

# Perspective: Ranking of the World's Top Innovation Management Scholars and Universities\*

Pianpian Yang and Lei Tao

*This paper extends Jeffrey Thieme's article "The World's Top Innovation Management Scholars and Their Social Capital," published in 2007 in JPIM, in which he made a ranking of the world's top innovation management scholars. This paper makes four contributions. First, this paper includes data on innovation management from articles published in two leading innovation management journals and eight top management and marketing journals during past 20 years (1991–2010). Second, this paper classifies 1229 articles into 29 categories, revealing hot topics and future research directions. Third, this paper ranks 1718 innovation management scholars over a period of 20 years from 1991 to 2010. Fourth, this is the first time that 625 universities have been ranked in terms of their current faculty research capabilities in the field of innovation management.*

*The empirical data from the past 20 years show that the world's top 10 innovation management scholars are: Michael Song (University of Missouri-Kansas City), Roger J. Calantone (Michigan State University), Erik Jan Hultink (Delft University of Technology), Mark E. Parry (University of Missouri-Kansas City), Kwaku Atuahene-Gima (China Europe International Business School), C. Anthony Di Benedetto (Temple University), Abbie Griffin (University of Utah), William E. Souder (Retired), Barry L. Bayus (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), and Christoph H. Loch (INSEAD).*

*The world's top 10 innovation management universities are: University of Missouri-Kansas City, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Michigan State University, INSEAD, Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania, Northeastern University, Texas A&M University, Stanford University, and Delft University of Technology.*

## Introduction

Innovation is "the overall process whereby an invention is transformed into a commercial product that can be sold profitably" (Crawford and Di Benedetto, 2006). As a burgeoning area of fierce competition among firms, studying innovation yields critical economic insights (Clark and Fujimoto, 1991; Guo, 2008). Managing innovation is integral in changing innovative ideas to performance. Reviews by Chen, Damanpour, and Reilly (2010), Karniouchina, Victorino, and Verma (2006), and Page and Schirr (2008) have confirmed substantial growth in the field of innovation management during the last two decades.

As the body of innovation management literature develops and expands, it is useful to list top contributors and universities. A research productivity ranking of individual scholars is useful for identifying top scholars in the field, while a productivity ranking of universities pro-

vides important information for prospective faculty recruits, doctoral students, companies seeking consulting help, potential donors, and other stakeholders. Articles published in top academic journals are one of the most important measures for high-quality intellectual research (Bakir, Vitell, and Rose, 2000; Chan, Fung, and Leung, 2006; Ford, LaTour, and Henthorne, 2001; Linton, 2004; Thieme, 2007). Therefore, this paper identifies and ranks the most productive scholars and universities by computing the number of articles from two leading academic innovation management journals and eight top management and marketing journals.

This paper also investigates general topics that have been studied and identify the most popular research topics in the field of innovation management. A comprehensive database of articles related to innovation management between 1991 and 2010 is developed. Further, these articles are classified into 29 specific categories, and the experts are identified in each subfield. By collecting and analyzing 1229 publications, which reflect the work of 1718 scholars in 10 top journals from the past 20 years, this paper makes the following three ranking lists: (1) top scholars based on total number of articles published in top 10 journals over last 20 years; (2) top scholars based

Address correspondence to: Lei Tao, Marketing Department, Management School, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Shaanxi 710049, China. E-mail: leitao@mail.xjtu.edu.cn. Tel: 86-29-8267-2193.

\* Both authors contributed equally to this research.

on total number of articles published in eight traditional top management and marketing journals that publish significant innovation management articles over the last 20 years; and (3) the world's top innovation management universities in terms of their current faculty research capabilities.

## Ranking Method

The ranking of scholars and universities is made on the basis of peer-reviewed research journals. Although books, conference proceedings, and working papers are also evidence of scholarship, peer-reviewed journals remain the focus of the academic community (Linton, 2004; Thieme, 2007). Based on citation impact factor, past studies have established that *JPIM* and *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* are the top two innovation management journals (Cheng, Kumar, Motwani, Reisman, and Madan, 1999; Linton and Thongpapanl, 2004; Thieme, 2007). Since innovation management cuts across disciplines (Thieme, 2007), this paper also includes five top management journals (*Strategic Management Journal*, *Management Science*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Review*, and *Academy of Management Journal*; see ranking by Linton and Thongpapanl, 2004), one top journal in operations management (*Journal of Operations Management*; see ranking by Barman, Hanna, and Laforge, 2001), and two top marketing journals (*Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Marketing Research*; see ranking by Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003). This paper considers the same top management and marketing journals as Thieme (2007), but in contrast to Thieme's work, our research includes only two top innovation management journals and adds one top operations management journal for its growing attention in the innovation management field.

This research collected electronic copies of all articles published in these 10 top journals between 1991 and 2010, using Business Source Premier and the Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection. Following Thieme's (2007) data collection procedure, an article was retained immediately

if it was clear from the title that the article's conclusions had direct implications on innovation management. In many cases, when this was not necessarily clear from the title, two authors read the abstract. An article was retained only if the abstract reading clarified that the article had direct implications for innovation management (Crawford and Di Benedetto, 2006).

Our focus is original contribution to innovation management research. Therefore, this paper excluded the following types of articles: literature review, meta-analysis, ranking article, research note and practitioner note, book review, comment, reply, dialogue and rejoinder, spotlight article, editorial (from the editors), and announcements. In addition, this research excluded articles whose primary focus is technology forecasting, technology transfer and diffusion, cross-functional team management (unless the study is specifically related to innovation management teams), organizational innovation (i.e., new forms of organizing a firm's management structure), organizational innovative technology adoption, process innovation, product line innovation, new business creation and entrepreneurship, and individual creativity.

Using these criteria, 1293 possible innovation management articles were collected. The journal's name, article title, publication year, author's name, author's affiliation at the time of publication, abstract, and key words (if applicable) were noted. Among these 1293 articles, the two authors independently judged 1175 of them to be innovation management research, disagreeing on only 118 articles. To resolve this, both authors read the articles in their entirety and were able to agree that 39 of the disputed articles are in fact innovation management research. For the remaining 79 articles where no consensus was reached, two well-known and respected professors in innovation management were requested to classify these articles independently. Fifteen more articles were judged to be innovation management research. Therefore, a total of 1229 innovation management articles are included in our ranking analysis.

