Advances in Accounting, incorporating Advances in International Accounting 27 (2011) 10–16

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Advances in Accounting, incorporating Advances in International Accounting

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/adiac

A longitudinal study of the research productivity of graduates of accounting doctoral programs

James R. Hasselback [a,*], Alan Reinstein [b,1], Philip M.J. Reckers [c]

[a] Mary Ball Washington Eminent Scholar, College of Business, University of West Florida, Pensacola, FL 32514, United States
[b] Department of Accounting, School of Business Administration, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202, United States
[c] School of Accountancy, W. P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-3606, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Accepted 10 October 2010

Keywords:
Research productivity
Benchmarks
Citation indices
Recruiting

ABSTRACT

While the number of graduates from U.S. accounting doctoral programs has declined significantly since the early 1990s (thus producing a significant faculty shortage), many schools' research requirements to achieve promotion and tenure [P & T] have increased significantly—along with salary packages for new faculty. The purposes of the study reported here are to: (1) compare the research output of accounting doctoral graduates across time (1989–1993 period versus their 1999–2003 counterparts) to see if there is sufficiently enhanced output to justify today's higher entry level salaries; and (2) extract from productivity measures information relative to P & T decisions, thus providing benchmarks for promotion to associate and full professor. We examine research records for six and 12 years beyond graduation because these are frequently relevant to tenure and promotion decisions.

1. Introduction

Hasselback's *Accounting Faculty Directory 2010–2011* shows that U.S. accounting doctoral programs produced about 200 graduates annually from 1991 to 1994; but only about 110 annually from 2000 to 2003; and about 140 annually from 2004 to 2008. Many established programs today produce fewer doctoral program graduates than in the past (e.g., University of Florida, University of Illinois, University of Mississippi, and Michigan State University); and many other (mostly private) schools have ceased or suspended their doctoral programs altogether (e.g., American University, Cleveland State University, Rice University, St. Louis University, Tulane University, and Vanderbilt University). Fewer new programs (mostly non-major athletic conference schools) have emerged (e.g., Jackson State University, Morgan State University, University of Central Florida, University of South Florida, University of Texas at Dallas, and University of Texas at San Antonio). In addition, frequently doctoral students spend a longer time completing their degrees today than in the past. This greater investment of time in training arguably contributes to our growing faculty shortage.

Ironically, undergraduate accounting enrollment grew 12.3% between 1988 and 2004 while the number of doctoral degree-holding accounting faculty fell 13.3% (Leslie, 2008). Many schools experience significant faculty shortages currently; and trends imply even greater future shortages. Hunt, Eaton, and Reinstein (2009) cite several causal factors for these trends, including increased undergraduate student interest in the accounting profession, more rigorous AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) *Academically-Qualified* faculty accreditation requirements, and more schools seeking AACSB accounting accreditation.

These conditions have contributed to rising salaries for new faculty; but, salary compression among continuing accounting faculty in schools experiencing overall budgetary shortfalls. For example, the AACSB, 2009–10 U.S. Salary Report finds that new accounting doctoral faculty earn higher average salaries ($127,800) than do average assistant professors ($120,400), associate professors ($115,600) and not much less than full professors ($137,000). Many highly ranked doctoral programs also often offer salary packages including at least three years' spring/summer research support of two-ninths of base salaries, teaching loads of only three class sections per year (often only requiring one course preparation), database and student research assistance support, and other perks which often amount to over $200,000 of annual compensation. But, in return new faculty reportedly must publish more articles in the highest ranked (premier) accounting journals. Unfortunately, many programs find that relatively few new faculty can meet current research standards, requiring replacing expensive new faculty soon with even more expensive ones—all in a time of declining state appropriations and increased resistance to higher student tuition and increased class sizes.

Nelson (1983), Rebele, Stout, and Hassel (1991), Freeman, Jarvenpaa, and Wheeler (2000), and Carpenter and Robson (2004) warn of the

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 850 473 7100.
E-mail addresses: jhasselback@uwf.edu (J.R. Hasselback), a.reinstein@wayne.edu (A. Reinstein), Philip.reckers@asu.edu (P.M.J. Reckers).
[1] Tel.: +1 313 577 4584, +1 248 420 1522.

