

# AN ANALYSIS OF WORLD-WIDE BUSINESS SCHOOL RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY IN PRODUCTION AND OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT

Tony Polito, East Carolina University  
PolitoA@ECU.Edu  
Jose Gavidia, College of Charleston  
GavidiaJ@CofC.Edu

## ABSTRACT

*Most academic disciplines within business schools have authoritatively and reasonably analyzed and ranked their own research productivity in terms of authors and institutions. Disciplines such as finance (eg, Alexander & Mabry, 1994; Heck, Cooley, & Hubbard, 1986; Kaufman, 1984), accounting (eg, Andrews & McKenzie, 1978; Glover, Prawitt, & Wood, 2006; Zivney, Bertin, & Gavin, 1995), management (eg, Stahl, Leap, & Wei, 1988) and management information systems (eg, Claver, González, & Llopis, 2000; Grover, Segars, & Simon, 1992; Shim, English, & Yoon, 1993) publish such studies on a rather routine basis. Research in productivity rankings for business schools in whole has also been longitudinally conducted (Henry & Burch, 1974; Moore & Taylor, 1980; Niemi, 1988; Trieschmann, Dennis, Northcraft, & Niemi, 2000; Williams, 1987). In contrast, little such research has been conducted regarding the production and operations management discipline; only three such articles were located in a review of the relevant literature (Agrawal, 2002; Malhotra & Grover, 1996; Young, Baird, & Pullman, 1996).*

*In order to assess similar questions within the POM discipline, a large database (ie, greater than 4,600 entries) of POM article citations was compiled. The citations approximately and fully span the years 1991 through 2006 for the top five POM journals, in terms of both relevance and quality, selected upon the work of Barman, Hanna and LaForge (2001): Journal of Operations Management, Production and Operations Management, Decision Sciences, International Journal of Production Research and International Journal of Production & Operations Management. For the purposes of this study, those articles within Decision Sciences that were deemed not to directly pertain to the POM discipline were excluded from the analysis.*

*The preliminary results (based upon first authorship only, number of articles, without regard to number of pages) find that institutional productivity in POM is higher in certain second-tier American universities, whereas it is noticeably absent from most American top--tier institutions. This finding generally concurs with Young, Baird and Pullman's work, while it generally discounts Malhotra and Kher's work. More significant is the finding that a large percentage of institutions with the highest levels of productivity in POM research are outside the United States. This finding heavily discounts the findings of Malhotra and Kher; the other two studies were intentionally constrained to U.S. institutions. This latter finding, upon further analysis, may be attributed to a trend toward globalization of research efforts in the POM discipline.*

## REFERENCES

- Agrawal, V. K. (2002). Constituencies of journals in production and operations management: Implications on reach and quality. *Production and Operations Management, 11*(2), 101-108.
- Alexander, J. C., & Mabry, R. H. (1994). Relative significance of journals, authors, and articles cited in financial research. *Journal of Finance, 49*(2), 697-712.
- Andrews, W. T., & McKenzie, P. B. (1978). Leading accounting departments revisited. *The Accounting Review, 53*(1), 135-138.
- Barman, S., Hanna, M. D., & LaForge, R. L. (2001). Perceived relevance and quality of POM journals : A decade later. *Journal of Operations Management, 19*(3), 367-385.
- Claver, E., González, R., & Llopis, J. (2000). An analysis of research in information systems (1981-1997). *Information & Management, 37*(4), 181-195.
- Glover, S. M., Prawitt, D. F., & Wood, D. A. (2006). Publication records of faculty promoted at the top 75 accounting research programs. *Issues in Accounting Education, 21*(3), 195-218.
- Grover, V., Segars, A. H., & Simon, S. J. (1992). An assessment of institutional research productivity in MIS. *Database, 23*(4), 5-9.
- Heck, J. L., Cooley, P. L., & Hubbard, C. M. (1986). Contributing authors and institutions to the Journal of Finance: 1946-1985. *Journal of Finance, 41*(5), 1129-1140.
- Henry, W. R., & Burch, E. E. (1974). Institutional contributions to scholarly journals of business. *Journal of Business, 47*(1), 56-66.
- Kaufman, G. G. (1984). Rankings of finance departments by faculty representation on editorial boards of professional journals: A note. *Journal of Finance, 39*(4), 1189-1197.
- Malhotra, M. K., & Grover, V. (1996). An assessment of survey research in POM: from constructs to theory. *Journal of Operations Management, 16*(4), 407-425.
- Moore, L. J., & Taylor, B. W. (1980). Institutional publications in business-related academic journals. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business, 20*(1), 87-97.
- Niemi, A. W. (1988). Research productivity of American business schools, 1975-1985. *Review of Business & Economic Research, 23*(2), 1-17.
- Shim, J. P., English, J. B., & Yoon, J. (1993). An examination of articles in the eight leading management information systems journals: 1980–1988. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 25*(3), 211-219.

Stahl, M. J., Leap, T. L., & Wei, Z. Z. (1988). Publications in leading management journals as a measure of institutional research productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(3), 707-720.

Trieschmann, J. S., Dennis, A. R., Northcraft, G. B., & Niemi, A. W. (2000). Serving multiple contingencies in the business school: MBA program versus research performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1130-1141.

Williams, W. W. (1987). Institutional propensities to publish in academic journals of business administration. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, 27(1), 77-94.

Young, S. T., Baird, B. C., & Pullman, M. E. (1996). POM research productivity in U.S. business schools. *Journal of Operations Management*, 14(1), 41-53.

Zivney, T. L., Bertin, W. J., & Gavin, T. A. (1995). A comprehensive examination of accounting faculty publishing. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 10(1), 1-25.