Our results indicate that in the 20-year period (1991–2010), *JPIM* and *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* published the most innovation management articles (555 and 138, respectively). Among top eight management and marketing journals, *Management Science* is found to publish the most innovation management articles (140), followed by *Academy of Management Journal* (82), *Journal of Marketing* (77), *Journal of Marketing Research* (76), *Strategic Management Journal* (58), *Journal of Operations Management* (50), *Academy of Management Review* (29), and *Administrative Science Quarterly* (24).

### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Pianpian Yang is Ph.D candidate at Management School of Xi'an Jiaotong University. Her current research interests include marketing channel management and innovation strategy.

Lei Tao is Assistant Professor at Management School of Xi'an Jiaotong University. Her current research interests include marketing strategy and marketing channel management.

## Classification

This paper classified the innovation management research topics into 29 categories (i.e., subfields) based on three review articles (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995; Henard and Szymanski, 2001; Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994). The results are presented in Table 1. The categories in Table 1 are not necessarily mutually exclusive (one article may be classified into multiple categories).

One of the most noticeable aspects of Table 1 is the uneven distribution of articles among the subfields of innovation management research. Over the 20-year period, the areas that have received the most publishing attention are: company resources, structural approach, and external/internal relations, followed by organizational attributes, environment, strategy, launch proficiency, product innovation, fit with market need/meet customer needs, and speed to market. However, few articles have examined product price and product technological sophistication.

Results from Table 1 demonstrate that Michael Song published at least two articles in 21 out of the 29 categories, thereby making him the most prolific contributor in more than two thirds of the innovation management subfields. Michael Song is followed by Mark E. Parry, Erik Jan Hultink, William E. Souder, Kwaku Atuahene-Gima, Roger J. Calantone, Barry L. Bayus, Ulrike de Brentani, Abbie Griffin, C. Anthony Di Benedetto, and Morgan L. Swink—all of who published at least two articles in more than three categories. In addition, 16 scholars are shown as experts relating to two categories (see Table 1).

## World's Top Innovation Management Scholars

To rank the innovation management scholars, this paper adopted the methods used in prior ranking studies (e.g., Heck and Cooley, 1988; Inkpen and Beamish, 1994; Lu, 2003; Morrison and Inkpen, 1991; Thieme, 2007) to construct unadjusted and adjusted count measures of authors. The first method gives full credit to each author of an article, while the second method weights the authors (one divided by the number of authors in the article). No weighting distinction was made between senior authors and their co-authors (see Table 2 “Number of Articles Adjusted”). The same method was used in previous studies by Stahl, Leap, and Wei (1988), Thieme (2007), and Young, Baird, and Pullman (1996). Because each of these two ranking methods inherently includes some bias, this paper uses both ranking methods, and the results are reported in Table 2.

Table 2 presents top 50 innovation management scholars who have each published at least five articles in the 10 top journals between 1991 and 2010. The list of top scholars expands to 182 if scholars who published at least three articles are included. This paper also presents the top innovation management scholars whose adjusted number of articles is more than 2.25. A longer list of top innovation management scholars and a supplementary list of most active innovation management scholars from 2006 to 2010 are available in the following website: <http://gr.xjtu.edu.cn:8080/web/leitao>.

Consistent with the ranking by Thieme (2007), the empirical results show that Michael Song leads the ranking again and he claims that title of “world’s number one innovation scholar.” The other top 10 innovation management scholars are Roger J. Calantone, Erik Jan Hultink, Mark E. Parry, Kwaku Atuahene-Gima, C. Anthony Di Benedetto, Abbie Griffin, William E. Souder, Barry L. Bayus, and Christoph H. Loch.

Because innovation management has also gained increasing attention in top management and marketing journals, this paper also ranks innovation management scholars who publish in other traditional A + marketing and management journals. Table 3 displays the top innovation management scholars in eight top management and marketing journals (excluding *JPIM* and *IEEE*) over 20 years. The 12 top innovation management scholars in top management and marketing journals are Michael Song, Barry L. Bayus, Rajesh K. Chandy, Kwaku Atuahene-Gima, Michael A. Hitt, Christian Terwiesch, Christine Moorman, Christoph H. Loch, Donald R. Lehmann, Eric von Hippel, Jinhong Xie, and Steven D. Eppinger. Each of these top 12 scholars has published at least six innovation management articles in the eight top management and marketing journals between 1991 and 2010.

## World's Top Innovation Management Universities

There are different methodologies for ranking universities (Chapple, Powers, and Bunch, 2003; Linton, 2004). Traditionally, university rankings are based on aggregation of faculty publishing articles (Bakir et al., 2000; Chan et al., 2006; Ford et al., 2001; Linton, 2004) where all publications are credited to the author’s affiliated university at the time of publication. Polonsky (2008) suggests that it is more appropriate to rank universities based on current faculty members (Polonsky, 2008). Therefore, this paper ranks top universities in innovation management research by summing the publication records of the current faculties.