0882-6110/$ – see front matter © 2010 Published by Elsevier Ltd.
doi:10.1016/j.adiac.2010.10.002

many perils arising from accounting faculty salary compression, if not inversion of continuing faculty salaries, compared to newcomers' compensation; including but not limited to (a) lower general faculty morale and job satisfaction, (b) lower professional commitment, (c) an expensive churning of faculty, (d) declining willingness of faculty to engage in service activities, (e) increased class sizes, and (f) lower attention to student needs. Leslie (2008) cautions that the cumulative effect could cause increasing numbers of faculty members to leave the academe; this would exacerbate the accounting faculty shortage dilemma.

Questions thus arise as to whether today's expectations of new faculty are simply too great and whether actual productivities warrant the ever increasing salaries. "Have recent new additions to faculties amassed significantly better research records than their predecessors?" Goals of this report are to answer these questions and to help faculty, department administrators, deans, provosts, and others develop more valid benchmarks to measure accounting faculty research records for promotion, tenure, merit pay, and other resource allocation decisions. Thus, this study compares the research output (number of published articles) of all 1989–1993 U.S. accounting doctoral program graduates, across three quality categories of 38 journals, to their 1999–2003 counterparts. We compare both sets of research records for the year of graduation plus the next six years in order to measure that window of opportunity customarily afforded new faculty before the tenure decision. We also examine the 12-year research records of all 1993–1997 accounting doctoral holders' research records to help establish benchmarks for obtaining promotion to full professor.

2. Current study methodology

Based on prior research (Hasselback, Reinstein, & Schwan, 2000, 2003; Everett, Klamm, & Stoltzfus, 2004; Glover, Prawitt, & Wood, 2006; Barniv & Fetyko, 2007; Chan, Chan, Seow, & Tam, 2008; Englebrecht, Hanke, & Kuang, 2008; Matherly & Shortridge, 2009; Heck & Danielson, forthcoming; Pickerd et al., forthcoming), we developed three research journals ranking categories: (a) premier; (b) high level; and (c) other quality journals. Since most programs give full credit for coauthored works, we did not adjust for co-authorship. Per Exhibit 1, Category A contains five premier journals: *The Accounting Review* [TAR], the *Journal of Accounting Research* [JAR], the *Journal of Accounting and Economics* [JAE], *Accounting, Organizations & Society* [AOS] and *Contemporary Accounting Research* [CAR]. Category B (high level journals) adds the major American Accounting Association [AAA] section journals and other highly reputed outlets: *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory* [AJPT], the *Journal of the American Taxation* Association [JATA], *Behavioral Research in Accounting* [BRIA], the *Journal of Management Accounting Research* [JMAR], the *Review of Accounting Studies* [RAS], the *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy* [JAPP], and the *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance* [JAAF]. Category C includes 23 other quality academic, educational or professional accounting journals, including: the *National Tax Journal* [NTJ], *Accounting Horizons* [AH], *Journal of Information Systems* [JIS], *European Accounting Review* [EAR], *Advances in Accounting* and *Advances in International Accounting* [AIAA], the *Journal of Accountancy* [J of A], and *Issues in Accounting Education* [IAE].

To identify each faculty member's published journal articles, we created a database of journals, authors, and publication dates from each selected journal's tables of contents. Including all articles in the 38 journals through 2009, we resolved problems such as author name changes, author misspellings, use of initials rather than first names, and cases where authors shared the same name by checking the actual articles or author vitas.

Exhibit 1
Classification of journals examined.

