of Arizona	U of Massachusetts	9	24
Dennis F. GALLETTA	U of Minnesota	U of Pittsburgh	9	24
David GEFEN	Georgia State U	Drexel U	9	24
Alan R. HEVNER	Purdue U	U of South Florida	9	24
Atreyi KANKANHALLI	National U of Singapore	National U of Singapore	9	24
Jae-Nam LEE	KAIST	Korea U	9	24
Paul Benjamin LOWRY	U of Arizona	Brigham Young U	9	24
Paul A. PAVLOU	U of Southern California	Temple U	9	24
Upkar VARSHNEY	U of Missouri–Kansas City	Georgia State U	9	24
Viswanath VENKATESH	U of Minnesota	U of Arkansas	9	24
Eric T. G. WANG	U of Rochester	National Central U	9	24
Chih-Ping WEI	U of Arizona	National Tsing Hua U	9	24
Ritu AGARWAL	Syracuse U	U of Maryland	8	38
Alan R. DENNIS	U of Arizona	Indiana U	8	38
Weiguo FAN	U of Michigan	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U	8	38
Ram D. GOPAL	SUNY at Buffalo	U of Connecticut	8	38
Sanjay GOSAIN	U of Southern California	Industry	8	38
Alok GUPTA	U of Texas at Austin	U of Minnesota	8	38
Laurie J. KIRSCH	U of Minnesota	U of Pittsburgh	8	38
Gary KLEIN	Purdue U	U of Colorado at Colorado Springs	8	38
M. Lynne MARKUS	Case Western Reserve	Bentley U	8	38
Victor W. A. MBARIKA	Auburn U	Southern U and Agricultural and Mechanical College at Baton Rouge	8	38
Michael NEWMAN	U of British Columbia	U of Manchester	8	38
Jay F. NUNAMAKER, Jr.	Case Western Reserve	U of Arizona	8	38
Wonseok OH	New York U	McGill U	8	38
Praveen PATHAK	U of Michigan	U of Florida	8	38
Sandeep PURAO	U of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	Pennsylvania State U	8	38
Michael ROSEMAN	U of Munich	Queensland U of Technology	8	38
Saonee SARKER	Washington State U	Washington State U	8	38
Kar Yan TAM	Purdue U	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	8	38
Kwok-Kee WEI	U of York	City U of Hong Kong	8	38
Richard L. BASKERVILLE	London School of Economics	Georgia State U	7	57
Jerry Cha-Jan CHANG	U of Pittsburgh	U of Nevada–Las Vegas	7	57
Michael Chiu-Lung CHAU	U of Arizona	U of Hong Kong	7	57
Jan Guynes CLARK	U of North Texas	U of Texas at San Antonio	7	57
Eric K. CLEMONS	Cornell U	U of Pennsylvania	7	57
Gert-Jan de VREEDE	Delft U of Technology	U of Nebraska at Omaha	7	57
Michael David GORDON	U of Michigan	U of Michigan	7	57
Rudy HIRSCHHEIM	U of London	Louisiana State U	7	57
Juhani IIVARI	U of Oulu	U of Jyväskylä	7	57
Dan J. KIM	SUNY at Buffalo	U of Houston–Clear Lake	7	57
Gary J. KOEHLER	Purdue U	U of Florida	7	57
Kenneth L. KRAEMER	U of Southern California	U of California–Irvine	7	57
Claudia LOEBBECKE	U of Cologne	U of Cologne	7	57
Sunil MITHAS	U of Michigan	U of Maryland	7	57
Kannan MOHAN	Georgia State U	Baruch College	7	57
E. W. T. NGAI	Hong Kong Polytechnic U	Hong Kong Polytechnic U	7	57
Fred NIEDERMAN	U of Minnesota	Saint Louis U	7	57

Table A-1: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005-2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation**	Total # Articles	Rank ***
Daniel ROBEY	Kent State U	Georgia State U	7	57
Ravi SEN	U of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	Texas A&M U	7	57
Leiser SILVA	London School of Economics	U of Houston	7	57
Jaeki SONG	U of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	Texas Tech U	7	57
Richard VIDGEN	U of Salford	U of Bath	7	57
Edgar A. WHITLEY	London School of Economics	London School of Economics	7	57
Rolf T. WIGAND	Michigan State U	U of Arkansas at Little Rock	7	57
Fatemeh (Mariam) ZAHEDI	Indiana U	U of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	7	57
Dongsong ZHANG	U of Arizona	U of Maryland Baltimore County	7	57
David ARNOTT	U of Newcastle upon Tyne	Monash U	6	82
Raquel BENBUNAN-FICH	Rutgers U	Baruch College	6	82
Anol BHATTACHERJEE	U of Houston	U of South Florida	6	82
Robert BRIGGS	U of Arizona	U of Nebraska at Omaha	6	82
Robert M. DAVISON	City U of Hong Kong	City U of Hong Kong	6	82
Timon C. DU	Arizona State U	Chinese U of Hong Kong	6	82
Brian FITZGERALD	U of London	U of Limerick	6	82
Guy GABLE	U of Bradford	Queensland U of Technology	6	82
Michael GALLIVAN	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Georgia State U	6	82
Anindya GHOSE	Carnegie Mellon U	New York U	6	82
Jun HE	U of Pittsburgh	U of Michigan–Dearborn	6	82
Paul Jen-Hwa HU	U of Arizona	U of Utah	6	82
Qing HU	U of Miami	Iowa State U	6	82
Norman JOHNSON	Baruch College	U of Houston	6	82
Donald R. JONES	U of Texas at Austin	Texas Tech U	6	82
Iris JUNGLAS	U of Georgia	U of Houston	6	82
Karlheinz KAUTZ	U of Oslo	Copenhagen Business School	6	82
Rajiv KISHORE	Georgia State U	SUNY at Buffalo	6	82
Ned KOCK	U of Waikato	Texas A&M International U	6	82
M. S. KRISHNAN	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Michigan	6	82
Kai R. LARSEN	SUNY at Buffalo	U of Colorado at Boulder	6	82
Albert L. LEDERER	Ohio State U	U of Kentucky	6	82
Natalia LEVINA	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	New York U	6	82
Huigang LIANG	Auburn U	East Carolina U	6	82
Peter LOVE	Monash U	Curtin U of Technology	6	82
Henry C. LUCAS, Jr.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	U of Maryland	6	82
Scott MCCOY	U of Pittsburgh	College of William and Mary	6	82
D. Harrison MCKNIGHT	U of Minnesota	Michigan State U	6	82
Prashant PALVIA	U of Minnesota	U of North Carolina at Greensboro	6	82
Gary PAN	U of Manchester	Singapore Management U	6	82
Selwyn PIRAMUTHU	U of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	U of Florida	6	82
T. S. RAGHUNATHAN	U of Pittsburgh	U of Toledo	6	82
Matti ROSSI	U of Jyväskylä	Helsinki School of Economics	6	82
Raj SHARMAN	Louisiana State U	SUNY at Buffalo	6	82
Jai-Yeol SON	Georgia Institute of Technology	Yonsei U	6	82
Veda C. STOREY	U of British Columbia	Georgia State U	6	82
Bernard TAN	National U of Singapore	National U of Singapore	6	82
Amrit TIWANA	Georgia State U	Iowa State U	6	82
Shambhu UPADHYAYA	U of Wisconsin–Madison	SUNY at Buffalo	6	82

Table A-1: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005-2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation**	Total # Articles	Rank ***
Emmanuelle VAAST	Polytechnique Paris	Long Island U Brooklyn Campus	6	82
Wil M.P. VANDERAALST	Eindhoven U of Technology	Eindhoven U of Technology	6	82
Michael WADE	U of Western Ontario	York U	6	82
Jonathan WAREHAM	Copenhagen Business School	U of Ramon Llull	6	82
Leslie P. WILLCOCKS	U of Cambridge	London School of Economics	6	82
Yajiong XUE	Auburn U	East Carolina U	6	82
J. Leon ZHAO	U of California–Berkeley	City U of Hong Kong	6	82
Lina ZHOU	Beijing U	U of Maryland Baltimore County	6	82
Kevin ZHU	Stanford U	U of California–San Diego	6	82
Robert W. ZMUD	U of Arizona	U of Oklahoma	6	82
Kemal ALTINKEMER	U of Rochester	Purdue U	5	131
Deborah J. ARMSTRONG	U of Kansas	Florida State U	5	131
David AVISON	Aston U	ESSEC Business School	5	131
Subhajyoti BANDYOPADHYAY	Purdue U	U of Florida	5	131
Ravi BAPNA	U of Connecticut	U of Minnesota	5	131
Henri BARKI	U of Western Ontario	HEC Montréal	5	131
Glenn J. BROWNE	U of Minnesota	U of Virginia	5	131
Terry A. BYRD	U of South Carolina–Columbia	Auburn U	5	131
Yolande E. CHAN	U of Western Ontario	Queen's U	5	131
Sutirtha CHATTERJEE	Washington State U	Prairie View A&M U	5	131
Yen-Liang CHEN	National Tsing Hua U	National Central U	5	131
Hsing K. CHENG	U of Rochester	U of Florida	5	131
Waiman CHEUNG	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Chinese U of Hong Kong	5	131
Mike CHIASSON	U of British Columbia	Lancaster U	5	131
Wynne CHIN	U of Michigan	U of Houston	5	131
Rosann Webb COLLINS	U of Minnesota	U of South Florida	5	131
Deborah COMPEAU	U of Western Ontario	U of Western Ontario	5	131
Randolph COOPER	U of California–Los Angeles	U of Houston	5	131
Pratim DATTA	Louisiana State U	Kent State U	5	131
Elizabeth DAVIDSON	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	U of Hawaii at Manoa	5	131
Tamara DINEV	Florida Atlantic U	Florida Atlantic U	5	131
Yogesh K. DWIVEDI	Brunel U	Swansea U	5	131
Yulin FANG	U of Western Ontario	City U of Hong Kong	5	131
Robert GALLIERS	Turku School of Economics	Bentley U	5	131
Matt GERMONPREZ	U of Colorado at Boulder	U of Wisconsin–Eau Claire	5	131
Paulo GOES	U of Rochester	U of Arizona	5	131
Blake IVES	U of Minnesota	U of Houston	5	131
Brian JANZ	U of Minnesota	U of Memphis	5	131
Elena KARAHANNA	U of Minnesota	U of Georgia	5	131
Sung S. KIM	Georgia Institute of Technology	U of Wisconsin–Madison	5	131
Prabhudev KONANA	U of Arizona	U of Texas at Austin	5	131
Julia KOTLARSKY	Erasmus U Rotterdam	U of Warwick	5	131
Kenneth A. KOZAR	U of Minnesota	U of Colorado at Boulder	5	131
Vincent LAI	U of Texas at Arlington	Chinese U of Hong Kong	5	131
Matthew K. O. LEE	U of Manchester	City U of Hong Kong	5	131
Younghwa LEE	U of Colorado at Boulder	U of Kansas	5	131
Eldon Li	Texas Tech U	National Cheng Chi U	5	131
Ting-Peng LIANG	U of Pennsylvania	National Sun Yat-Sen U	5	131
Moez LIMAYEM	U of Minnesota	U of Arkansas	5	131
James MARSDEN	Purdue U	U of Connecticut	5	131

Table A-1: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005-2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation**	Total # Articles	Rank ***
Maris G. MARTINSONS	U of Warwick	City U of Hong Kong	5	131
Likoebe M. MARUPING	U of Maryland	U of Arkansas	5	131
Peter MESO	Kent State U	Georgia Gwinnett College	5	131
Derrick J. NEUFELD	U of Western Ontario	U of Western Ontario	5	131
Dorit NEVO	U of British Columbia	York U	5	131
Ojelanki NGWENYAMA	SUNY at Binghamton	Ryerson U	5	131
Zafer D. OZDEMIR	Purdue U	Miami U	5	131
Graham PERVAN	Curtin U of Technology	Curtin U of Technology	5	131
Radhika SANTHANAM	U of Nebraska– Lincoln	U of Kentucky	5	131
Sumit SARKAR	U of Rochester	U of Texas at Dallas	5	131
Carol S. SAUNDERS	U of Houston	U of Central Florida	5	131
David SCHUFF	Arizona State U	Temple U	5	131
Graeme SHANKS	Monash U	U of Melbourne	5	131
Benjamin SHAO	SUNY at Buffalo	Arizona State U	5	131
Olivia R. Liu SHENG	U of Rochester	U of Utah	5	131
Keng SIAU	U of British Columbia	U of Nebraska–Lincoln	5	131
Mikko T. SIPONEN	U of Oulu	U of Oulu	5	131
Shirish C. SRIVASTAVA	National U of Singapore	HEC Paris	5	131
Chandrasekar SUBRAMANIAM	U of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	U of North Carolina at Charlotte	5	131
Monideepa TARAFDAR	Indian Institute of Management	U of Toledo	5	131
Rahul TELANG	Carnegie Mellon U	Carnegie Mellon U	5	131
Matt THATCHER	U of Pennsylvania	U of Louisville	5	131
Marinos THEMISTOCLEOUS	Brunel U	Brunel U	5	131
Paul C. van FENEMA	Erasmus U Rotterdam	Netherlands Defense Academy	5	131
Yair WAND	Israel Institute of Technology	U of British Columbia	5	131
Trevor WOOD-HARPER	U of East Anglia	U of Manchester	5	131
Jen-Her WU	U of Kentucky	National Sun Yat-Sen U	5	131
Peng XU	Georgia State U	U of Massachusetts Boston	5	131
Ping ZHANG	U of Texas at Austin	Syracuse U	5	131
Xiaoni ZHANG	U of North Texas	Northern Kentucky U	5	131

* Heather A. Smith and James D. McKeen have a series of “Developments in Practice” articles published in *Communications of the Association for Information Systems (CAIS)*. Starting with Volume 22 (2008) of *CAIS*, these articles have been classified as “columns.” Such categorization was not made prior to that volume. In this study, we do not include “columns.”