**Table 1. Classification of Innovation Management Topics**

Category	Definition <sup>b</sup>	Top Scholars in This Category
Product factors (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to elements pertaining to the offering.	
1. Product advantage (45) <sup>a</sup> (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to the customer's perception of product superiority with respect to quality, cost-benefit ratio, or function relative to competitors.	Parry, M. E. (4); Song, M. (4); Harter, D. E. (3); Hultink, E. J. (3); Calantone, R. J. (3); Slaughter, S. A. (3); Guiltinan, J. P. (2); Krishnan, M. S. (2); Kaufman, P. (2); Rose, R. L. (2); Jayachandran, S. (2)
2. Fit with market need/Meet customer needs (110) (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Extent to which product is perceived as satisfying desires/needs of the customer. Relative customer factors in this category, such as customer perception and attitude (customer preference, customer acceptance, customer confidence, customer risk feeling), customer categories (lead user, ordinary user), customer characteristics (customer personality, customer experience and knowledge, customer innovativeness), and customer behaviors (customer updating behaviors, communication) in new product context are included.	Song, M. (6); Parry, M. E. (5); Athaide, G. A. (4); Calantone, R. J. (4); Hultink, E. J. (3); Sethi, R. (3)
3. Product price (17) (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to perceived price-performance congruency (i.e., value).	Bayus, B. L. (3); Kang, W. (2)
4. Product technological sophistication (9) (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to perceived technological sophistication (i.e., high tech, low tech) of the product.	No author published more than two articles relating to this category
5. Product innovation (132) (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to perceived newness/originality/uniqueness/radicalness of the product.	Hultink, E. J. (6); Calantone, R. J. (6); O'Connor, G. C. (5); Griffin, A. (4); Song, M. (4); Atuahene-Gima, K. (3); Swink, M. L. (3); de Brentani, U. (3)
6. Product attributions (85)	Referring to product categories (products, service) and product characteristics such as product life cycle, and product portfolio and product network externality, product compatibility, product diversity, and product architectures.	No author publish more than 3 articles relating to this category Bayus, B. L. (2); Chhajed, D. (2); Hitt, M. A. (2); Park, S. H. (2); Childers, T. L. (2)
Firm strategy factors (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to a firm's planned actions that have the potential for providing it a competitive advantage in the marketplace separate from any factors associated with the new product development process.	
7. Technological synergy (44) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994; Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to fit between the needs of the project and the firm's resources and skills with respect to R&D or product development, engineering, and production.	Song, M. (9); Parry, M. E. (3); Kleinschmidt, E. J. (3); Dröge, C. (2); Vickery, S. K. (2); Salomo, S. (2); de Brentani, U. (2)
8. Marketing synergy (25) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994; Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to fit between the needs of the project and the firm's resources and skills with respect to the sales force, distribution, advertising, promotion, market research, and customer service.	Song, M. (6); Parry, M. E. (4); Souder, W. E. (4)
9. Company resources (246) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to compatibility of the resource base of the firm with the requirements of the project. It is more general than marketing or technological synergy. For example, it includes financial, manpower requirements, learning capability, organizational knowledge and experience, and organizational brands and patents.	Song, M. (10); Moorman, C. (4); Di Benedetto, C. A. (3); Rothaermel, F. T. (3); Parry, M. E. (3); Hitt, M. A. (3); Calantone, R. J. (3)
10. Strategy (151) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to strategic impetus for the development of a project (for example, defensive, reactive, proactive, imitative). Organizational strategy orientation, product positioning strategy, product entry strategy, and product development strategy are included.	Song, M. (6); Di Benedetto, C. A. (4); Atuahene-Gima, K. (3); Sarkar, M. B. (3); Echambadi, R. (3); Agarwal, R. (3); Kerin, R. A. (3)
Development process factors (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring specifically to elements associated with new product development process and its execution.	

**Table 1.** *Continued*

Category	Definition <sup>b</sup>	Top Scholars in This Category
11. Structural approach (244) (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to employment of formalized product development procedures. New product developing process and some new product developing tools are included.	Song, M. (6); Loch, C. H. (5); Griffin, A. (3); Srinivasan, K. (3); Montoya-Weiss, M. M. (3); Kekre, S. (3); Souder, W. E. (3)
12. Protocol (64) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to firm's knowledge and understanding of specific marketing and technical aspects prior to product development. The target market, customer needs, product concept, and product specifications and requirements are included.	No author published more than 3 articles relating to this category Finn, A. (2); Peng, L. (2); Souder, W. E. (2)
13. Predevelopment task proficiency (60) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to proficiency of initial screening, preliminary market and technical assessment, detailed market study and market research, and preliminary business/financial analysis.	Cooper, R. G. (5); Song, M. (4); Veryzer, R. W. (3); Verganti, R. (3)
14. Marketing task proficiency (52) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994; Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to proficiency with which a firm conducts its marketing activities, such as proficiency of service, advertising, distribution.	Song, M. (7); Souder, W. E. (4); Balachander, S. (2)
15. Technological proficiency (31) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994; Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to proficiency of product development, in-house testing of the product or prototype, trial/pilot production, production start-up, and obtaining necessary technology are included.	Song, M. (7); Souder, W. E. (4); Parry, M. E. (3)
16. Launch proficiency (144) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994; Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to proficiency with which a firm launches the product/ services, customer tests of prototypes or samples, test markets/trial selling, launch strategy, preannouncement are included.	Hultink, E. J. (4); Song, M. (3); Mahajan, V. (3)
17. Speed to market (104) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to the speed of the development process or launch effort. Launch timing, development cycle time, and first or second to market effects are included.	Hultink, E. J. (4); Di Benedetto, C. A. (3); Bayus, B. L. (3); Terwiesch, C. (3); Jayaram, J. (3); Song, M. (3)
18. Financial/Business analysis (44) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to the proficiency of ongoing financial and business analysis during development, prior to commercialization and full-scale launch. Go/no-go decision is included.	Weinberg, B. D. (2); Urban, G. L. (2); Schmidt, J. B. (2); Hauser, J. R. (2); Song, M. (2); Montoya-Weiss, M. M. (2); Tzokas, N. X. (2); Calantone, R. J. (2); Hart, S. J. (2)
19. Costs (38)(Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to project development cost, production, R&D, or marketing cost overruns or expenditures and insufficient project funds are included.	Hultink, E. J. (3); Langerak, F. (3); Griffin, A. (2); Bayus, B. L. (2); Harter, D. E. (2); Terwiesch, C. (2); Slaughter, S. A. (2); Atuahene-Gima, K. (2);
20. Task/project attributes (27)	Referring to new product development project characteristics, such as project complexity, project uncertainty, and project prioritization.	No author published more than two articles relating to this category
21. Senior management (93) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994; Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995; Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to top management's commitment to the project, as well as their day-to-day involvement, guidance/direction, and control over the project development.	Song, M. (3); Swink, M. L. (3); de Brentani, U. (3)
22. Project leader (59) (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995)	Referring to project leader's power, vision, and management skill.	McDonough, E. F. III (3); Song, M. (3); Souder, W. E. (3)
23. Team composition (84) (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995)	Referring to new product development team's attributes, tenure, team member's characteristics, and team characteristics are included. The ideas of key individuals (i.e., product champions, gatekeepers) are also included.	McDonough, E. F. III (3); Barczak, G. (3)
Market environment factors (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to elements that describe the target market.	
24. Market potential (23) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to market (and demand) size and growth, as well as an indication of customer need level for the product type. This measure also indicates the importance of the product to the customer	Hultink, E. J. (3); Bayus, B. L. (2); Parry, M. E. (2); Song, M. (2)