A. Premier journals
1. The Accounting Review [TAR]
2. Journal of Accounting Research [JAR]
3. Journal of Accounting and Economics [JAE]
4. Accounting, Organizations and Society [AOS]
5. Contemporary Accounting Research [CAR]

B. High level academic journals
1. Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory [AJPT]
2. Journal of the American Taxation Association [JATA]
3. National Tax Journal [NTJ]
4. Behavioral Research in Accounting [BRIA]
5. Journal of Management Accounting Research [JMAR]
6. Accounting Horizons [AH]
7. Journal of Information Systems [JIS]
8. Review of Accounting Studies [RAS]
9. Journal of Accounting and Public Policy [JAPP]
10. Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance [JAAF]

C. Other high quality academic, educational or professional accounting journals
1. Journal of Business, Finance and Accounting [JBFA]
2. Journal of Taxation [JT]
3. Abacus [AB]
4. Accounting and Business Research [ABR]
5. Accounting and the Public Interest [API]
6. Advances in Accounting/Advances in International Accounting [AIA/AIIA]
7. Advances in Taxation [AIA]
8. Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research [AABR]
9. European Accounting Review [EAR]
10. The International Journal of Accounting [IJA]
11. Journal of Accounting Education [JAEd]
12. Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation [JIAAT]
13. Research in Accounting Regulation [RIAR]
14. Research in Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting [RIGNA]
15. Accounting Historians Journal [AHJ]
16. Critical Perspectives on Accounting [CPOA]
17. Journal of Accounting Literature [JAL]
18. Issues in Accounting Education [IAE]
19. Accounting Educators' Journal [AEJ]
20. Strategic Finance/Management Accounting [MA/SF]
21. The CPA Journal [CPAJ]
22. Journal of Accountancy [JOA]
23. Journal of International Accounting Research [JIAR]

2.1. Overall productivity — the classes of 1989–1993 versus the classes of 1999–2003

We compiled the number of articles written by individual faculty by the year that they earned their doctoral degree. Exhibit 2 lists all 1989–1993 accounting doctoral program graduates' research records for articles published in the three sets of journal classifications for their year of graduation, plus the next six years, as well as the related percentages. For example, eight (i.e., four percent) of all 201 of U.S. 1992 accounting doctoral graduates published two articles in Category A (premier) journals; four (2%) of 1992 graduates published three articles in Category A or Category B (high level) journals; and six (three percent) of 1992 graduates published five articles in Category A, Category B, or Category C (other quality) journals.

Similarly, Exhibit 3 lists all 1999–2003 accounting doctoral program graduates' research records for articles published in the three sets of journal classifications for their year of graduation, plus the next six years, as well as the related percentages. For example, seven (i.e., 6.1%) of all 114 of U.S. 2002 accounting doctoral graduates published two articles in Category A (premier) journals; six (5.3%) of the same year's graduates published four articles in Category A or Category B journals; and one (.9%) of such graduates published seven articles in Category A, B or C journals.

Exhibit 2
1989–1993 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus six more years.

No. of publications	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>9	Total no. of faculty members
	A = premier journals (TAR, JAR, JAE, AOS and CAR)											
Year												
1989	176	23	7	3	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	216
	81.5%	10.6%	3.2%	1.4%	1.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
1990	130	20	9	7	2	4	0	2	1	0	0	175
	74.3%	11.4%	5.1%	4.0%	1.1%	2.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	
1991	160	18	11	3	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	198
	80.8%	9.1%	5.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	
1992	165	16	8	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	201
	82.1%	8.0%	4.0%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	
1993	181	15	2	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	205
	88.3%	7.3%	1.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	B = A plus high level journals (AJPT, JATA, NTJ, BRIA, JMAR, AH, JIS, RAS, JAPP and JAAF)											
1989	137	35	24	6	6	5	1	1	0	1	0	216
	63.4%	16.2%	11.1%	2.8%	2.8%	2.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	
1990	99	33	17	9	3	4	5	2	2	1	0	175
	56.6%	18.9%	9.7%	5.1%	1.7%	2.3%	2.9%	1.1%	1.1%	0.6%	0.0%	
1991	132	30	15	8	9	2	1	0	0	1	0	198
	66.7%	15.2%	7.6%	4.0%	4.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	
1992	128	36	19	4	4	4	2	1	1	1	1	201
	63.7%	17.9%	9.5%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	
1993	145	30	17	5	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	205
	70.7%	14.6%	8.3%	2.4%	1.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	C = A + B + other quality journals (JBFE, Abacus, ABR, AIA/AIIA, AIT, EAR, IJA, JAEd, JIAAT, RIAR, RIGNA, CPOA, JAL, IAE, AEJ, MA/SF, CPAJ, JA, JT)											
1989	85	46	30	24	16	7	4	1	1	0	2	216
	39.4%	21.3%	13.9%	11.1%	7.4%	3.2%	1.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%	
1990	68	42	22	11	8	9	4	6	2	2	1	175
	38.9%	24.0%	12.6%	6.3%	4.6%	5.1%	2.3%	3.4%	1.1%	1.1%	0.6%	
1991	86	39	18	23	13	8	5	4	0	1	1	198
	43.4%	19.7%	9.1%	11.6%	6.6%	4.0%	2.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	
1992	88	42	24	14	13	6	7	2	3	1	1	201
	43.8%	20.9%	11.9%	7.0%	6.5%	3.0%	3.5%	1.0%	1.5%	0.5%	0.5%	
1993	102	49	19	15	8	5	1	3	2	0	1	205
	49.8%	23.9%	9.3%	7.3%	3.9%	2.4%	0.5%	1.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%	