** Author affiliations and locations are current as of the end of the reporting period, Spring 2010. Several faculty have changed affiliations since then, including moving from one AIS region to another, and these changes could impact future ratings.

*** Note that there are multiple ties. If two researchers tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-2: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the AIS-6 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Izak BENBASAT	U of Minnesota	U of British Columbia	21	1
Robert KAUFFMAN	Carnegie Mellon U	Arizona State U	11	2
Mark KEIL	Harvard U	Georgia State U	11	2
Varun GROVER	U of Pittsburgh	Clemson U	10	4
Andrew B. WHINSTON	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Texas at Austin	10	4
Arun RAI	Kent State U	Georgia State U	9	6
Viswanath VENKATESH	U of Minnesota	U of Arkansas	9	6
Ritu AGARWAL	Syracuse U	U of Maryland	8	8
Andrew BURTON-JONES	Georgia State U	U of British Columbia	8	8
Mark A. FULLER	U of Arizona	U of Massachusetts	8	8

Table A-2: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the AIS-6 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Alan R. DENNIS	U of Arizona	Indiana U	7	11
Dennis F. GALLETTA	U of Minnesota	U of Pittsburgh	7	11
Sanjay GOSAIN	U of Southern California	Industry	7	11
Zahir IRANI	Brunel U	Brunel U	7	11
William R. KING	Case Western Reserve	U of Pittsburgh	7	11
Kalle LYYTINEN	U of Jyväskylä	Case Western Reserve	7	11
Paul A. PAVLOU	U of Southern California	Temple U	7	11
H. R. RAO	Purdue U	SUNY at Buffalo	7	11
Suprateek SARKER	U of Cincinnati	Copenhagen Business School	7	11
Leiser SILVA	London School of Economics	U of Houston	7	11
Joseph S. VALACICH	U of Arizona	Washington State U	7	11
Richard L. BASKERVILLE	London School of Economics	Georgia State U	6	22
Brian FITZGERALD	U of London	U of Limerick	6	22
Michael GALLIVAN	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Georgia State U	6	22
Anindya GHOSE	Carnegie Mellon U	New York U	6	22
Alok GUPTA	U of Texas at Austin	U of Minnesota	6	22
Rudy HIRSCHHEIM	U of London	Louisiana State U	6	22
James J. JIANG	U of Cincinnati	U of Central Florida	6	22
Atreyi KANKANHALLI	National U of Singapore	National U of Singapore	6	22
Laurie J. KIRSCH	U of Minnesota	U of Pittsburgh	6	22
Lars MATHIASSEN	U of Oslo	Georgia State U	6	22
Sunil MITHAS	U of Michigan	U of Maryland	6	22
Jay F. NUNAMAKER Jr.	Case Western Reserve	U of Arizona	6	22
Wonseok OH	New York U	McGill U	6	22
Daniel ROBEY	Kent State U	Georgia State U	6	22
Detmar W. STRAUB	Indiana U	Georgia State U	6	22
Anol BHATTACHERJEE	U of Houston	U of South Florida	5	37
Eric K. CLEMONS	Cornell U	U of Pennsylvania	5	37
Gert-Jan de VREEDE	Delft U of Technology	U of Nebraska at Omaha	5	37
Juhani IIVARI	U of Oulu	U of Jyväskylä	5	37
Sung S. KIM	Georgia Institute of Technology	U of Wisconsin–Madison	5	37
Kenneth L. KRAEMER	U of Southern California	U of California–Irvine	5	37
M. S. KRISHNAN	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Michigan	5	37
Natalia LEVINA	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	New York U	5	37
M. Lynne MARKUS	Case Western Reserve	Bentley U	5	37
Likoebe M. MARUPING	U of Maryland	U of Arkansas	5	37
Ojelanki NGWENYAMA	SUNY at Binghamton	Ryerson U	5	37
Balasubramaniam RAMESH	New York U	Georgia State U	5	37
Sumit SARKAR	U of Rochester	U of Texas at Dallas	5	37
Saonee SARKER	Washington State U	Washington State U	5	37
Jai-Yeol SON	Georgia Institute of Technology	Yonsei U	5	37
Kar Yan TAM	Purdue U	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	5	37
Bernard TAN	National U of Singapore	National U of Singapore	5	37
Amrit TIWANA	Georgia State U	Iowa State U	5	37
Kevin ZHU	Stanford U	U of California–San Diego	5	37
Robert W. ZMUD	U of Arizona	U of Oklahoma	5	37
Henri BARKI	U of Western Ontario	HEC Montréal	4	57
Robert BRIGGS	U of Arizona	U of Nebraska at Omaha	4	57
Glenn J. BROWNE	U of Minnesota	U of Virginia	4	57
Jerry Cha-Jan CHANG	U of Pittsburgh	U of Nevada–Las Vegas	4	57

Table A-2: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the AIS-6 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Hsinchun CHEN	New York U	U of Arizona	4	57
Mike CHIASSON	U of British Columbia	Lancaster U	4	57
Wynne CHIN	U of Michigan	U of Houston	4	57
Elizabeth DAVIDSON	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	U of Hawaii at Manoa	4	57
Tamara DINEV	Florida Atlantic U	Florida Atlantic U	4	57
Guy FITZGERALD	U of North London	Brunel U	4	57
Chris FORMAN	Northwestern U	Georgia Institute of Technology	4	57
David GEFEN	Georgia State U	Drexel U	4	57
Qing HU	U of Miami	Iowa State U	4	57
Norman JOHNSON	Baruch College	University of Houston	4	57
Gary KLEIN	Purdue U	U of Colorado at Colorado Springs	4	57
Prabhudev KONANA	U of Arizona	U of Texas at Austin	4	57
Huigang LIANG	Auburn U	East Carolina U	4	57
Paul Benjamin LOWRY	U of Arizona	Brigham Young U	4	57
Victor W. A. MBARIKA	Auburn U	Southern U and Ag. and Mech. College at Baton Rouge	4	57
Peter MESO	Kent State U	Georgia Gwinnett College	4	57
Michael NEWMAN	U of British Columbia	U of Manchester	4	57
Jan PRIES-HEJE	IT U of Copenhagen	Roskilde U	4	57
Srinivasan RAGHUNATHAN	U of Pittsburgh	U of Texas at Dallas	4	57
Michael ROSEMANN	U of Munich	Queensland U of Technology	4	57
Mikko T. SIPONEN	U of Oulu	U of Oulu	4	57
Rahul TELANG	Carnegie Mellon U	Carnegie Mellon U	4	57
Emmanuelle VAAST	Polytechnique Paris	Long Island U Brooklyn Campus	4	57
Eric T.G. WANG	U of Rochester	National Central U	4	57
Weiquan WANG	U of British Columbia	City U of Hong Kong	4	57
Trevor WOOD-HARPER	U of East Anglia	U of Manchester	4	57
Sean XU	U of California–Irvine	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	4	57
Yajiong XUE	Auburn U	East Carolina U	4	57
Margunn AANESTAD	U of Oslo	U of Oslo	3	90
Gediminas ADOMAVICIUS	New York U	U of Minnesota	3	90
Pär ÅGERFALK	Linköping U	Uppsala U	3	90
Manju AHUJA	U of Pittsburgh	U of Louisville	3	90
Sameh AL-NATOUR	U of British Columbia	U of British Columbia	3	90
Deborah J. ARMSTRONG	U of Kansas	Florida State U	3	90
David AVISON	Aston U	ESSEC Business School	3	90
Rajiv D. BANKER	Harvard U	Temple U	3	90
Ravi BAPNA	U of Connecticut	U of Minnesota	3	90
Indranil R. BARDHAN	U of Texas at Austin	U of Texas at Dallas	3	90
France BÉLANGER	U of South Florida	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U	3	90
Michel BENAROCHE	New York U	Syracuse U	3	90
Anandhi BHARADWAJ	Texas A&M U	Emory U	3	90
Carol V. BROWN	Indiana U	Stevens Institute of Technology	3	90
Brian S. BUTLER	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Pittsburgh	3	90
Terry A. BYRD	U of South Carolina–Columbia	Auburn U	3	90
Huseyin CAVUSOGLU	U of Texas at Dallas	U of Texas at Dallas	3	90
Ronald CENFETELLI	U of British Columbia	U of British Columbia	3	90
Sutirtha CHATTERJEE	Washington State U	Prairie View A&M U	3	90
Ramnath CHELLAPPA	U of Texas at Austin	Emory U	3	90
Katherine M. CHUDоба	U of Arizona	Utah state U	3	90
Paul F. CLAY	Indiana U	Washington State U	3	90
Deborah COMPEAU	U of Western Ontario	U of Western Ontario	3	90

Table A-2: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the AIS-6 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Randolph COOPER	University of California–Los Angeles	U of Houston	3	90
Pratim DATTA	Louisiana State U	Kent State U	3	90
Gordon B. DAVIS	Stanford U	U of Minnesota	3	90
Omar A. El SAWY	Stanford U	U of Southern California	3	90
Tony ELLIMAN	Brunel U	Brunel U	3	90
Xianjun GENG	U of Texas at Austin	U of Texas at Dallas	3	90
Matt GERMONPREZ	U of Colorado at Boulder	U of Wisconsin–Eau Claire	3	90
Paulo GOES	U of Rochester	U of Arizona	3	90
Rahul GOKHALE	Clemson U	Clemson U	3	90
Ram D. GOPAL	SUNY at Buffalo	U of Connecticut	3	90
Peter H. GRAY	Queen's U	U of Virginia	3	90
Shirley GREGOR	U of Queensland	Australian National U	3	90
Bill C. HARDGRAVE	Oklahoma State U	U of Arkansas	3	90
Andrew M. HARDIN	Washington State U	U of Nevada–Las Vegas	3	90
Dirk S. HOVORKA	U of Colorado at Boulder	Bond U	3	90
Ghiyoung IM	Georgia State U	Clark Atlanta U	3	90
Richard D. JOHNSON	U of Maryland	SUNY at Albany	3	90
Karlheinz KAUTZ	U of Oslo	Copenhagen Business School	3	90
William KETTINGER	U of South Carolina–Columbia	U of Memphis	3	90
Henry M. KIM	U of Toronto	York U	3	90
Ned KOCK	U of Waikato	Texas A&M International U	3	90
Kai R. LARSEN	SUNY at Buffalo	U of Colorado at Boulder	3	90
Albert L. LEDERER	Ohio State U	U of Kentucky	3	90
Matthew K. O. LEE	U of Manchester	City U of Hong Kong	3	90
Dorothy E. LEIDNER	U of Texas at Austin	Baylor U	3	90
Ben LIGHT	U of Salford	U of Salford	3	90
Moez LIMAYEM	U of Minnesota	U of Arkansas	3	90
Lihui LIN	U of Texas at Austin	Boston U	3	90
Peter LOVE	Monash U	Curtin U of Technology	3	90
Henry C. LUCAS, Jr.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	U of Maryland	3	90
Sabine MADSEN	Copenhagen Business School	Copenhagen Business School	3	90
Ann MAJCHRZAK	U of California–Los Angeles	U of Southern California	3	90
Arvind MALHOTRA	U of Southern California	U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	3	90
George M. MARAKAS	Florida International U	U of Kansas	3	90
Maris G. MARTINSONS	U of Warwick	City U of Hong Kong	3	90
Scott MCCOY	U of Pittsburgh	College of William and Mary	3	90
D. Harrison MCKNIGHT	U of Minnesota	Michigan State U	3	90
Vijay MOOKERJEE	Purdue U	U of Texas at Dallas	3	90
Tridas MUKHOPADHYAY	U of Michigan	Carnegie Mellon U	3	90
Sridhar NARASIMHAN	Ohio State U	Georgia Institute of Technology	3	90
Fred NIEDERMAN	U of Minnesota	Saint Louis U	3	90
Ravi PATNAYAKUNI	Southern Illinois U at Carbondale	U of Alabama in Huntsville	3	90
David E. PINGRY	Purdue U	U of Arizona	3	90
Alain PINSONNEAULT	U of California–Irvine	McGill U	3	90
Ivan PNG	Stanford U	National U of Singapore	3	90
Marshall Scott POOLE	U of Wisconsin–Madison	U of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	3	90
Jaana PORRA	U of Jyväskylä	U of Houston	3	90
Sandeep PURAO	U of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	Pennsylvania State U	3	90