**Table 1. Continued**

Category	Definition <sup>b</sup>	Top Scholars in This Category
25. Market competitive (include likelihood of competitive response and competitive response intensity) (59) (Henard and Szymanski, 2001)	Referring to degree/likelihood and intensity/level of competitive response to a new product introduction	Hultink, E. J. (3); Song, M. (3); Calantone, R. J. (3)
26. Environment (152) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to general operating environment faced by the firm. Risk, country culture, policy, technological trends, turbulence are included.	Atuahene-Gima, K. (5); Moorman, C. (3); Li, H. (3); Schmidt, J. B. (3); Kahn, K. B. (3); Parry, M. E. (3)
Organizational factors (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to elements that describe organization's internal and external relationship and organization attributes.	
27. Internal relations (211) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to coordination and cooperation within the firm. Communication in and between departments, cross-functional participation on project, and degree of interaction are included.	Song, M. (6); Souder, W. E. (6); Kahn, K. B. (4); Parry, M. E. (4); Swink, M. L. (4); Calantone, R. J. (4); Moenaert, R. K. (4); Liker, J. K. (3); Atuahene-Gima, K. (3)
28. External relations (235) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to coordination and cooperation between firms and other stakeholders. Communication or information exchange between firms, customer involvement, supplier involvement, co-development alliance, and new product developing network are included.	Song, M. (6); von Hippel, E. (5); Rothaermel, F. T. (4); Liker, J. K. (4); Athaide, G. A. (3); Li, H. (3); Cristiano, J. J. (3); Srinivasan, K. (3); Atuahene-Gima, K. (3); Nambisan, S. (3)
29. Organizational attributes (198) (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone, 1994)	Referring to organizational structure of the firm. Organizational climate, size, centralization, reward structure, and job design are included.	Song, M. (10); Atuahene-Gima, K. (6); Kleinschmidt, E. J. (5); Souder, W. E. (4); Parry, M. E. (3); Sethi, R. (3); de Brentani, U. (3)

<sup>a</sup> The figure given in parentheses following the title of category presents the number of related articles in each category.

<sup>b</sup> Definitions of 29 categories except for category 6 and 20 were adopted from Montoya-Weiss and Calantone (1994); Henard and Szymanski (2001); and Brown and Eisenhardt (1995).

**Table 2. Rankings of the World's Top Innovation Management Scholars**

Ranking	Authors	Current Affiliation	Number of Articles	Ranking Adjusted	Authors	Number of Articles Adjusted
1	Michael Song	University of Missouri-Kansas City	53	1	Michael Song	20.53
2	Roger J. Calantone	Michigan State University	24	2	Kwaku Atuahene-Gima	11.33
3	Erik Jan Hultink	Delft University of Technology	22	3	Roger J. Calantone	8.75
4	Mark E. Parry	University of Missouri-Kansas City	18	4	Erik Jan Hultink	8.63
5	Kwaku Atuahene-Gima	China Europe International Business School	17	5	Mark E. Parry	7.71
6	C. Anthony Di Benedetto	Temple University	16	6	Barry L. Bayus	7.50
7	Abbie Griffin	University of Utah	14	7	Robert G. Cooper	7.03
	William E. Souder	Retired	14	8	Abbie Griffin	6.90
9	Barry L. Bayus	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	12	9	Kenneth B. Kahn	6.50
	Christoph H. Loch	INSEAD	12	10	C. Anthony Di Benedetto	6.16
11	Kenneth B. Kahn	Virginia Commonwealth University	11	11	William E. Souder	5.67
	Robert G. Cooper	Retired	11	12	John E. Ettlie	5.50
13	Christian Terwiesch	University of Pennsylvania	10	13	Morgan L. Swink	5.42
	Cornelia Dröge	Michigan State University	10	14	Eric von Hippel	5.37
	Jeffrey K. Liker	University of Michigan	10	15	Christoph H. Loch	5.33
	Rudy K. Moenaert	Tilburg University	10	16	Gina Colarelli O'Connor	4.83
	Steven D. Eppinger	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	10		Robert W. Veryzer (Jr.)	4.83
	Vijay Mahajan	University of Texas at Austin	10	18	Roberto Verganti	4.67