	# Grads	Total articles			Average number of articles		
		Category A	Category B	Category C	Category A	Category B	Category C
1989	216	77	94	168	0.36	0.44	0.78
1990	175	109	86	112	0.62	0.49	0.64
1991	198	79	66	168	0.40	0.33	0.85
1992	201	89	80	145	0.44	0.40	0.72
1993	205	49	72	126	0.24	0.35	0.61
5-year avg.	199.0	80.6	79.6	143.8	0.41	0.40	0.72

Exhibit 2 also addresses (at the bottom of the exhibit) *the average annual* number articles that the 1989–1993 graduates wrote in the three categories of journals, plus the *five-year average*. For example, the 201 individuals graduating in 1992 wrote in total 89, 80, and 145 Categories A, B, and C articles for the six year period following graduation, or respectively .44, .40, and .72 articles per graduate. Similarly Exhibit 3, shows, for example, that the 114 individuals graduating in 2002 published in total 62, 53, and 67 articles respectively in Categories A, B, and C articles for the six year period following their graduation, or respectively .54, .46, and .59 articles per graduate for the six year period.

Overall, we see that the classes of 1999–2003 outperformed the classes of 1989–1993 as follows: average articles in Category A journals, .57 versus .41; average articles in Category B journals, .48 versus .40; and average articles in Category C journals, .57 versus .72. In Categories A and B, the classes of 1999–2003 outperformed the classes of 1989–1993. But, the question remains whether that modest increase is commensurate with the rapidly raising salaries.

2.2. Reasonable tenure benchmarks

Of equal, if not greater, interest is what constitutes a good, tenurable record after six years. Top schools report that they expect three or even four Category A publications for tenure. Exhibit 3 reports that only 4% of year 1999 graduates, 5.5% of year 2000 graduates, 2.4% of year 2001 graduates, 6.1% of year 2002 graduates and 5.9% of year 2003 graduates met expectations to publish 4 articles in Category A journals in the probationary period. If the standard is reduced to 3 articles in Category A journals, the respective figures only increase by 1.6% (1999), 4.7% (2000), 4.8% (2001), 1.8% (2002) and 4.8% (2003). Thus relevant questions include: "Can a profession that holds out standards that about 90%–95% of its graduates cannot meet hope to persist and succeed in the long run?" Also, "How many potential entrants to the academic profession are deterred by standards perceived by many as "unreasonable""? And, "Where are all the "failed" graduates to go?" Further, "Does the current system reap benefits commensurate to all the financial and human costs

Exhibit 3
1999–2003 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus six more years.