Table A-2: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the AIS-6 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Neil C. RAMILLER	U of California–Los Angeles	Portland State U	3	90
Gautam RAY	Ohio State U	U of Minnesota	3	90
Frederick J. RIGGINS	Carnegie Mellon U	Arizona State U	3	90
Matti ROSSI	U of Jyväskylä	Helsinki School of Economics	3	90
Andrew SCHWARZ	U of Houston	Louisiana State U	3	90
Ravi SEN	U of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	Texas A&M U	3	90
Sandra A. SLAUGHTER	U of Minnesota	Georgia Institute of Technology	3	90
Michael D. SMITH	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Carnegie Mellon U	3	90
Pnina SOFFER	Israel Institute of Technology	U of Haifa	3	90
Bernd Carsten STAHL	U of Whitten	De Montfort U	3	90
Katherine J. STEWART	U of Texas at Austin	U of Maryland	3	90
Huseyin TANRIVERDI	Boston U	U of Texas at Austin	3	90
Matt THATCHER	U of Pennsylvania	U of Louisville	3	90
Marinos THEMISTOCLEOUS	Brunel U	Brunel U	3	90
Paul C. van FENEMA	Erasmus U Rotterdam	Netherlands Defense Academy	3	90
Anthony VANCE	Georgia State U	Brigham Young U	3	90
Iris VESSEY	U of Queensland	Indiana U (retired)	3	90
Richard VIDGEN	U of Salford	U of Bath	3	90
Michael WADE	U of Western Ontario	York U	3	90
Geoff WALSHAM	No Doctoral Degree	U of Cambridge	3	90
Yair WAND	Israel Institute of Technology	U of British Columbia	3	90
Ping WANG	U of California–Los Angeles	U of Maryland	3	90
Ron WEBER	U of Minnesota	Monash U	3	90
Jane WEBSTER	New York U	Queen's U	3	90
Chih-Ping WEI	U of Arizona	National Tsing Hua U	3	90
Kwok-Kee WEI	U of York	City U of Hong Kong	3	90
John D. WELLS	Texas A&M U	Washington State U	3	90
Edgar A. WHITLEY	London School of Economics	London School of Economics	3	90
Peng XU	Georgia State U	U of Massachusetts Boston	3	90
Youngjin YOO	U of Maryland	Temple U	3	90
Ilze ZIGURS	U of Colorado at Boulder	U of Nebraska at Omaha	3	90

* Author affiliations and locations are current as of the end of the reporting period, Spring 2010. Several faculty have changed affiliations since then, including moving from one AIS region to another, and these changes could impact future ratings.

** Note that there are multiple ties. If two researchers tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-3: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Top-3 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Izak BENBASAT	U of Minnesota	U of British Columbia	16	1
Ritu AGARWAL	Syracuse U	U of Maryland	8	2
Arun RAI	Kent State U	Georgia State U	8	2
Andrew B. WHINSTON	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Texas at Austin	8	2
Alan R. DENNIS	U of Arizona	Indiana U	7	5
Robert KAUFFMAN	Carnegie Mellon U	Arizona State U	7	5
Viswanath VENKATESH	U of Minnesota	U of Arkansas	7	5
Dennis F. GALLETTA	U of Minnesota	U of Pittsburgh	6	8
Anindya GHOSE	Carnegie Mellon U	New York U	6	8

Table A-3: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Top-3 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Sanjay GOSAIN	U of Southern California	Industry	6	8
Sunil MITHAS	U of Michigan	U of Maryland	6	8
Jay F. NUNAMAKER Jr.	Case Western Reserve	U of Arizona	6	8
Wonseok OH	New York U	McGill U	6	8
Paul A. PAVLOU	U of Southern California	Temple U	6	8
Andrew BURTON-JONES	Georgia State U	U of British Columbia	5	15
Eric K. CLEMONS	Cornell U	U of Pennsylvania	5	15
Alok GUPTA	U of Texas at Austin	U of Minnesota	5	15
William R. KING	Case Western Reserve	U of Pittsburgh	5	15
M.S. KRISHNAN	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Michigan	5	15
Natalia LEVINA	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	New York U	5	15
Sumit SARKAR	U of Rochester	U of Texas at Dallas	5	15
Kar Yan TAM	Purdue U	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	5	15
Joseph S. VALACICH	U of Arizona	Washington State U	5	15
Anol BHATTACHERJEE	U of Houston	U of South Florida	4	24
Hsinchun CHEN	New York U	U of Arizona	4	24
Brian FITZGERALD	U of London	U of Limerick	4	24
Mark A. FULLER	U of Arizona	U of Massachusetts	4	24
David GEFEN	Georgia State U	Drexel U	4	24
Atreyi KANKANHALLI	National U of Singapore	National U of Singapore	4	24
Elena KARAHANNA	U of Minnesota	U of Georgia	4	24
Sung S. KIM	Georgia Institute of Technology	U of Wisconsin–Madison	4	24
Laurie J. KIRSCH	U of Minnesota	U of Pittsburgh	4	24
Prabhudev KONANA	U of Arizona	U of Texas at Austin	4	24
Huigang LIANG	Auburn U	East Carolina U	4	24
M. Lynne MARKUS	Case Western Reserve	Bentley U	4	24
Likobe M. MARUPING	U of Maryland	U of Arkansas	4	24
Srinivasan RAGHUNATHAN	U of Pittsburgh	U of Texas at Dallas	4	24
H.R. RAO	Purdue U	SUNY at Buffalo	4	24
Jai-Yeol SON	Georgia Institute of Technology	Yonsei U	4	24
Bernard TAN	National U of Singapore	National U of Singapore	4	24
Rahul TELANG	Carnegie Mellon U	Carnegie Mellon U	4	24
Amrit TIWANA	Georgia State U	Iowa State U	4	24
Emmanuelle VAAST	Polytechnique Paris	Long Island U Brooklyn Campus	4	24
Yajiong XUE	Auburn U	East Carolina U	4	24
Kevin ZHU	Stanford U	U of California–San Diego	4	24
Robert W. ZMUD	U of Arizona	U of Oklahoma	4	24
Gediminas ADOMAVICIUS	New York U	U of Minnesota	3	47
Manju AHUJA	U of Pittsburgh	U of Louisville	3	47
Deborah J. ARMSTRONG	U of Kansas	Florida State U	3	47
Rajiv D. BANKER	Harvard U	Temple U	3	47
Ravi BAPNA	U of Connecticut	U of Minnesota	3	47
Indranil R. BARDHAN	U of Texas at Austin	U of Texas at Dallas	3	47
Michel BENAROCHE	New York U	Syracuse U	3	47
Carol V. BROWN	Indiana U	Stevens Institute of Technology	3	47
Brian S. BUTLER	Carnegie Mellon U	U of Pittsburgh	3	47
Huseyin CAVUSOGLU	U of Texas at Dallas	U of Texas at Dallas	3	47
Ramnath CHELLAPPA	U of Texas at Austin	Emory U	3	47
Omar A. EI SAWY	Stanford U	U of Southern California	3	47
Chris FORMAN	Northwestern U	Georgia Institute of Technology	3	47
Michael GALLIVAN	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Georgia State U	3	47
Xianjun GENG	U of Texas at Austin	U of Texas at Dallas	3	47

Table A-3: Leading IS Researchers Publishing in the Top-3 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

IS Researcher	Doctoral Program Affiliation	University Affiliation*	Total # Articles	Rank **
Paulo GOES	U of Rochester	U of Arizona	3	47
Ram D. GOPAL	SUNY at Buffalo	U of Connecticut	3	47
Peter H. GRAY	Queen's U	U of Virginia	3	47
Varun GROVER	U of Pittsburgh	Clemson U	3	47
Bill C. HARDGRAVE	Oklahoma State U	U of Arkansas	3	47
Kenneth L. KRAEMER	U of Southern California	U of California–Irvine	3	47
Matthew K.O. LEE	U of Manchester	City U of Hong Kong	3	47
Dorothy E. LEIDNER	U of Texas at Austin	Baylor U	3	47
Lihui LIN	U of Texas at Austin	Boston U	3	47
Paul Benjamin LOWRY	U of Arizona	Brigham Young U	3	47
Ann MAJCHRAZAK	U of California–Los Angeles	U of Southern California	3	47
Arvind MALHOTRA	U of Southern California	U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	3	47
D. Harrison MCKNIGHT	U of Minnesota	Michigan State U	3	47
Vijay MOOKERJEE	Purdue U	U of Texas at Dallas	3	47
Tridas MUKHOPADHYAY	U of Michigan	Carnegie Mellon U	3	47
Sridhar NARASIMHAN	Ohio State U	Georgia Institute of Technology	3	47
David E. PINGRY	Purdue U	U of Arizona	3	47
Ivan PNG	Stanford U	National U of Singapore	3	47
Balasubramaniam RAMESH	New York U	Georgia State U	3	47
Gautam RAY	Ohio State U	U of Minnesota	3	47
Ravi SEN	U of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	Texas A&M U	3	47
Sandra A. SLAUGHTER	U of Minnesota	Georgia Institute of Technology	3	47
Michael D. SMITH	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Carnegie Mellon U	3	47
Katherine J. STEWART	U of Texas at Austin	U of Maryland	3	47
Detmar W. STRAUB	Indiana U	Georgia State U	3	47
Huseyin TANRIVERDI	Boston U	U of Texas at Austin	3	47
Matt THATCHER	U of Pennsylvania	U of Louisville	3	47
Iris VESSEY	U of Queensland	Indiana U (retired)	3	47
Eric T.G. WANG	U of Rochester	National Central U	3	47
Weiquan WANG	U of British Columbia	City U of Hong Kong	3	47
Chih-Ping WEI	U of Arizona	National Tsing Hua U	3	47
Sean XU	U of California–Irvine	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	3	47

* Author affiliations and locations are current as of the end of the reporting period, Spring 2010.

Several faculty have changed affiliations since then, including moving from one AIS region to another, and these changes could impact future ratings.