**Table 2.** *Continued*

Ranking	Authors	Current Affiliation	Number of Articles	Ranking Adjusted	Authors	Number of Articles Adjusted
19	Elko J. Kleinschmidt	McMaster University	9	19	Christian Terwiesch	4.33
	Eric von Hippel	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	9	20	Vijay Mahajan	4.17
	Gloria Barczak	Northeastern University	9		Gloria Barczak	4.17
	Jinhong Xie	University of Florida	9		Edward F. McDonough III	4.17
	Morgan L. Swink	Texas Christian University	9	23	Ulrike de Brentani	4.00
	Rajesh K. Chandy	London Business School	9		John R. Hauser	4.00
25	Gerard A. Athaide	Loyola University Maryland	8	25	Frank T. Rothaermel	3.83
	Gina Colarelli O'Connor	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	8		Macro Iansiti	3.83
	Henry S. J. Robben	Nyenrode Business Universiteit	8	27	Jeffrey K. Liker	3.75
	Michael A. Hitt	Texas A&M University	8	28	Steven D. Eppinger	3.70
	Mitzi M. Montoya-Weiss	Arizona State University	8	29	Gerard A. Athaide	3.67
	Roberto Verganti	Politecnico di Milano	8	30	Elko J. Kleinschmidt	3.53
	Ulrike de Brentani	Concordia University, Montreal	8	31	Haiyang Li	3.50
32	Donald R. Lehmann	Columbia University	7	32	Cornelia Dröge	3.33
	Edward F. McDonough III	Northeastern University	7		Christine Moorman	3.33
	Frank T. Rothaermel	Georgia Institute of Technology	7		Marc H. Meyer	3.33
	Fred Langerak	Eindhoven University of Technology	7		Mohan V. Tatikonda	3.33
	Haiyang Li	Rice University	7	36	Rudy K. Moenaert	3.32
	Jeffrey B. Schmidt	University of Oklahoma	7	37	Jinhong Xie	3.25
	John E. Ettlie	Rochester Institute of Technology	7		Mitzi M. Montoya-Weiss	3.25
	John R. Hauser	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	7	39	Rajesh K. Chandy	3.17
	Kannan Srinivasan	Carnegie Mellon University	7		Klaus K. Brockhoff	3.17
	Rajesh Sethi	Clarkson University	7	41	Riitta Katila	3.00
	Robert W. Veryzer (Jr.)	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	7		Venkatesh Shankar	3.00
	Søren Salomo	Technical University of Denmark	7		Angela Paladino	3.00
44	Christine Moorman	Duke University	6		Willow A. Sheremata	3.00
	Marc H. Meyer	Northeastern University	6	45	Fred Langerak	2.83
	Macro Iansiti	Harvard University	6		Subramanian Balachander	2.83
	Martin Schreier	Bocconi University	6	47	Henry S. J. Robben	2.70
	Mohan V. Tatikonda	Indiana University-Purdue University	6	48	Rajesh Sethi	2.67
	Sunder Kekre	Carnegie Mellon University	6		Martin Schreier	2.67
50	Lisa Z. Song	University of Missouri-Kansas City	5	50	Gerard J. Tellis	2.58
	Dipak C. Jain	INSEAD	5	51	Donald R. Lehmann	2.50
	Riitta Katila	Stanford University	5		Stephen R. Rosenthal	2.50
	Venkatesh Shankar	Texas A&M University	5		Albert L. Page	2.50
	Gerard J. Tellis	University of Southern California	5		Gautam Ahuja	2.50
	Jaideep C. Prabhu	University of Cambridge	5		Mohan Subramaniam	2.50
	Klaus K. Brockhoff	Retired	5		Erwin Danneels	2.50
	Christer Karlsson	Copenhagen Business School	5		John P. Workman, Jr.	2.50
	Nikolaus Franke	Vienna Univ. of Economics and Business	5		Ludwig Bstieler	2.50
	Orville C. Walker, Jr.	Retired	5		Ulrich Lichtenthaler	2.50
	Eitan Muller	Tel Aviv University/New York University	5	60	Michael A. Hitt	2.33
	Robert B. Handfield	North Carolina State University	5		Jeffrey B. Schmidt	2.33
	Stephen R. Rosenthal	Boston University	5		Christer Karlsson	2.33
	Stylianos Kavadias	Georgia Institute of Technology	5		Stylianos (Stelios) Kavadias	2.33
	Subramanian Balachander	Purdue University	5		Robert T. Keller	2.33
Susan J. Hart	University of Strathclyde	5		Vittorio Chiesa	2.33	
Vish Krishnan	University of California, San Diego	5	66	Søren Salomo	2.25	
Gary S. Lynn	Stevens Institute of Technology	5		Robert B. Handfield	2.25	

**Table 3. Rankings of the World's Top Innovation Management Scholars Based on Eight Top Management and Marketing Journals (Excluding *JPIM* and *IEEE*)<sup>a</sup>**

Ranking	Authors	Number of Articles <sup>b</sup>	Ranking Adjusted	Authors	Number of Articles Adjusted <sup>c</sup>
1	Michael Song	15	1	Michael Song	5.62
2	Barry L. Bayus	9	2	Barry L. Bayus	5.17
	Rajesh K. Chandy	9	3	Kwaku Atuahene-Gima	5.00
4	Kwaku Atuahene-Gima	8	4	Eric von Hippel	3.53
	Michael A. Hitt	8	5	Christine Moorman	3.33
6	Christian Terwiesch	6	6	Rajesh K. Chandy	3.17
	Christine Moorman	6	7	Morgan L. Swink	3.08
	Christoph H. Loch	6	8	Riitta Katila	3.00
	Donald R. Lehmann	6		Venkatesh Shankar	3.00
	Eric von Hippel	6		John E. Ettlie	3.00
	Jinhong Xie	6	11	Christoph H. Loch	2.83
	Steven D. Eppinger	6		Frank T. Rothaermel	2.83
13	C. Anthony Di Benedetto	5	13	Christian Terwiesch	2.67
	Frank T. Rothaermel	5	14	Haiyang Li	2.50
	Haiyang Li	5		John R. Hauser	2.50
	Jaideep C. Prabhu	5	16	Michael A. Hitt	2.33
	John R. Hauser	5		Stylios (Stelios) Kavadias	2.33
	Kannan Srinivasan	5		Vish Krishnan	2.33
	Morgan L. Swink	5		Subramanian Balachander	2.33
	Riitta Katila	5		Robert T. Keller	2.33
	Roger J. Calantone	5	21	Jinhong Xie	2.25
	Stylios (Stelios) Kavadias	5	22	Donald R. Lehmann	2.17
	Sunder Kekre	5		Steven D. Eppinger	2.17
	Vish Krishnan	5		Vijay Mahajan	2.17
	Venkatesh Shankar	5	25	Roger J. Calantone	2.00
	Vijay Mahajan	5		Frank M. Bass	2.00
27	Gerard J. Tellis	4		Gautam Ahuja	2.00
	Glen L. Urban	4		Wenpin Tsai	2.00
	Jacob Goldenberg	4		Melissa A. Schilling	2.00
	Jehoshua Eliashberg	4		Willow A. Sheremata	2.00
	Karl Ulrich	4	31	Donald Gerwin	1.83
	Robert E. Hoskisson	4		Macro Iansiti	1.83
	Subramanian Balachander	4		Rajesh Sethi	1.83
	William Boulding	4	34	C. Anthony Di Benedetto	1.67
35	Anne S. Miner	3		Jaideep C. Prabhu	1.67
	Bruce D. Weinberg	3	36	Gerard J. Tellis	1.58
	Cornelia Dröge	3		Karl Ulrich	1.58
	Daniel E. Whitney	3	38	Jehoshua Eliashberg	1.50
	Dipak C. Jain	3		William Boulding	1.50
	Donald Gerwin	3		Hubert Gatignon	1.50
	Eitan Muller	3		Kathleen M. Eisenhardt	1.50
	Frank M. Bass	3		Mark E. Parry	1.50
	Gary L. Lilien	3		Abbie Griffin	1.50
	Gautam Ahuja	3		Ashwin W. Joshi	1.50
	Hubert Gatignon	3		Constance E. Helfat	1.50
	Jeffrey S. Harrison	3		Deborah Dougherty	1.50
	John E. Ettlie	3		Dorothy Leonard-Barton	1.50
	Kamel Jedidi	3		Henrich R. Greve	1.50
	Kathleen M. Eisenhardt	3		John P. Workman, Jr.	1.50
	Koen H. Pauwels	3		Peter W. Roberts	1.50
	M. B. Sarkar	3		Stefan H. Thomke	1.50
	Macro Iansiti	3		Toby E. Stuart	1.50
	Mark A. Vonderembse	3	53	Glen L. Urban	1.33