No. of publications	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>9	Total no. of faculty members
	A = premier journals (TAR, JAR, JAE, AOS and CAR)											
Year												
1999	101	9	12	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	129
	78.3%	7.0%	9.3%	1.6%	1.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	
2000	74	17	5	5	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	107
	69.2%	15.9%	4.7%	4.7%	0.9%	3.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2001	99	12	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
	79.2%	9.6%	4.0%	4.8%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2002	90	8	7	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	114
	78.9%	7.0%	6.1%	1.8%	3.5%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2003	75	14	5	5	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	105
	71.4%	13.3%	4.8%	4.8%	1.0%	1.0%	1.9%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	B = A plus high level journals (AJPT, JATA, NTJ, BRIA, JMAR, AH, JIS, RAS, JAPP and JAAF)											
1999	79	22	11	7	6	1	0	1	2	0	0	129
	61.2%	17.1%	8.5%	5.4%	4.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	
2000	57	18	12	7	5	2	4	2	0	0	0	107
	53.3%	16.8%	11.2%	6.5%	4.7%	1.9%	3.7%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2001	73	25	10	9	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	125
	58.4%	20.0%	8.0%	7.2%	3.2%	2.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2002	59	31	8	7	6	0	1	0	1	1	0	114
	51.8%	27.2%	7.0%	6.1%	5.3%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	
2003	63	13	11	10	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	107
	60.0%	12.4%	10.5%	9.5%	1.0%	1.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.9%	1.0%	1.9%	
	C = A + B + other quality journals (JBFE, JT, AB, ABR, API, AIA/AIIA, AIT, AABR, EAR, IJA, JAEd, JIAAT, RIAR, RIGNA, CPOA, JAL, IAE, AEJ, MA/SF, CPAJ, JOA, JIAR)											
1999	57	29	16	10	9	5	0	1	2	0	0	129
	44.2%	22.5%	12.4%	7.8%	7.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.8%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	
2000	44	18	16	9	9	4	4	3	0	0	0	107
	41.1%	16.8%	15.0%	8.4%	8.4%	3.7%	3.7%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2001	46	36	11	14	7	6	1	2	1	1	0	125
	36.8%	28.8%	8.8%	11.2%	5.6%	4.8%	0.8%	1.6%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	
2002	43	24	21	8	13	1	0	1	1	1	1	114
	37.7%	21.1%	18.4%	7.0%	11.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	
2003	44	21	10	11	5	3	2	3	1	1	4	105
	41.9%	20.0%	9.5%	10.5%	4.8%	2.9%	1.9%	2.9%	1.0%	1.0%	3.8%	

	# Grads	Total articles			Average number of articles		
		Category A	Category B	Category C	Category A	Category B	Category C
1999	129	67	50	58	0.52	0.39	0.45
2000	107	72	59	47	0.67	0.55	0.44
2001	125	52	57	86	0.42	0.46	0.69
2002	114	62	53	67	0.54	0.46	0.59
2003	105	75	58	70	0.71	0.55	0.67
5-year avg.	116	65.6	55.4	65.6	0.57	0.48	0.57

imposed?" Each school and each faculty must examine the figures in these tables and answer those questions, as they apply to their environment; and determine what are reasonable standards for their institution.

2.3. Reasonable standards for promotion to full professor

Exhibit 4 reports that only 3% of year 1993 graduates, 6.5% of year 1994 graduates, 7.8% of year 1995 graduates, 6.1% of year 1996 graduates and 6.5% of year 1997 graduates have published 5 or more articles in Category A journals in the twelve years since graduation. If the standard is relaxed to 5 articles or more in either Category A or B journals, 6.5% of year 1993 graduates, 14.2% of year 1994 graduates, 15.2% of year 1995 graduates, 12/8% of year 1996 graduates and 14.6% of year 1997 graduates meet the standard in the twelve years since graduation. Exhibit 5 next tracks research productivity over time by listing the 1999–2003 and 1989–1993 graduates' research productivity for the listed journals over the six years after they completed their doctoral degrees, plus the 1993–1997 graduates' records for the 12 years since they completed their degrees. The data shows that within six years of graduation 2.3% of year 1999 graduates, 4.7% of year 2000 graduates, no year 2001 graduates, 2.6% of year 2002 graduates, and 4.8% of year 2003 graduates published 5 or more articles in Category A journals. Relaxing the standard to 5 or more articles in either Category A or B journals, 3.1% of year 1999 graduates, 7.5% of year 2000 graduates, 3.2% of year 2001 graduates, 2.6% of year 2002 graduates and 8.6% of year 2003 graduates meet the standard in the six years since graduation. Also, in the 12 years after graduation, 3.4% of the 1993 graduates, 5.1% of the 1994 graduates, 7.6% the 1995 graduates, 6.1% of the 1996 graduates, and 6.9% of the 1997 graduates published 5 or more articles in Category A journals. Hopefully, this data will help faculty and school administrators to make informed decisions in future promotion and tenure decisions (Exhibit 5).