** Note that there are multiple ties. If two researchers tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-4: Researchers with the Most Publications in Top-3 Journals 2005–2009

Researcher	Select-11	Select-11 Rank*	AIS-6	AIS-6 Rank*	Top-3	Top-3 Rank*
Gediminas ADOMAVICIUS	3	319	3	89	3	47
Ritu AGARWAL	8	38	8	8	8	2
Manju AHUJA	4	201	3	89	3	47
Deborah J. ARMSTRONG	5	131	3	89	3	47
Rajiv D. BANKER	3	319	3	89	3	47
Ravi BAPNA	5	131	3	89	3	47
Indranil R. BARDHAN	3	319	3	89	3	47
Michel BENAROC	3	319	3	89	3	47
Izak BENBASAT	24	2	21	1	16	1
Anol BHATTACHERJEE	6	83	5	37	4	24
Carol V. BROWN	3	319	3	89	3	47
Andrew BURTON-JONES	9	24	8	8	5	15
Brian S. BUTLER	4	201	3	89	3	47

**Table A-4: Researchers with the Most Publications in
Top-3 Journals 2005–2009 - Continued**

Researcher	Select-11	Select-11 Rank*	AIS-6	AIS-6 Rank*	Top-3	Top-3 Rank*
Huseyin CAVUSOGLU	3	319	3	89	3	47
Ramnath CHELLAPPA	3	319	3	89	3	47
Hsinchun CHEN	25	1	4	57	4	24
Eric K. CLEMONS	7	57	5	37	5	15
Alan R. DENNIS	8	38	7	11	7	5
Omar A. EI SAWY	4	201	3	89	3	47
Guy FITZGERALD	4	201	6	22	4	24
Chris FORMAN	4	201	4	57	3	47
Mark A. FULLER	9	24	8	8	4	24
Dennis F. GALLETTA	9	24	7	11	6	8
Michael GALLIVAN	6	83	6	22	3	47
David GEFEN	9	24	4	57	4	24
Xianjun GENG	3	319	3	89	3	47
Anindya GHOSE	6	83	6	22	6	8
Paulo GOES	5	131	3	89	3	47
Ram D. GOPAL	8	38	3	89	3	47
Sanjay GOSAIN	8	38	7	11	6	8
Peter H. GRAY	4	201	3	89	3	47
Varun GROVER	14	8	10	4	3	47
Alok GUPTA	8	38	6	22	5	15
Bill C. HARDGRAVE	4	201	3	89	3	47
Atreyi KANKANHALLI	9	24	6	22	4	24
Elena KARAHANNA	5	131	4	57	4	24
Robert KAUFFMAN	14	8	11	2	7	5
Sung S. KIM	5	131	3	89	4	24
William R. KING	13	12	7	11	5	15
Laurie J. KIRSCH	8	38	6	22	4	24
Prabhudev KONANA	5	131	4	57	4	24
Kenneth L. KRAEMER	7	57	5	37	3	47
M. S. KRISHNAN	6	83	5	37	5	15
Matthew K. O. LEE	5	131	3	89	3	47
Dorothy E. LEIDNER	4	201	3	89	3	47
Natalia LEVINA	6	83	5	37	5	15
Huigang LIANG	6	83	4	57	4	24
Lihui LIN	3	319	3	89	3	47
Paul Benjamin LOWRY	9	24	4	57	3	47
Ann MAJCHRZAK	4	201	3	89	3	47
Arvind MALHOTRA	3	319	3	89	3	47
M. Lynne MARKUS	8	38	5	37	4	24
Likoebe M. MARUPING	5	131	5	37	4	24
D. Harrison MCKNIGHT	6	83	3	89	3	47
Sunil MITHAS	7	57	6	22	6	8
Vijay MOOKERJEE	4	201	3	89	3	47
Tridas MUKHOPADHYAY	3	319	3	89	3	47
Sridhar NARASIMHAN	3	319	3	89	3	47
Jay F. NUNAMAKER, Jr.	8	38	6	22	6	8
Wonseok OH	8	38	6	22	6	8
Paul A. PAVLOU	9	24	7	11	6	8
David E. PINGRY	4	201	3	89	3	47
Ivan PNG	3	319	3	89	3	47
Srinivasan RAGHUNATHAN	4	201	4	57	4	24
Arun RAI	10	19	9	6	8	2
Balasubramaniam RAMESH	10	19	5	37	3	47
H.R. RAO	22	3	7	11	4	24
Gautam RAY	3	319	3	89	3	47
Sumit SARKAR	5	131	5	37	5	15
Ravi SEN	7	57	3	89	3	47

Table A-4: Researchers with the Most Publications in Top-3 Journals 2005–2009 - Continued

Researcher	Select-11	Select-11 Rank*	AIS-6	AIS-6 Rank*	Top-3	Top-3 Rank*
Sandra A. SLAUGHTER	3	319	3	89	3	47
Michael D. SMITH	3	319	3	89	3	47
Jai-Yeol SON	6	83	5	37	4	24
Katherine J. STEWART	4	201	3	89	3	47
Detmar W. STRAUB	12	15	6	22	3	47
Kar Yan TAM	8	38	5	37	5	15
Bernard TAN	6	83	5	37	4	24
Huseyin TANRIVERDI	3	319	3	89	3	47
Rahul TELANG	5	131	4	57	4	24
Matt THATCHER	5	131	3	89	3	47
Amrit TIWANA	6	83	5	37	4	24
Emmanuelle VAAST	6	83	4	57	4	24
Joseph S. VALACICH	13	12	7	11	5	15
Viswanath VENKATESH	9	24	9	6	7	5
Iris VESSEY	3	319	3	89	3	47
Eric T.G. WANG	9	24	4	57	3	47
Weiquan Wang	4	201	4	57	3	47
Chih-Ping WEI	9	24	3	89	3	47
Andrew B. WHINSTON	15	5	10	4	8	2
Sean XU	4	201	4	57	3	47
Yajiong XUE	6	83	4	57	4	24
Kevin ZHU	6	83	5	37	4	24
Robert W. ZMUD	6	83	5	37	4	24

* Note that there are multiple ties. If two researchers tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-5. Breakdown of Top IS Researchers With Seven Or More Publications in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009

IS Researcher Total /Unique Journals	CAIS	DSS	EJIS	I&M	ISJ	ISR	JAIS	JIT	JMIS	JSIS	MISQ
Hsinchun CHEN 25/3		21							3		1
Izak BENBASAT 24/5	3					4	5		7		5
H. R. RAO 22/7	1	13	1	1		2	2				2
Kalle LYYTINEN 18/7	7		4	1	1		2	2		1	
Mark KEIL 15/8		1	2	2	4		3		1	1	1
Andrew B. WHINSTON 15/6	1	4				1	2		5		2
David C. YEN 15/3	3	6		6							
Varun GROVER 14/5	2		2	2			5		3		
Robert KAUFFMAN 14/5	1	2					4		6		1
James D. MCKEEN 14/1	14*										
Heather A. SMITH 14/1	14*										
William R. KING 13/7	4		1	2		1	1		3		1
Richard T. WATSON 13/3	10	1					2				
Joseph S. VALACICH 13/7	4	1			1	2	1			1	3
Zahir IRANI 12/7	2		5	1	1			1	1	1	
Detmar W. STRAUB 12/7	5		1			1	2	1	1		1
Shan PAN 11/6	2	3	1	2	1					2	
Thompson S.H. TEO 11/5	4	2	1	3					1		
James J. JIANG 10/6	1			3	1		3		1		1
Lars MATHIASSEN 10/6	1	1	3		1		2	2			
Arun RAI 10/5				1		1	1		2		5
Balasubramaniam RAMESH 10/7	1	3	1	1	1				2		1
Suprateek SARKER 10/7	1	2	1		1	1	3		1		
Indranil BOSE 9/3	4	3		2							
Andrew BURTON-JONES 9/4				1		3	3				2
Mark A. FULLER 9/5	1					1	4		2		1
Dennis F. GALLETTA 9/4	2		1			2			4		
David GEFEN 9/5	4			1		1			1		2
Alan R. HEVNER 9/3	4	4				1					

**Table A-5. Breakdown of Top IS Researchers With Seven Or More Publications
in the Select-11 Basket of IS Journals 2005–2009 - Continued**

IS Researcher Total /Unique Journals	CAIS	DSS	EJIS	I&M	ISJ	ISR	JAIS	JIT	JMIS	JSIS	MISQ
Atreyi KANKANHALLI 9/7		1	1	1			1		2	1	2
Jae-Nam LEE 9/3	4			4							1
Paul Benjamin LOWRY 9/4	3	2					1		3		
Paul A. PAVLOU 9/5	2					3	1		1		2
Upkar VARSHNEY 9/2	5	4									
Viswanath VENKATESH 9/4			1			2	1				5
Eric T.G. WANG 9/4		3	1	2					3		
Chih-Ping WEI 9/2		6							3		
Ritu AGARWAL 8/3						5			1		2
Alan R. DENNIS 8/4		1				4			1		2
Weiguo FAN 8/2		7							1		
Ram D. GOPAL 8/3		5				2			1		
Sanjay GOSAIN 8/4			1			3				1	3
Alok GUPTA 8/5		2				2	1		1		2
Laurie J. KIRSCH 8/7		1	1			2	1		1	1	1
Gary KLEIN 8/6	1			3	1		1		1		1
M. Lynne MARKUS 8/5	2						1	1	1		3
Victor W.A. MBARIKA 8/4	4		1		1		2				
Michael NEWMAN 8/6	2	1	2		2			1		1	
Jay F. NUNAMAKER, Jr. 8/4	1			1		1			5		
Wonseok OH 8/5				1		1			3	1	2
Praveen PATHAK 8/2		7							1		
Sandeep PURAO 8/4	2	3	2			1					
Michael ROSEMAN 8/5	2	2	2				1				1
Saonee SARKER 8/6		3	1		1	1	1		1		
Kar Yan TAM 8/4		3				2			2		1
Kwok-Kee WEI 8/5		3	1	2					1		1
Richard L. BASKERVILLE 7/5			2		1		1			1	2
Jerry Cha-Jan CHANG 7/5		1		2			2		1		1
Michael Chiu-Lung CHAU 7/2		5					2				
Jan Guynes CLARK 7/2	6			1							
Eric K. CLEMONS 7/3		1							5	1	
Gert-Jan de VREEDE 7/3	2						3		2		
Michael David GORDON 7/3	2	4							1		
Rudy HIRSCHHEIM 7/4	1				1		3				2
Juhani IIVARI 7/6	1		2	1	1		1				1
Dan J. KIM 7/4	1	4				1			1		
Gary J. KOEHLER 7/2		6							1		
Kenneth L. KRAEMER 7/7	1	1	1			1	1		1		1
Claudia LOEBBECKE 7/5	3		1					1	1	1	
Sunil MITHAS 7/4		1				2			2		2
Kannan MOHAN 7/4	1	4	1	1							
E.W.T. NGAI 7/5	1	3		1	1						1
Fred NIEDERMAN 7/3	4				1		2				
Daniel ROBEY 7/5			3		1		1	1			1
Ravi SEN 7/3	3	1							3		
Leiser SILVA 7/4			1		2		2				2
Jaeki SONG 7/4	2	2		2					1		
Richard VIDGEN 7/6	1		2	1		1		1		1	
Edgar A. WHITLEY 7/6	1		2	1	1			1		1	
Rolf T. WIGAND 7/4	3							2	1		1
Fatemeh (Mariam) ZAHEDI 7/3		3		2					2		
Dongsong ZHANG 7/4	1	3		1					2		

* Heather A. Smith and James D. McKeen have a series of "Developments in Practice" articles published in *Communications of the Association for Information Systems (CAIS)*. Starting with Volume 22 (2008) of *CAIS*, these articles have been classified as "columns." Such categorization was not made prior to that volume. In this study, we do not include any articles explicitly labeled as "columns," "panel reports," "teaching cases," "tutorials," "editorial notes," or anything similar.