**Table 3. Continued**

Ranking	Authors	Number of Articles <sup>b</sup>	Ranking Adjusted	Authors	Number of Articles Adjusted <sup>c</sup>
	Mark E. Parry	3		Anne S. Miner	1.33
	Mitzi M. Montoya-Weiss	3		Dipak C. Jain	1.33
	Mohan V. Tatikonda	3		Eitan Muller	1.33
	Qiong Wang	3		Mitzi M. Montoya-Weiss	1.33
	Raj Echambadi	3		Mohan V. Tatikonda	1.33
	Rajesh Sethi	3		William T. (Bill) Robinson	1.33
	Rajshree Agarwal	3		Corey Phelps	1.33
	Richard Staelin	3		Jennifer W. Spencer	1.33
	Robert T. Keller	3		Jürgen Mihm	1.33
	Sandra A. Slaughter	3		Morten T. Hansen	1.33
	Sanjay Jain	3		Steve Hoeffler	1.33
	Sridhar Balasubramanian	3	65	William S. (Bill) Lovejoy	1.33
	Stephen G. Green	3	66	Kannan Srinivasan	1.32
	Stefan Stremersch	3	67	Jacob Goldenberg	1.25
	Surendra Rajiv	3		Kamel Jedidi	1.25
	Teck H. Ho	3	69	Sunder Kekre	1.23
	Trichy V. Krishnan	3	70	Richard Staelin	1.17
	Wenpin Tsai	3		Sandra A. Slaughter	1.17
	William Doll	3		Sanjay Jain	1.17
	William T. (Bill) Robinson	3		Sridhar Balasubramanian	1.17
	Xenophon Koufteros	3		Trichy V. Krishnan	1.17
				Daniel Tzabbar	1.17
			76	M. B. Sarkar	1.08
				Mark A. Vonderembse	1.08
			78	Rajshree Agarwal	1.05
			79	Robert E. Hoskisson	1.03
				Gary L. Lilien	1.03
				Qiong Wang	1.03

<sup>a</sup> The eight top management and marketing journals are *Strategic Management Journal*, *Management Science*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Operations Management*, *Journal of Marketing*, and *Journal of Marketing Research*.

<sup>b</sup> Number of articles was computed by giving full credit for each author of an article.

<sup>c</sup> Number of articles adjusted was computed by equally dividing one point among the authors of an article.

Affiliations of 1718 scholars were obtained from web sites. For visiting positions, the permanent university affiliation rather than the temporary affiliation was used. 26 scholars who retired or passed away and 120 scholars who lack a university affiliation were excluded from the calculation. In addition, the total number (full credit to all co-contributors) and adjusted number (weighted method) for the remaining 1572 scholars were computed for each university. The results are presented in Table 4.

The top 100 universities include 110 universities due to ties in the publications. This paper demarcates the top 50 universities as “first tier” and the remaining universities as “second tier” for current innovation management research capabilities. Based on the number of current faculty’s research publications in the 10 top journals, the world’s top 10 universities (including 11 universities due to the case of ties) in innovation management research

are: (1) University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC), (2) Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), (3) Michigan State University (MSU), (4) INSEAD, (5) Harvard University and University of Pennsylvania (UPenn), (7) Northeastern University and Texas A&M University, (9) Stanford University, (10) Temple University and (10) Delft University of Technology (Delft).

Follow-up research was performed to examine how the top 10 universities established their reputation in innovation management research. Based on the analyses, there are three strategies: (1) building on existing university reputation, (2) retaining productive scholars, and (3) attracting the best faculty using new strategic focus. It is not surprising to find MIT, INSEAD, Harvard, UPenn, Texas A&M, and Stanford in the top 10. Capitalizing on their excellent overall university reputation, these universities have attracted faculty to advance their innovation management research.

**Table 4. Rankings of World's Top Innovation Management Universities<sup>a</sup>**

Ranking	Universities	Number of Articles <sup>b</sup>	Ranking Adjusted	Universities	Number of Articles Adjusted <sup>c</sup>
First Tier					
1	University of Missouri-Kansas City	78	1	Michigan State University	44.44
2	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	53	2	University of Missouri-Kansas City	30.65
3	Michigan State University	51	3	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	25.48
4	INSEAD	41	4	Harvard University	21.95
5	Harvard University	38	5	Northeastern University	19.16
	University of Pennsylvania	38	6	INSEAD	18.71
7	Northeastern University	37	7	University of Pennsylvania	17.07
	Texas A&M University	37	8	Stanford University	15.00
9	Stanford University	32	9	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	14.49
10	Delft University of Technology	29	10	China Europe International Business School	13.66
	Temple University	29	11	Texas A&M University	13.57
12	University of Michigan	27	12	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	13.49
13	Carnegie Mellon University	26	13	University of Utah	11.89
	Duke University	26	14	Duke University	11.57
15	Arizona State University	25	15	Delft University of Technology	11.46
	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	25	16	New York University	11.33
17	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	24	17	Temple University	11.15
	University of Utah	24	18	University of Michigan	10.89
19	London Business School	23	19	Arizona State University	10.15
	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	23		London Business School	10.15
21	Boston University	22	21	Georgia Institute of Technology	10.07
	Erasmus University Rotterdam	22	22	Boston University	9.98
	Georgia Institute of Technology	22	23	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	9.73
	University of Texas at Austin	22	24	Politecnico di Milano	9.16
25	China Europe International Business School	21	25	University of Texas at Austin	8.99
26	Columbia University	20	26	Carnegie Mellon University	8.77
	New York University	20	27	WHU–Otto Beisheim School of Management	8.66
	North Carolina State University	20	28	North Carolina State University	8.41
29	Clarkson University	19	29	Purdue University	8.40
	Purdue University	19	30	University of Minnesota	8.33
	Tilburg University	19	31	Copenhagen Business School	8.26
32	Eindhoven University of Technology	18	32	Erasmus University Rotterdam	8.08
	Indiana University, Bloomington	18	33	Columbia University	7.99
	University of Groningen	18	34	Emory University	7.91
	University of Minnesota	18	35	Clarkson University	7.75
36	University of Maryland	17	36	University of California, Los Angeles	7.66
37	Copenhagen Business School	16	37	Dartmouth College	7.58
	Emory University	16	38	Texas Christian University	7.33
	McMaster University	16	39	Indiana University, Bloomington	7.32
	National University of Singapore	16	40	McMaster University	7.11
	Politecnico di Milano	16	41	York University	7.00
	WHU–Otto Beisheim School of Management	16	42	Babson College	6.92
43	Dartmouth College	15	43	Pennsylvania State University	6.77
	Pennsylvania State University	15	44	National University of Singapore	6.76
	University of California, Los Angeles	15	45	Rochester Institute of Technology	6.75
46	Bocconi University	14	46	Virginia Commonwealth University	6.50
	Nyenrode Business Universiteit	14	47	Vienna University of Economics and Business	6.39
	Texas Christian University	14	48	Chalmers University of Technology	6.32
	University of Southern California	14		Eindhoven University of Technology	6.32
	University of Twente	14	50	University of Maryland	6.31

**Table 4.** *Continued*

Second Tier				
51	Northwestern University	13	51 Tilburg University	6.18
	Rice University	13	52 Rice University	6.08
	University of Cincinnati	13	53 Bocconi University	5.90
	University of South Carolina	13	54 University of Groningen	5.82
55	Babson College	12	55 University of South Carolina	5.48
	Chalmers University of Technology	12	56 Northwestern University	5.24
	Cornell University	12	57 Loyola University Maryland	5.17
	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	12	58 Cornell University	5.15
	Stevens Institute of Technology	12	59 University of Illinois at Chicago	4.99
	University of Cambridge	12	60 Concordia University, Montreal	4.83
	University of Florida	12	61 Nyenrode Business Universiteit	4.78
	Vienna University of Economics and Business	12	62 Stevens Institute of Technology	4.67
63	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	11	63 Boston College	4.66
	Loyola University Maryland	11	64 University of Cincinnati	4.65
	University of Manchester	11	65 University of Virginia	4.61
	Virginia Commonwealth University	11	66 Simon Fraser University	4.58
67	Colorado State University	10	University of Florida	4.58
	Concordia University, Montreal	10	68 University of Melbourne	4.50
	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	10	69 University of Wisconsin-Madison	4.49
	Rochester Institute of Technology	10	70 University of Southern California	4.33
	Simon Fraser University	10	71 University of California, San Diego	4.23
	Southern Methodist University	10	72 Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	4.16
	University of California, San Diego	10	University of Cambridge	4.16
	University of Virginia	10	74 University of Texas at Dallas	4.08
	York University	10	75 University of Central Florida	4.00
76	University of California, Berkeley	9	76 Carleton University	3.99
	University of Illinois at Chicago	9	University of Twente	3.99
	University of Oklahoma	9	University of Western Ontario	3.99
	University of Pittsburgh	9	79 Hebrew University of Jerusalem	3.92
	University of Texas at Dallas	9	80 Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	3.91
	University of Wisconsin-Madison	9	81 ESSEC	3.83
	Washington University in St. Louis	9	82 Colorado State University	3.75
83	Boston College	8	83 Southern Methodist University	3.67
	Carleton University	8	University of New Hampshire	3.67
	Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	8	85 University of Pittsburgh	3.66
	University of Toledo	8	86 Hong Kong Polytechnic University	3.64
	University of Washington	8	87 University of Manchester	3.49
	University of Western Ontario	8	88 University of Houston	3.41
89	Technical University of Denmark	7	89 HEC Paris	3.33
	Florida State University	7	Washington University in St. Louis	3.33
	Santa Clara University	7	91 Vanderbilt University	3.32
	University of Houston	7	92 George Mason University	3.08
	University of Strathclyde	7	93 University of Washington	3.07
94	École Polytechnique de Montréal	6	94 Northern Illinois University	3.00
	ESSEC	6	San Francisco State University	3.00
	George Mason University	6	University of Oklahoma	3.00
	George Washington University	6	97 George Washington University	2.99
	HEC Paris	6	University of California, Berkeley	2.99
	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	6	99 Florida State University	2.83
	Northern Illinois University	6	Georgetown University	2.83
	Pace University	6	New Jersey Institute of Technology	2.83
	San Francisco State University	6		
	Tel Aviv University	6		
	Thunderbird School of Global Management	6		

**Table 4. Continued**

Tulane University	6
University of Arizona	6
University of British Columbia	6
University of Iowa	6
University of Memphis	6
University of New Hampshire	6

<sup>a</sup> This ranking is based on the aggregation of current faculty's all previous articles published in the 10 top journals between 1991 and 2010. The original university rather than universities where they hold visiting scholar position, and concurrent post was used as the scholar's current affiliation.

<sup>b</sup> Number of articles was computed following three steps: (1) All 1572 scholars' current affiliations were found; (2) Each scholar's number of articles was computed by giving full credit for each author of an article; and (3) The number of articles of each university was computed by summing up their current faculty's number of articles.

<sup>c</sup> Number of articles adjusted was computed following three steps: (1) All 1572 scholars' current affiliations were found; (2) Each scholar's adjusted number of articles was computed by equally dividing one point among the authors of an article; and (3) The adjusted number of articles of each university was computed by summing up their current faculty's adjusted number of articles.