Table A-6. Universities that Supplied the Graduates Who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking)

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
Aalborg U	14 / 10 = 1.4	92	8 / 7 = 1.14	63	N/A	N/A
Arizona State U	39 / 23 = 1.7	33	13 / 13 = 1	43	11 / 11 = 1	23
Aston U	13 / 7 = 1.86	96	6 / 3 = 2	79	1 / 1 = 1	110
Auburn U	26 / 14 = 1.86	53	14 / 10 = 1.4	40	6 / 5 = 1.2	46
Baruch College	17 / 10 = 1.7	77	8 / 5 = 1.6	63	5 / 4 = 1.25	51
Boston U	22 / 15 = 1.47	66	10 / 8 = 1.25	52	7 / 5 = 1.4	40
Brunel U	28 / 23 = 1.22	45	16 / 16 = 1	32	1 / 3 = 0.33	110
Carnegie Mellon U	112 / 61 = 1.84	5	67 / 35 = 1.91	2	53 / 30 = 1.77	2
Case Western Reserve U	52 / 17 = 3.06	17	26 / 10 = 2.6	15	18 / 6 = 3	16
Catholic U of Leuven	15 / 18 = 0.83	87	1 / 1 = 1	202	N/A	N/A
City U of Hong Kong	27 / 24 = 1.13	48	6 / 8 = 0.75	79	4 / 6 = 0.67	61
Claremont Graduate U	21 / 16 = 1.31	69	4 / 4 = 1	103	2 / 2 = 1	81
Clemson U	12 / 12 = 1	105	6 / 8 = 0.75	79	1 / 1 = 1	100
Columbia U in the City of New York	13 / 12 = 1.08	96	5 / 5 = 1	91	3 / 3 = 1	69
Copenhagen Business School	16 / 7 = 2.29	84	7 / 4 = 1.75	74	1 / 1 = 1	110
Cornell U	27 / 16 = 1.69	48	12 / 7 = 1.71	47	10 / 5 = 2	26
Cranfield U	13 / 11 = 1.18	96	7 / 6 = 1.17	74	N/A	N/A
Emory U	6 / 4 = 1.5	173	4 / 3 = 1.33	103	3 / 2 = 1.5	69
Erasmus U Rotterdam	25 / 26 = 0.96	59	9 / 13 = 0.69	56	2 / 4 = 0.5	81
Florida Atlantic U	9 / 5 = 1.8	130	6 / 4 = 1.5	79	2 / 2 = 1	81
Florida International U	14 / 8 = 1.75	92	8 / 6 = 1.33	63	1 / 2 = 0.5	110
Florida State U	25 / 21 = 1.19	59	12 / 12 = 1	47	9 / 9 = 1	29
Georgia Institute of Technology	28 / 21 = 1.33	45	14 / 7 = 2	40	9 / 5 = 1.8	29
Georgia State U	101 / 58 = 1.74	7	52 / 36 = 1.44	6	24 / 16 = 1.5	11
Harvard U	44 / 23 = 1.91	26	23 / 11 = 2.09	20	11 / 8 = 1.38	23
HEC Montréal	17 / 20 = 0.85	77	8 / 11 = 0.73	63	5 / 5 = 1	51
Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	15 / 12 = 1.25	86	6 / 4 = 1.5	78	6 / 4 = 1.5	46
Indiana U	69 / 40 = 1.73	12	34 / 26 = 1.31	11	23 / 20 = 1.15	12
Israel Institute of Technology	10 / 4 = 2.5	119	6 / 4 = 1.5	79	2 / 2 = 1	81
Kent State U	38 / 17 = 2.24	36	23 / 8 = 2.88	20	12 / 5 = 2.4	22
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	38 / 29 = 1.31	36	6 / 5 = 1.2	79	3 / 4 = 0.75	69
London School of Economics	55 / 33 = 1.67	14	32 / 22 = 1.45	13	6 / 6 = 1	46
Louisiana State U	25 / 15 = 1.67	59	7 / 7 = 1	74	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	78 / 50 = 1.56	10	45 / 28 = 1.61	8	33 / 24 = 1.38	8
Michigan State U	24 / 17 = 1.41	63	8 / 7 = 1.14	63	7 / 6 = 1.17	39
Monash U	19 / 17 = 1.12	74	8 / 10 = 0.8	63	2 / 4 = 0.5	81
National Central U	15 / 12 = 1.25	87	3 / 4 = 0.75	121	1 / 2 = 0.5	110
National Sun Yat-Sen U	26 / 25 = 1.04	53	4 / 5 = 0.8	103	3 / 4 = 0.75	69
National U of Singapore	44 / 29 = 1.52	26	17 / 12 = 1.42	27	11 / 8 = 1.38	23
New York U	86 / 29 = 2.97	9	41 / 23 = 1.78	10	35 / 20 = 1.75	6
Northwestern U	23 / 18 = 1.28	64	11 / 8 = 1.38	50	9 / 6 = 1.5	29
Ohio State U	42 / 26 = 1.62	30	17 / 10 = 1.7	27	14 / 8 = 1.75	19
Oklahoma State U	17 / 13 = 1.31	77	6 / 4 = 1.5	79	5 / 3 = 1.67	51
Pennsylvania State U	31 / 29 = 1.07	42	9 / 10 = 0.9	56	6 / 7 = 0.86	46
Polytechnique Paris	6 / 1 = 6	173	4 / 1 = 4	103	4 / 1 = 4	61
Purdue U	139 / 58 = 2.4	3	43 / 24 = 1.79	9	35 / 21 = 1.67	6
Queen's U	16 / 10 = 1.6	84	7 / 5 = 1.4	74	6 / 4 = 1.5	46
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	15 / 11 = 1.36	87	5 / 5 = 1	91	3 / 4 = 0.75	69
Rutgers U	18 / 7 = 2.57	75	3 / 3 = 1	121	1 / 1 = 1	110
Southern Illinois U at Carbondale	23 / 14 = 1.64	64	9 / 7 = 1.29	56	7 / 6 = 1.17	40
Stanford U	52 / 36 = 1.44	17	27 / 18 = 1.5	14	22 / 16 = 1.38	13

Table A-6. Universities that Supplied the Graduates Who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking) - Continued

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
State U of New York at Buffalo	77 / 46 = 1.67	11	25 / 20 = 1.25	16	15 / 15 = 1	18
Syracuse U	26 / 15 = 1.73	53	15 / 8 = 1.88	37	9 / 3 = 3	29
Tel Aviv U	20 / 12 = 1.67	72	8 / 6 = 1.33	63	5 / 4 = 1.25	51
Texas A&M U	42 / 24 = 1.75	30	16 / 11 = 1.45	32	8 / 7 = 1.14	35
Texas Tech U	45 / 30 = 1.5	24	15 / 11 = 1.36	37	4 / 3 = 1.33	61
U of Arizona	160 / 89 = 1.8	2	67 / 43 = 1.56	2	49 / 34 = 1.44	3
U of Arkansas	15 / 12 = 1.25	87	10 / 8 = 1.25	52	7 / 6 = 1.17	40
U of Bradford	13 / 5 = 2.6	96	6 / 4 = 1.5	79	N/A	N/A
U of British Columbia	97 / 42 = 2.31	8	47 / 30 = 1.57	7	29 / 23 = 1.26	9
U of California–Berkeley	40 / 27 = 1.48	32	8 / 7 = 1.14	63	5 / 5 = 1	51
U of California–Irvine	31 / 19 = 1.63	42	15 / 11 = 1.36	37	9 / 7 = 1.29	29
U of California–Los Angeles	39 / 26 = 1.5	33	19 / 13 = 1.46	24	10 / 10 = 1	26
U of Cambridge	26 / 13 = 2	53	5 / 5 = 1	91	1 / 1 = 1	110
U of Cincinnati	26 / 7 = 3.71	53	13 / 2 = 6.5	43	4 / 2 = 2	61
U of Colorado at Boulder	29 / 17 = 1.71	44	10 / 6 = 1.67	52	1 / 1 = 1	110
U of Connecticut	22 / 12 = 1.83	66	8 / 7 = 1.14	63	7 / 6 = 1.17	40
U of Florida	43 / 26 = 1.65	29	9 / 7 = 1.29	56	5 / 4 = 1.25	51
U of Georgia	45 / 36 = 1.25	24	18 / 17 = 1.06	25	9 / 11 = 0.82	29
U of Göteborg	9 / 8 = 1.13	130	6 / 7 = 0.86	79	3 / 2 = 1.5	69
U of Houston	38 / 23 = 1.65	36	17 / 12 = 1.42	27	8 / 5 = 1.6	35
U of Illinois at Chicago	14 / 7 = 2	92	2 / 2 = 1	148	N/A	N/A
U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	49 / 29 = 1.69	19	14 / 12 = 1.17	40	8 / 7 = 1.14	35
U of Jyväskylä	39 / 11 = 3.55	33	18 / 7 = 2.57	25	2 / 2 = 1	81
U of Kansas	10 / 6 = 1.67	119	5 / 3 = 1.67	91	5 / 3 = 1.67	51
U of Kentucky	28 / 17 = 1.65	45	5 / 5 = 1	91	4 / 4 = 1	61
U of London	27 / 13 = 2.08	48	17 / 6 = 2.83	27	7 / 3 = 2.33	40
U of Manchester	49 / 29 = 1.69	19	16 / 13 = 1.23	32	3 / 1 = 3	69
U of Maryland	44 / 27 = 1.63	26	23 / 13 = 1.77	20	14 / 10 = 1.4	19
U of Maryland Baltimore County	16 / 12 = 1.33	84	6 / 5 = 1.2	79	4 / 4 = 1	61
U of Michigan	63 / 46 = 1.37	13	25 / 19 = 1.32	16	19 / 14 = 1.36	15
U of Minnesota	201 / 79 = 2.54	1	91 / 46 = 1.98	1	66 / 32 = 2.06	1
U of Munich	17 / 8 = 2.13	77	9 / 6 = 1.5	56	3 / 3 = 1	69
U of Nebraska–Lincoln	46 / 24 = 1.92	23	9 / 7 = 1.29	56	4 / 3 = 1.33	61
U of North Texas	20 / 10 = 2	72	2 / 2 = 1	148	1 / 1 = 1	110
U of Oklahoma	11 / 7 = 1.57	113	4 / 4 = 1	103	3 / 3 = 1	69
U of Oslo	27 / 16 = 1.69	48	17 / 13 = 1.31	27	3 / 7 = 0.43	66
U of Oulu	13 / 7 = 1.86	96	9 / 5 = 1.8	56	1 / 1 = 1	110
U of Pennsylvania	47 / 31 = 1.52	22	22 / 18 = 1.22	23	16 / 13 = 1.23	17
U of Pittsburgh	105 / 46 = 2.28	6	55 / 31 = 1.77	4	36 / 27 = 1.33	5
U of Queensland	22 / 13 = 1.69	66	10 / 6 = 1.67	52	5 / 3 = 1.67	51
U of Rochester	55 / 23 = 2.39	14	24 / 16 = 1.5	19	20 / 14 = 1.43	14
U of Salford	17 / 9 = 1.89	77	11 / 8 = 1.38	50	1 / 1 = 1	100
U of South Carolina–Columbia	32 / 24 = 1.33	41	16 / 14 = 1.14	32	8 / 9 = 0.89	35
U of South Florida	21 / 12 = 1.75	69	7 / 4 = 1.75	74	3 / 3 = 1	66
U of Southern California	53 / 25 = 2.12	16	33 / 18 = 1.83	12	27 / 14 = 1.93	10
U of Texas at Arlington	27 / 17 = 1.59	48	5 / 6 = 0.83	91	2 / 3 = 0.67	81
U of Texas at Austin	116 / 73 = 1.59	4	54 / 37 = 1.46	5	45 / 31 = 1.45	4
U of Texas at Dallas	18 / 15 = 1.2	75	13 / 12 = 1.08	43	13 / 12 = 1.08	21
U of Toledo	13 / 9 = 1.44	96	4 / 2 = 2	103	4 / 2 = 2	61
U of Warwick	35 / 16 = 2.19	40	13 / 9 = 1.44	43	2 / 2 = 1	81
U of Washington	17 / 14 = 1.21	77	2 / 2 = 1	148	2 / 2 = 1	81
U of Western Ontario	49 / 24 = 2.04	19	25 / 17 = 1.47	16	10 / 9 = 1.11	26
U of Wisconsin–Madison	37 / 24 = 1.54	39	12 / 10 = 1.2	47	5 / 5 = 1	51
U of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	26 / 10 = 2.6	53	8 / 6 = 1.33	63	5 / 5 = 1	51

Table A-6. Universities that Supplied the Graduates Who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking) - Continued

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U	21 / 19 = 1.11	69	5 / 5 = 1	91	2 / 2 = 1	81
Washington State U	25 / 14 = 1.79	59	16 / 10 = 1.6	32	8 / 7 = 1.14	35
Yale U	5 / 4 = 1.25	196	3 / 2 = 1.5	121	3 / 2 = 1.5	69
York U	14 / 6 = 2.33	92	6 / 4 = 1.5	79	2 / 1 = 2	81

* These numbers represent the following: Total number of articles published by graduates of a designated university in target journals / total number of graduates publishing in target journals = average number of articles per graduate publishing in target journals.