The remaining universities appear to pursue two different strategies. Employing the strategy of “retaining productive scholars,” MSU, Northeastern, Temple, and Delft have done an excellent job in retaining top innovation management faculty for a long time. On the other hand, UMKC pursued a strategy of “attracting the best faculty using new strategic focus.” In line with Kansas City's entrepreneurial culture, UMKC created a strategic focus in entrepreneurship and innovation in 2004 and recruited Michael Song. It provided permanent university funding, secured private and foundation funding, recruited seven productive innovation scholars, and created a permanent academic Department of Global Entrepreneurship and Innovation in the Henry W. Bloch School of Management led by a new dean with entrepreneurship and innovation expertise. UMKC's success provides a model for universities aspiring to create and foster excellence in a particular discipline of academic excellence. Any of the three strategies highlighted above could be equally successful in creating research excellence and enhancing university reputation in research and knowledge creation.

## Conclusion

This paper collected research publication data from 10 top academic journals that published significant numbers of innovation management articles between 1991 and 2010. Based on the data, this paper provides a ranking for the world's top innovation management scholars and top 10 innovation management universities. This paper also identified product price and product technological sophistication as under-researched areas. Our ranking has several limitations. First, research publication in top academic journals is only one measure of individual or university prestige and quality. While many scholars from

highly prestigious universities are among the leading scholars included here, some scholars from other universities with strong academic reputations are not represented. There are two possible reasons for the exclusion. First, their innovation management research faculty is relatively small compared to other universities. Second, faculty in those universities may have focused on publishing books, preparing conference proceedings, or submitting to nontop academic journals. Another limitation is that this paper used a relatively simplistic, count-based approach. Citation impact and faculty size were not considered in this paper. Some scholars have used citation impact (e.g., Boyd, Finkelstein, and Gove, 2005; Peng and Zhou, 2006; Tahai and Meyer, 1999) and examined per capita publication to rank universities (e.g., Hix, 2004; Stahl et al., 1988).

## References

- Bakir, A., S. J. Vitell, and G. M. Rose. 2000. Publications in major marketing journals: An analysis of scholars and marketing departments. *Journal of Marketing Education* 22 (2): 97–107.
- Barman, S., M. D. Hanna, and R. L. Laforge. 2001. Perceived relevance and quality of POM journals: A decade later. *Journal of Operations Management* 19 (3): 367–85.
- Baumgartner, H., and R. Pieters. 2003. The structural influence of marketing journals: A citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time. *Journal of Marketing* 67 (2): 123–39.
- Boyd, B., S. Finkelstein, and S. Gove. 2005. How advanced is the strategy paradigm? The role of particularism and universalism in shaping research outcomes. *Strategic Management Journal* 26: 841–54.
- Brown, S. L., and K. M. Eisenhardt. 1995. Product development: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *Academy of Management Review* 20 (2): 343–78.
- Chan, K. C., H.-G. Fung, and W. K. Leung. 2006. International business research: Trends and school rankings. *International Marketing Review* 15 (4): 317–38.
- Chapple, M., N. Powers, and R. Bunch. 2003. *Beyond grey pinstripes 2003: Preparing MBAs for social and environmental stewardship*. Washington, DC: World Resource Institute.
- Chen, J., F. Damanpour, and R. R. Reilly. 2010. Understanding antecedents of new product development speed: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Operations Management* 28 (1): 17–33.

- Cheng, C. H., A. Kumar, J. G. Motwani, A. Reisman, and M. S. Madan. 1999. A citation analysis of the technology innovation management journals. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* 46 (1): 4–13.
- Clark, K. B., and T. Fujimoto. 1991. *Product development performance*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Crawford, C. M., and C. A. Di Benedetto. 2006. *New products management* (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Ford, J. B., M. S. LaTour, and T. L. Henthorne. 2001. Author and institution productivity in industrial marketing management 1971 to 1998. *Industrial Marketing Management* 30 (5): 441–52.
- Guo, L. 2008. Perspective: An analysis of 22 years of research in JPIM. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 25 (3): 249–60.
- Heck, J. L., and P. L. Cooley. 1988. Most frequent contributors to the finance literature. *Financial Management* 17 (3): 100–8.
- Henard, D. H., and D. M. Szymanski. 2001. Why some new products are more successful than others. *Journal of Marketing Research* 38 (3): 362–75.
- Hix, S. 2004. A global ranking of political science departments. *Political Studies Review* 2 (3): 293–313.
- Inkpen, A. C., and P. W. Beamish. 1994. An analysis of twenty-five years of research in the journal of international business studies. *Journal of International Business Studies* 25 (4): 703–13.
- Karniouchina, E. V., L. Victorino, and R. Verma. 2006. Product and service innovation: Ideas for future cross-disciplinary research. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 23 (3): 274–80.
- Linton, J. D. 2004. Perspective: Ranking business schools on the management of technology. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 21 (6): 416–30.
- Linton, J. D., and N. Thongpapanl. 2004. Perspective: Ranking the technology innovation management journals. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 21 (2): 123–39.
- Lu, J. W. 2003. The evolving contributions in international strategic management research. *Journal of International Management* 9 (2): 193–213.
- Montoya-Weiss, M. M., and J. R. Calantone. 1994. Determinants of new product performance: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 11 (5): 397–417.
- Morrison, A. J., and A. C. Inkpen. 1991. An analysis of significant contributions to the international business literature. *Journal of International Business Studies* 22 (1): 143–53.
- Page, A. L., and G. R. Schirr. 2008. Growth and development of a body of knowledge: 16 years of new product development research, 1989–2004. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 25 (3): 233–48.
- Peng, M. W., and J. Q. Zhou. 2006. Most cited articles and authors in global strategy research. *Journal of International Management* 12 (4): 490–508.
- Polonsky, M. J. 2008. Publishing on publishing: Streams in the literature. *European Business Review* 20: 401–20.
- Stahl, M. J., T. L. Leap, and Z. Z. Wei. 1988. Publication in leading management journals as a measure of institutional research productivity. *Academy of Management Journal* 31 (3): 707–20.
- Tahai, A., and M. J. Meyer. 1999. A revealed preference study of management journals' direct influences. *Strategic Management Journal* 20 (3): 279–96.
- Thieme, J. 2007. Perspective: The world's top innovation management scholars and their social capital. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 24 (3): 214–29.
- Young, S. T., B. C. Baird, and M. E. Pullman. 1996. POM research productivity in U.S. business schools. *Journal of Operations Management* 14 (1): 41–53.