** Rank is based on total number of articles by graduates publishing in target journals. Note that there are multiple ties. If two universities tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-7. Universities that Supplied the Most Doctoral Students who Published in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking)

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
Academia Sinica	1 / 3 = 0.33	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arizona State U	4 / 4 = 1	27	2 / 2 = 1	18	2 / 2 = 1	8
Athens U of Economics and Business	2 / 2 = 1	62	2 / 2 = 1	18	N/A	N/A
Baruch College	6 / 5 = 1.2	19	2 / 2 = 1	18	2 / 2 = 1	8
Carnegie Mellon U	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Catholic U of Leuven	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chinese U of Hong Kong	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City U of Hong Kong	7 / 10 = 0.7	5	1 / 3 = 0.33	10	1 / 3 = 0.33	2
Claremont Graduate U	4 / 4 = 1	27	1 / 1 = 1	35	N/A	N/A
Clemson U	9 / 11 = 0.82	4	5 / 7 = 0.71	1	1 / 1 = 1	20
Emory U	3 / 3 = 1	39	2 / 2 = 1	18	1 / 1 = 1	20
Erasmus U Rotterdam	6 / 6 = 1	14	3 / 3 = 1	10	1 / 1 = 1	20
Florida State U	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia Institute of Technology	4 / 5 = 0.8	19	2 / 2 = 1	18	2 / 2 = 1	8
Georgia State U	14 / 15 = 0.93	2	5 / 6 = 0.83	2	2 / 3 = 0.67	2
Goethe U	2 / 3 = 0.67	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HEC Montréal	4 / 6 = 0.67	14	3 / 5 = 0.6	3	2 / 2 = 1	8
Helsinki School of Economics	3 / 3 = 1	39	1 / 1 = 1	35	N/A	N/A
Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indiana U	1 / 2 = 0.5	62	1 / 2 = 0.5	18	1 / 2 = 0.5	8
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	2 / 3 = 0.67	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
National Central U	10 / 7 = 1.43	10	1 / 2 = 0.5	18	N/A	N/A
National Chung Cheng U	6 / 6 = 1	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
National Sun Yat-sen U	5 / 5 = 1	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
National Taiwan U	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
National U of Singapore	13 / 14 = 0.93	3	2 / 2 = 1	18	N/A	N/A
New Jersey Institute of Technology	3 / 4 = 0.75	27	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York U	2 / 2 = 1	62	2 / 2 = 1	18	2 / 2 = 1	8
Purdue U	9 / 10 = 0.9	5	2 / 2 = 1	18	1 / 1 = 1	20
State U of New York at Buffalo	8 / 8 = 1	8	4 / 4 = 1	6	2 / 2 = 1	8
Syracuse U	5 / 4 = 1.25	50	2 / 2 = 1	18	N/A	N/A
Texas Tech U	6 / 5 = 1.2	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tsinghua U	2 / 3 = 0.67	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Umeå U	1 / 2 = 0.5	62	1 / 2 = 0.5	18	N/A	N/A
U Miguel Hernández	2 / 3 = 0.67	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Arizona	14 / 16 = 0.88	1	3 / 4 = 0.75	6	3 / 4 = 0.75	1
U of Arkansas	3 / 3 = 1	39	3 / 3 = 1	10	2 / 2 = 1	8
U of British Columbia	11 / 7 = 1.57	10	7 / 5 = 1.4	3	3 / 3 = 1	2

Table A-7. Universities that Supplied the Most Doctoral Students who Published in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking) - Continued

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
U of Central Florida	7 / 10 = 0.7	5	3 / 3 = 1	10	N/A	N/A
U of Florida	4 / 5 = 0.8	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Georgia	3 / 6 = 0.5	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Ghent	4 / 4 = 1	27	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Hong Kong	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Houston	5 / 7 = 0.71	10	1 / 2 = 0.5	18	N/A	N/A
U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	4 / 3 = 1.33	39	1 / 1 = 1	35	1 / 1 = 1	20
U of Lausanne	1 / 2 = 0.5	62	1 / 2 = 0.5	18	1 / 2 = 0.5	8
U of Maryland	6 / 6 = 1	14	3 / 3 = 1	10	2 / 2 = 1	8
U of Maryland Baltimore County	5 / 5 = 1	19	2 / 2 = 1	18	2 / 2 = 1	8
U of Melbourne	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Michigan	4 / 7 = 0.57	10	1 / 1 = 1	35	1 / 1 = 1	20
U of Minnesota	4 / 4 = 1	27	4 / 4 = 1	6	3 / 3 = 1	2
U of Missouri-Saint Louis	4 / 4 = 1	27	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Nebraska-Lincoln	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Nebraska at Omaha	3 / 4 = 0.75	27	2 / 4 = 0.5	6	1 / 1 = 1	20
U of North Carolina at Greensboro	3 / 4 = 0.75	27	1 / 1 = 1	35	N/A	N/A
U of Oslo	7 / 8 = 0.88	8	4 / 5 = 0.8	3	2 / 3 = 0.67	2
U of Pittsburgh	6 / 5 = 1.2	19	1 / 1 = 1	35	1 / 1 = 1	20
U of Salamanca	1 / 3 = 0.33	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Salford	2 / 2 = 1	62	2 / 2 = 1	18	N/A	N/A
U of South Carolina-Columbia	3 / 4 = 0.75	27	2 / 3 = 0.67	10	N/A	N/A
U of Texas at Austin	4 / 4 = 1	27	1 / 1 = 1	35	1 / 1 = 1	20
U of Texas at Dallas	3 / 3 = 1	39	3 / 3 = 1	10	3 / 3 = 1	2
U of Texas at San Antonio	3 / 3 = 1	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Western Ontario	5 / 5 = 1	19	2 / 2 = 1	18	N/A	N/A
Washington State U	6 / 4 = 1.5	27	4 / 3 = 1.33	10	3 / 2 = 1.5	8
Xian Jiaotong U	2 / 3 = 0.67	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yuan Ze U	2 / 3 = 0.67	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Equals number of articles by doctoral students / number of doctoral students publishing

** Based on total number of doctoral students who published in target journals.

Table A-8. Universities that Supplied Faculty/Staff who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking)

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
American U	8 / 4 = 2	146	6 / 4 = 1.5	72	4 / 3 = 1.33	55
Arizona State U	28 / 20 = 1.4	22	13 / 15 = 0.87	21	9 / 8 = 1.13	18
Baruch College	20 / 9 = 2.22	43	8 / 7 = 1.14	50	6 / 5 = 1.2	36
Bentley U	34 / 20 = 1.7	8	13 / 11 = 1.18	21	5 / 3 = 1.67	44
Boston College	10 / 7 = 1.43	117	5 / 4 = 1.25	86	5 / 4 = 1.25	44
Boston U	16 / 12 = 1.33	69	6 / 6 = 1	72	4 / 3 = 1.33	55
Brigham Young U	14 / 9 = 1.56	84	7 / 4 = 1.75	60	4 / 2 = 2	55
Brunel U	30 / 25 = 1.2	16	18 / 15 = 1.2	12	2 / 4 = 0.5	106
Carnegie Mellon U	26 / 27 = 0.96	26	19 / 18 = 1.06	10	16 / 16 = 1	10
Case Western Reserve U	21 / 5 = 4.2	39	8 / 2 = 4	50	N/A	N/A
Chinese U of Hong Kong	21 / 11 = 1.91	39	1 / 1 = 1	263	1 / 1 = 1	154
City U of Hong Kong	62 / 38 = 1.63	2	23 / 17 = 1.35	4	17 / 15 = 1.13	6
Clemson U	21 / 6 = 3.5	39	15 / 5 = 3	19	7 / 4 = 1.75	29
Copenhagen Business School	26 / 18 = 1.44	26	10 / 8 = 1.25	36	2 / 2 = 1	106
Drexel U	15 / 7 = 2.14	74	8 / 4 = 2	50	5 / 2 = 2.5	44
Emory U	10 / 9 = 1.11	117	8 / 9 = 0.89	50	8 / 9 = 0.89	24
Erasmus U Rotterdam	23 / 22 = 1.05	32	6 / 9 = 0.67	72	1 / 1 = 1	154
Florida Atlantic U	17 / 11 = 1.55	62	7 / 7 = 1	60	4 / 6 = 0.67	55
Florida State U	20 / 13 = 1.54	43	12 / 10 = 1.2	25	8 / 8 = 1	24

Table A-8. Universities that Supplied Faculty/Staff who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking) - Continued

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
Georgia Institute of Technology	18 / 14 = 1.29	54	9 / 8 = 1.13	43	9 / 8 = 1.13	18
Georgia State U	99 / 19 = 5.21	1	60 / 15 = 4	1	25 / 13 = 1.92	3
HEC Montréal	22 / 16 = 1.38	36	10 / 8 = 1.25	36	6 / 4 = 1.5	36
Hong Kong Polytechnic U	20 / 24 = 0.83	43	6 / 7 = 0.86	72	3 / 5 = 0.6	72
Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	19 / 11 = 1.73	50	10 / 4 = 2.5	36	9 / 4 = 2.25	18
Indiana U	29 / 18 = 1.61	19	19 / 11 = 1.73	10	17 / 10 = 1.7	6
Iowa State U	18 / 17 = 1.06	54	10 / 8 = 1.25	36	7 / 6 = 1.17	29
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	17 / 13 = 1.31	62	1 / 1 = 1	263	1 / 1 = 1	154
Korea U	15 / 11 = 1.36	74	3 / 3 = 1	142	2 / 2 = 1	106
London School of Economics	32 / 19 = 1.68	12	15 / 14 = 1.07	19	2 / 2 = 1	106
Louisiana State U	19 / 9 = 2.11	50	11 / 6 = 1.83	29	3 / 3 = 1	72
McGill U	17 / 9 = 1.89	62	12 / 9 = 1.33	25	10 / 7 = 1.43	16
Miami U	31 / 13 = 2.38	14	2 / 2 = 1	192	1 / 1 = 1	154
Michigan State U	22 / 16 = 1.38	36	13 / 11 = 1.18	21	9 / 9 = 1	18
Monash U	21 / 21 = 1	39	9 / 13 = 0.69	43	3 / 7 = 0.43	72
Nanyang Technological U	18 / 20 = 0.9	54	7 / 10 = 0.7	60	5 / 8 = 0.63	44
National Central U	20 / 10 = 2	43	5 / 2 = 2.5	86	3 / 1 = 3	72
National Sun Yat-Sen U	15 / 7 = 2.14	74	2 / 1 = 2	192	1 / 1 = 1	154
National Taiwan U	16 / 16 = 1	69	3 / 3 = 1	142	2 / 2 = 1	106
National Tsing Hua U	17 / 7 = 2.43	62	4 / 2 = 2	106	3 / 1 = 3	72
National U of Singapore	53 / 26 = 2.04	4	23 / 14 = 1.64	4	15 / 10 = 1.5	12
New York U	20 / 11 = 1.82	43	18 / 11 = 1.64	12	18 / 11 = 1.64	4
Oklahoma State U	15 / 11 = 1.36	74	4 / 4 = 1	106	2 / 2 = 1	106
Pennsylvania State U	28 / 22 = 1.27	22	11 / 11 = 1	29	4 / 5 = 0.8	55
Purdue U	18 / 17 = 1.06	54	4 / 6 = 0.67	106	3 / 5 = 0.6	72
Queen's U	27 / 12 = 2.25	24	6 / 6 = 1	72	3 / 2 = 1.5	72
Queensland U of Technology	18 / 14 = 1.29	54	5 / 8 = 0.63	86	2 / 4 = 0.5	106
Ryerson U	12 / 8 = 1.5	96	7 / 4 = 1.75	60	N/A	N/A
Simon Fraser U	16 / 12 = 1.33	69	10 / 8 = 1.25	36	6 / 5 = 1.2	36
Singapore Management U	14 / 10 = 1.4	84	6 / 5 = 1.2	72	4 / 3 = 1.33	55
Stanford U	9 / 8 = 1.13	135	5 / 5 = 1	86	5 / 5 = 1	44
State U of New York at Buffalo	31 / 9 = 3.44	14	9 / 7 = 1.29	43	6 / 4 = 1.5	36
Syracuse U	14 / 7 = 2	84	8 / 4 = 2	50	6 / 3 = 2	36
Temple U	17 / 10 = 1.7	62	9 / 5 = 1.8	43	7 / 5 = 1.4	29
Texas A&M U	18 / 9 = 2	54	8 / 5 = 1.6	50	5 / 3 = 1.67	44
Texas Tech U	26 / 14 = 1.86	26	7 / 7 = 1	60	4 / 5 = 0.8	55
Tulane U	5 / 5 = 1	217	4 / 5 = 0.8	106	4 / 5 = 0.8	55
U of Arizona	53 / 25 = 2.12	4	17 / 9 = 1.89	18	17 / 9 = 1.89	6
U of Arkansas	26 / 14 = 1.86	26	18 / 7 = 2.57	12	14 / 6 = 2.33	13
U of Bath	15 / 7 = 2.14	74	6 / 4 = 1.5	72	1 / 1 = 1	154
U of British Columbia	47 / 12 = 3.92	6	36 / 7 = 5.14	2	26 / 7 = 3.71	2
U of California-Irvine	15 / 11 = 1.36	74	11 / 10 = 1.1	29	6 / 7 = 0.86	36
U of California-Riverside	13 / 6 = 2.17	90	9 / 5 = 1.8	43	8 / 4 = 2	24
U of Central Florida	24 / 14 = 1.71	30	11 / 8 = 1.38	29	5 / 5 = 1	44
U of Cincinnati	6 / 4 = 1.5	186	4 / 4 = 1	106	4 / 4 = 1	55
U of Colorado at Boulder	16 / 9 = 1.78	69	7 / 5 = 1.4	60	1 / 1 = 1	154
U of Connecticut	23 / 18 = 1.28	32	7 / 9 = 0.78	60	7 / 9 = 0.78	29
U of Florida	30 / 9 = 3.33	16	7 / 6 = 1.17	60	5 / 5 = 1	44
U of Georgia	22 / 6 = 3.67	36	11 / 5 = 2.2	29	8 / 4 = 2	24
U of Hong Kong	29 / 13 = 2.23	19	5 / 3 = 1.67	86	1 / 1 = 1	154
U of Houston	30 / 15 = 2	16	18 / 10 = 1.8	12	7 / 7 = 1	29
U of Kansas	16 / 9 = 1.78	69	8 / 6 = 1.33	50	1 / 1 = 1	154
U of Kentucky	18 / 6 = 3	54	5 / 2 = 2.5	86	4 / 2 = 2	55

Table A-8. Universities that Supplied Faculty/Staff who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Global Ranking) - Continued

University	Select-11 Scores*	Select-11 Rank**	AIS-6 Scores*	AIS-6 Rank**	Top-3 Scores*	Top-3 Rank**
U of Limerick	7 / 2 = 3.5	165	7 / 2 = 3.5	60	4 / 1 = 4	55
U of Manchester	38 / 27 = 1.41	7	21 / 15 = 1.4	8	N/A	N/A
U of Maryland	54 / 31 = 1.74	3	35 / 18 = 1.94	3	30 / 17 = 1.76	1
U of Melbourne	23 / 22 = 1.05	32	11 / 13 = 0.85	29	5 / 7 = 0.71	44
U of Memphis	15 / 12 = 1.25	74	3 / 3 = 1	142	1 / 1 = 1	154
U of Michigan	29 / 16 = 1.81	19	10 / 7 = 1.43	36	7 / 4 = 1.75	29
U of Minnesota	27 / 16 = 1.69	24	23 / 12 = 1.92	4	14 / 12 = 1.17	13
U of Nebraska at Omaha	19 / 8 = 2.38	50	12 / 6 = 2	25	4 / 4 = 1	55
U of Nevada-Las Vegas	17 / 12 = 1.42	62	9 / 8 = 1.13	43	5 / 6 = 0.83	44
U of New South Wales	17 / 10 = 1.7	62	3 / 2 = 1.5	142	2 / 1 = 2	106
U of North Carolina at Charlotte	11 / 9 = 1.22	102	5 / 6 = 0.83	86	4 / 5 = 0.8	55
U of Notre Dame	7 / 7 = 1	165	4 / 5 = 0.8	106	4 / 5 = 0.8	55
U of Oklahoma	15 / 8 = 1.88	74	11 / 7 = 1.57	29	8 / 6 = 1.33	24
U of Oslo	11 / 8 = 1.38	102	7 / 6 = 1.17	60	4 / 5 = 0.8	55
U of Oulu	13 / 5 = 2.6	90	8 / 3 = 2.67	50	1 / 1 = 1	154
U of Pennsylvania	14 / 9 = 1.56	84	7 / 5 = 1.4	60	7 / 5 = 1.4	29
U of Pittsburgh	33 / 11 = 3	9	21 / 8 = 2.63	8	17 / 8 = 2.13	6
U of Salford	9 / 10 = 0.9	135	7 / 9 = 0.78	60	N/A	N/A
U of South Florida	32 / 18 = 1.78	12	12 / 11 = 1.09	25	10 / 9 = 1.11	16
U of Southern California	19 / 12 = 1.58	50	13 / 10 = 1.3	21	13 / 10 = 1.3	15
U of Texas at Austin	33 / 15 = 2.2	9	18 / 8 = 2.25	12	16 / 8 = 2	10
U of Texas at Dallas	24 / 19 = 1.26	30	18 / 15 = 1.2	12	18 / 15 = 1.2	4
U of Toledo	15 / 10 = 1.5	74	3 / 5 = 0.6	142	3 / 5 = 0.6	72
U of Utah	9 / 4 = 2.25	135	4 / 2 = 2	106	4 / 2 = 2	55
U of Washington	20 / 13 = 1.54	43	8 / 7 = 1.14	50	6 / 5 = 1.2	36
U of Western Ontario	15 / 7 = 2.14	74	8 / 7 = 1.14	50	3 / 3 = 1	72
U of Wisconsin-Madison	8 / 4 = 2	146	6 / 2 = 3	72	5 / 2 = 2.5	44
U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	23 / 14 = 1.64	32	10 / 10 = 1	36	9 / 9 = 1	18
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U	20 / 13 = 1.54	43	5 / 3 = 1.67	86	2 / 2 = 1	106
Washington State U	33 / 13 = 2.54	9	22 / 11 = 2	7	9 / 6 = 1.5	18
Wayne State U	7 / 4 = 1.75	165	4 / 3 = 1.33	106	4 / 3 = 1.33	55
Yonsei U	18 / 16 = 1.13	54	9 / 9 = 1	43	6 / 5 = 1.2	36

* These numbers represent the following: Total number of articles published by faculty or staff in target journals / total number of faculty/staff publishing in target journals = average number of articles per faculty/staff publishing in target journals.

** Rank is based on total number of articles published by faculty or staff in target journals. Note that there are multiple ties. If two universities tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-9. Universities that Supplied Graduates who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Ranked by Region)

Region	Degree From	Country	Select-11* Article Rank	AIS-6* Article Rank	Top-3* Article Rank
1-Americas	Carnegie Mellon U	USA	5	2	2
1-Americas	Case Western Reserve U	USA	16	14	16
1-Americas	Georgia State U	USA	7	6	11
1-Americas	Harvard U	USA	24	19	23
1-Americas	Indiana U	USA	12	11	12
1-Americas	Kent State U	USA	32	19	22
1-Americas	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	USA	10	8	8
1-Americas	New York U	USA	9	10	6
1-Americas	Ohio State U	USA	27	25	19

Table A-9. Universities that Supplied Graduates who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Ranked by Region) - Continued

Region	Degree From	Country	Select-11* Article Rank	AIS-6* Article Rank	Top-3* Article Rank
1-Americas	Purdue U	USA	3	9	6
1-Americas	Stanford U	USA	16	13	13
1-Americas	State U of New York at Buffalo	USA	11	15	18
1-Americas	Texas A&M U	USA	27	27	34
1-Americas	Texas Tech U	USA	22	30	55
1-Americas	U of Arizona	USA	2	2	3
1-Americas	U of British Columbia	Canada	8	7	9
1-Americas	U of California–Berkeley	USA	29	50	47
1-Americas	U of Florida	USA	26	46	47
1-Americas	U of Georgia	USA	22	24	28
1-Americas	U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	USA	18	33	34
1-Americas	U of Maryland	USA	24	19	19
1-Americas	U of Michigan	USA	13	15	15
1-Americas	U of Minnesota	USA	1	1	1
1-Americas	U of Nebraska–Lincoln	USA	21	46	55
1-Americas	U of Pennsylvania	USA	20	22	17
1-Americas	U of Pittsburgh	USA	6	4	5
1-Americas	U of Rochester	USA	14	18	14
1-Americas	U of Southern California	USA	15	12	10
1-Americas	U of Texas at Austin	USA	4	5	4
1-Americas	U of Western Ontario	Canada	18	15	25
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Aalborg U	Denmark	15	12	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Aston U	UK	16	16	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Brunel U	UK	5	5	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Catholic U of Leuven	Belgium	14	70	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	13	14	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Cranfield U	UK	16	14	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Delft U of Technology	Netherlands	28	20	9
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Eindhoven U of Technology	Netherlands	20	70	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Erasmus U Rotterdam	Netherlands	9	9	9
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Helsinki School of Economics	Finland	22	33	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Israel Institute of Technology	Israel	24	16	9
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Lancaster U	UK	22	33	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	London School of Economics	UK	1	1	2
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Polytechnique Paris	France	46	24	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Tel Aviv U	Israel	10	12	3
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Bradford	UK	16	16	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Cambridge	UK	8	20	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Cologne	Germany	24	33	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of East Anglia	UK	34	20	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Göteborg	Sweden	27	16	5
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Jyväskylä	Finland	3	2	9
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of London	UK	6	3	1
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Manchester	UK	2	5	5
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Munich	Germany	11	9	5
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Oslo	Norway	6	3	5
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Oulu	Finland	16	9	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Salford	UK	11	8	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Southampton	UK	24	24	21
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Warwick	UK	4	7	9
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Vienna U of Economics and Business Administration	Austria	20	20	21

Table A-9. Universities that Supplied Graduates who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Ranked by Region) - Continued

Region	Degree From	Country	Select-11* Article Rank	AIS-6* Article Rank	Top-3* Article Rank
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Australian Graduate School of Management	Australia	32	16	7
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Australian National U	Australia	17	8	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Beijing University	China	25	16	7
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Chinese U of Hong Kong	China	9	26	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	City U of Hong Kong	China	3	4	4
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Curtin U of Technology	Australia	13	8	12
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Hong Kong Polytechnic U	China	9	16	12
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	China	7	4	2
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Indian Institute of Management-Calcutta	India	32	16	7
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	South Korea	2	4	5
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Monash U	Australia	6	3	7
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	25	8	12
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Central U	China	7	8	12
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Chiao Tung U	China	13	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Sun Yat-sen U	China	4	7	5
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Taiwan U	China	11	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Tsing Hua U	China	17	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National U of Singapore	Singapore	1	1	1
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Queensland U of Technology	Australia	11	8	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Tsinghua U	China	17	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Hong Kong	China	16	26	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Melbourne	Australia	13	8	7
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of New South Wales	Australia	17	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Queensland	Australia	5	2	3

* Rank is based on total number of articles published, per region, by graduates in target journals. Note that there are multiple ties. If two universities tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-10. Universities that Supplied the Most Doctoral Students who Published in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009

Region	University	Country	Select-11 Student Rank*	AIS-6 Student Rank*	Top-3 Student Rank*
1-Americas	Arizona State U	USA	20	15	6
1-Americas	Baruch College	USA	13	15	6
1-Americas	Claremont Graduate U	USA	20	26	N/A
1-Americas	Clemson U	USA	3	1	17
1-Americas	Emory U	USA	31	15	17
1-Americas	Georgia Institute of Technology	USA	13	15	6
1-Americas	Georgia State U	USA	2	2	2
1-Americas	HEC Montréal	Canada	10	3	6
1-Americas	Indiana U	USA	39	15	6
1-Americas	New Jersey Institute of Technology	USA	20	N/A	N/A
1-Americas	New York U	USA	39	15	6
1-Americas	Purdue U	USA	4	15	17
1-Americas	State U of New York at Buffalo	USA	6	5	6
1-Americas	Syracuse U	USA	20	15	N/A

Table A-10. Universities that Supplied the Most Doctoral Students who Published in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 - Continued

Region	University	Country	Select-11 Student Rank*	AIS-6 Student Rank*	Top-3 Student Rank*
1-Americas	Texas Tech U	USA	13	N/A	N/A
1-Americas	U of Arizona	USA	1	5	1
1-Americas	U of Arkansas	USA	31	9	6
1-Americas	U of British Columbia	Canada	7	3	2
1-Americas	U of Central Florida	USA	4	9	N/A
1-Americas	U of Florida	USA	13	N/A	N/A
1-Americas	U of Georgia	USA	10	N/A	N/A
1-Americas	U of Houston	USA	7	15	N/A
1-Americas	U of Maryland	USA	10	9	6
1-Americas	U of Maryland Baltimore County	USA	13	15	6
1-Americas	U of Michigan	USA	7	26	17
1-Americas	U of Minnesota	USA	20	5	2
1-Americas	U of Missouri–Saint Louis	USA	20	N/A	N/A
1-Americas	U of Nebraska at Omaha	USA	20	5	17
1-Americas	U of North Carolina at Greensboro	USA	20	26	N/A
1-Americas	U of Pittsburgh	USA	13	26	17
1-Americas	U of South Carolina–Columbia	USA	20	9	N/A
1-Americas	U of Texas at Austin	USA	20	26	17
1-Americas	U of Texas at Dallas	USA	31	9	2
1-Americas	U of Western Ontario	Canada	13	15	N/A
1-Americas	Washington State U	USA	20	9	6
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Aarhus U	Denmark	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Athens U of Economics and Business	Greece	9	3	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Catholic U of Leuven	Belgium	4	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Erasmus U Rotterdam	Netherlands	2	2	3
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Goethe U	Germany	4	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Helsinki School of Economics	Finland	4	7	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Helsinki U of Technology	Finland	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Lancaster U	UK	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	National and Kapodistrian U of Athens	Greece	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Royal Institute of Technology	Sweden	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Technical U Munich	Germany	9	7	3
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Umeå U	Sweden	9	3	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U Miguel Hernández	Spain	4	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Bath	UK	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Cape Town	South Africa	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Cologne	Germany	9	7	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Ghent	Belgium	3	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Helsinki	Finland	9	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Jyväskylä	Finland	9	7	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Lausanne	Switzerland	9	3	2
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Manchester	UK	9	7	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Oslo	Norway	1	1	1
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Oulu	Finland	9	7	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Salamanca	Spain	4	N/A	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Salford	UK	9	3	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Academia Sinica	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Chiao-Tung U	China	16	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Chinese Academy of Sciences	China	16	N/A	N/A

Table A-10. Universities that Supplied the Most Doctoral Students who Published in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 - Continued

Region	University	Country	Select-11 Student Rank*	AIS-6 Student Rank*	Top-3 Student Rank*
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Chinese U of Hong Kong	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	City U of Hong Kong	China	2	1	1
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Inha U	South Korea	22	4	2
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	South Korea	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Monash U	Australia	16	4	2
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Central U	China	3	2	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Chiao Tung U	China	16	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Chung Cheng U	China	4	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Sun Yat-sen U	China	5	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Taiwan U	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National U of Singapore	Singapore	1	2	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Tsinghua U	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Hong Kong	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Melbourne	Australia	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Queensland	Australia	16	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Xian Jiaotong U	China	6	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Yonsei U	South Korea	16	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Yuan Ze U	China	6	N/A	N/A

* Rank is based on total number of doctoral students, per region, who published in target journals. Note that there are multiple ties. If two universities tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

Table A-11. Universities that Supplied Faculty and Staff who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Ranked by Region)

Region	University*	Country	Select-11 Article Rank**	AIS-6 Article Rank**	Top-3 Article Rank**
1-Americas	Arizona State U	USA	16	16	16
1-Americas	Bentley U	USA	5	16	39
1-Americas	Carnegie Mellon U	USA	20	7	9
1-Americas	Clemson U	USA	30	15	26
1-Americas	Emory U	USA	81	40	21
1-Americas	Florida State U	USA	32	20	21
1-Americas	Georgia Institute of Technology	USA	40	35	16
1-Americas	Georgia State U	USA	1	1	3
1-Americas	HEC Montréal	Canada	27	30	33
1-Americas	Indiana U	USA	14	7	6
1-Americas	Iowa State U	USA	40	30	26
1-Americas	Louisiana State U	USA	37	24	63
1-Americas	McGill U	Canada	45	20	14
1-Americas	Miami U	USA	10	135	123
1-Americas	Michigan State U	USA	27	16	16
1-Americas	New York U	USA	32	9	4
1-Americas	Pennsylvania State U	USA	16	24	49
1-Americas	Queen's U	Canada	18	57	63
1-Americas	Simon Fraser U	Canada	49	30	33
1-Americas	State U of New York at Buffalo	USA	10	35	33
1-Americas	Temple U	USA	45	35	26
1-Americas	Texas Tech U	USA	20	49	49
1-Americas	U of Arizona	USA	3	14	6

Table A-11. Universities that Supplied Faculty and Staff who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Ranked by Region) - Continued

Region	University*	Country	Select-11 Article Rank**	AIS-6 Article Rank**	Top-3 Article Rank**
1-Americas	U of Arkansas	USA	20	9	11
1-Americas	U of British Columbia	Canada	4	2	2
1-Americas	U of California-Irvine	USA	53	24	33
1-Americas	U of California-Riverside	USA	64	35	21
1-Americas	U of Central Florida	USA	23	24	39
1-Americas	U of Connecticut	USA	25	49	26
1-Americas	U of Florida	USA	12	49	39
1-Americas	U of Georgia	USA	27	24	21
1-Americas	U of Houston	USA	12	9	26
1-Americas	U of Maryland	USA	2	3	1
1-Americas	U of Michigan	USA	14	30	26
1-Americas	U of Minnesota	USA	18	4	11
1-Americas	U of Nebraska at Omaha	USA	37	20	49
1-Americas	U of Oklahoma	USA	53	24	21
1-Americas	U of Pennsylvania	USA	60	49	26
1-Americas	U of Pittsburgh	USA	6	6	6
1-Americas	U of South Florida	USA	9	20	14
1-Americas	U of Southern California	USA	37	16	13
1-Americas	U of Texas at Austin	USA	6	9	9
1-Americas	U of Texas at Dallas	USA	23	9	4
1-Americas	U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	USA	25	30	16
1-Americas	Washington State U	USA	6	5	16
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Aalborg U	Denmark	21	12	11
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Aarhus U	Denmark	37	12	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Brunel U	UK	3	2	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	4	4	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Cranfield U	UK	9	9	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Erasmus U Rotterdam	Netherlands	5	9	11
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	ESSEC Business School	France	14	15	11
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Goethe U	Germany	71	37	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Helsinki School of Economics	Finland	12	15	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Lancaster U	UK	12	15	11
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	London School of Economics	UK	2	3	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Loughborough U	UK	14	12	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Open U	UK	17	15	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Technical U Munich	Germany	21	21	3
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Tel Aviv U	Israel	8	15	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Tilburg U	Netherlands	17	64	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U College Dublin	UK	30	21	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Bath	UK	6	9	11
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Cambridge	UK	17	15	4
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Limerick	UK	21	6	1
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Manchester	UK	1	1	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Oslo	Norway	9	6	1
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Oulu	Finland	7	5	11
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Salford	UK	14	6	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Twente	Netherlands	17	37	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	U of Warwick	UK	9	36	N/A
2-Europe, Africa, Middle East	Uppsala U	Sweden	37	21	4
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Australian National U	Australia	26	15	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Chinese U of Hong Kong	China	5	33	22
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	City U of Hong Kong	China	1	1	1
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Curtin U of Technology	Australia	22	22	22

Table A-11. Universities that Supplied Faculty and Staff who Published the Most Articles in the IS Journal Baskets 2005-2009 (Ranked by Region) - Continued

Region	University*	Country	Select-11 Article Rank**	AIS-6 Article Rank**	Top-3 Article Rank**
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Edith Cowan U	Australia	22	8	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Hanyang U	South Korea	31	22	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Hong Kong Polytechnic U	China	7	8	8
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Hong Kong U of Science and Technology	China	9	4	3
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Nanyang Technological U	Singapore	10	7	5
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Central U	China	7	11	8
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Cheng Kung U	China	22	22	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Cheng-Chi U	China	22	22	22
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Chung Cheng U	China	19	N/A	N/A
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Sun Yat-Sen U	China	17	22	22
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Taiwan U	China	16	18	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National Tsing Hua U	China	13	15	8
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	National U of Singapore	Singapore	2	1	2
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Peking U	China	43	22	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Queensland U of Technology	Australia	10	11	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Singapore Management U	Singapore	19	8	7
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Sogang U	South Korea	37	18	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Auckland	New Zealand	26	15	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Hong Kong	China	3	11	22
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Melbourne	Australia	4	3	5
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of New South Wales	Australia	13	18	13
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	U of Queensland	Australia	21	11	8
3-Asia (except Middle East), Pacific	Yonsei U	South Korea	10	5	4

* Author affiliations and locations are current as of the end of the reporting period, Spring 2010. Several faculty have changed affiliations since then, including moving from one AIS region to another, and these changes could impact future ratings.

** Rank is based on total number of articles published, per region, by faculty and staff in target journals. Note that there are multiple ties. If two universities tie, for example, third, there is no fourth.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jan Guynes Clark is Professor of Information Systems and Chair of the Department of Information Systems and Cyber Security at the University of Texas at San Antonio. She received her Ph.D. from the University of North Texas. Her research interests include the impact of information technologies on productivity and performance, information security, and IS strategies. Her publications have appeared in leading journals such as *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *Communications of the ACM*, *Decision Support Systems*, *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, and *Information & Management*.

Yoris A. Au is Associate Professor of Information Systems at the University of Texas at San Antonio. He received his Ph.D. in Information and Decision Sciences from the University of Minnesota. His research areas include economics of Information Systems, Information Technology adoption, Information Systems security, online social networks, and open source software. His research has been published in a number of leading Information Systems journals. He is currently on the editorial board of *Information & Management* and serves as an area editor for *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*.

Diane B. Walz is Professor of Information Systems and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research at UTSA. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include software development, IS personnel issues, and the cognitive limitations of information security technologies and methods. Her publications include articles in *Communications of the ACM*, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *Database*, *Information Technology and People*, *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, and *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*.

John Warren is Associate Professor of Information Systems at the University of Texas at San Antonio. He received his Ph.D. in MIS from the University of Illinois at Chicago. His research interests focuses on the use of Information Technology to support communication and decision-making in distributed environments including virtual teams and virtual communities, Information Technology adoption and diffusion, and scientometrics. He has published in a number of journals, including *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *Database*, *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, *Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, and the *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*.

Copyright © 2011 by the Association for Information Systems. Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and full citation on the first page. Copyright for components of this work owned by others than the Association for Information Systems must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists requires prior specific permission and/or fee. Request permission to publish from: AIS Administrative Office, P.O. Box 2712 Atlanta, GA, 30301-2712, Attn: Reprints; or via e-mail from ais@aisnet.org.

Communications of the Association for Information Systems

ISSN: 1529-3181

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Ilze Zigurs
University of Nebraska at Omaha

AIS PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Kalle Lyytinen Vice President Publications Case Western Reserve University	Ilze Zigurs Editor, CAIS University of Nebraska at Omaha	Shirley Gregor Editor, JAIS The Australian National University
Robert Zmud AIS Region 1 Representative University of Oklahoma	Phillip Ein-Dor AIS Region 2 Representative Tel-Aviv University	Bernard Tan AIS Region 3 Representative National University of Singapore

CAIS ADVISORY BOARD

Gordon Davis University of Minnesota	Ken Kraemer University of California at Irvine	M. Lynne Markus Bentley University	Richard Mason Southern Methodist University
Jay Nunamaker University of Arizona	Henk Sol University of Groningen	Ralph Sprague University of Hawaii	Hugh J. Watson University of Georgia

CAIS SENIOR EDITORS

Steve Alter University of San Francisco	Jane Fedorowicz Bentley University	Jerry Luftman Stevens Institute of Technology
--	---------------------------------------	--

CAIS EDITORIAL BOARD

Monica Adya Marquette University	Michel Avital University of Amsterdam	Dinesh Batra Florida International University	Indranil Bose University of Hong Kong
Thomas Case Georgia Southern University	Evan Duggan University of the West Indies	Andrew Gemino Simon Fraser University	Matt Germontprez University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Mary Granger George Washington University	Åke Gronlund University of Umea	Douglas Havelka Miami University	K.D. Joshi Washington State University
Michel Kalika University of Paris Dauphine	Karlheinz Kautz Copenhagen Business School	Julie Kendall Rutgers University	Nelson King American University of Beirut
Hope Koch Baylor University	Nancy Lankton Marshall University	Claudia Loebbecke University of Cologne	Paul Benjamin Lowry City University of Hong Kong
Don McCubbrey University of Denver	Fred Niederman St. Louis University	Shan Ling Pan National University of Singapore	Katia Passerini New Jersey Institute of Technology
Jan Recker Queensland University of Technology	Jackie Rees Purdue University	Raj Sharman State University of New York at Buffalo	Mikko Siponen University of Oulu
Thompson Teo National University of Singapore	Chelley Vician University of St. Thomas	Padmal Vitharana Syracuse University	Rolf Wigand University of Arkansas, Little Rock
Fons Wijnhoven University of Twente	Vance Wilson Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Yajiong Xue East Carolina University	

DEPARTMENTS

Information Systems and Healthcare Editor: Vance Wilson	Information Technology and Systems Editors: Dinesh Batra and Andrew Gemino	Papers in French Editor: Michel Kalika
--	---	---

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

James P. Tinsley AIS Executive Director	Vipin Arora CAIS Managing Editor University of Nebraska at Omaha	Sheri Hronek CAIS Publications Editor Hronek Associates, Inc.	Copyediting by S4Carlisle Publishing Services
--	--	---	--