3. Limitations and extensions

As in all research productivity studies, this study has limitations. First, the summary data focuses on average output, and accordingly is

Exhibit 4
1993–1997 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus 12 more years.

No. of publications	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>9	Total no. of faculty members
	A = Premier Journals (TAR, JAR, JAE, AOS and CAR)											
Year												
1993	172	19	6	0	1	0	1	2	1	3	0	205
	83.9%	9.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%	0.5%	1.5%	0.0%	
1994	138	23	12	10	3	4	1	2	2	0	1	196
	70.4%	11.7%	6.1%	5.1%	1.5%	2.0%	0.5%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%	
1995	114	21	13	4	5	4	2	1	4	0	2	170
	67.1%	12.4%	7.6%	2.4%	2.9%	2.4%	1.2%	0.6%	2.4%	0.0%	1.2%	
1996	120	14	9	6	4	1	1	4	1	1	2	163
	73.6%	8.6%	5.5%	3.7%	2.5%	0.6%	0.6%	2.5%	0.6%	0.6%	1.2%	
1997	115	15	9	6	3	3	1	3	2	1	1	159
	72.3%	9.4%	5.7%	3.8%	1.9%	1.9%	0.6%	1.9%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	
	B = A plus high level journals (AJPT, JATA, NTJ, BRIA, JMAR, AH, JIS, RAS, JAPP and JAAF)											
1993	133	33	17	6	3	0	4	1	2	2	4	205
	64.9%	16.1%	8.3%	2.9%	1.5%	0.0%	2.0%	0.5%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	
1994	102	31	21	9	5	6	8	4	4	2	4	196
	52.0%	15.8%	10.7%	4.6%	2.6%	3.1%	4.1%	2.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	
1995	86	25	16	12	7	5	4	4	2	4	5	170
	50.6%	14.7%	9.4%	7.1%	4.1%	2.9%	2.4%	2.4%	1.2%	2.4%	2.9%	
1996	91	26	11	6	8	9	3	1	2	0	6	163
	55.8%	16.0%	6.7%	3.7%	4.9%	5.5%	1.8%	0.6%	1.2%	0.0%	3.7%	
1997	83	31	9	8	5	3	6	4	2	2	6	159
	52.2%	19.5%	5.7%	5.0%	3.1%	1.9%	3.8%	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	3.8%	
	C = A + B + other quality journals (JBFE, Abacus, ABR, AIA/AIIA, AIT, EAR, IJA, JAEd, JIAAT, RIAR, RIGNA, CPOA, JAL, IAE, AEJ, MA/SF, CPAJ, JA, JT)											
1993	89	36	21	15	17	4	2	7	4	4	6	205
	43.4%	17.6%	10.2%	7.3%	8.3%	2.0%	1.0%	3.4%	2.0%	2.0%	2.9%	
1994	60	28	28	22	8	10	9	9	3	6	13	196
	30.6%	14.3%	14.3%	11.2%	4.1%	5.1%	4.6%	4.6%	1.5%	3.1%	6.6%	
1995	58	24	14	14	10	9	9	8	4	5	15	170
	34.1%	14.1%	8.2%	8.2%	5.9%	5.3%	5.3%	4.7%	2.4%	2.9%	8.8%	
1996	61	28	15	9	6	12	10	5	5	1	11	163
	37.4%	17.2%	9.2%	5.5%	3.7%	7.4%	6.1%	3.1%	3.1%	0.6%	6.7%	
1997	48	28	16	13	11	2	12	6	4	7	12	159
	30.2%	17.6%	10.1%	8.2%	6.9%	1.3%	7.5%	3.8%	2.5%	4.4%	7.5%	

	# Grads	Total articles			Average number of articles		
		Category A	Category B	Category C	Category A	Category B	Category C
1993	205	90	120	215	0.44	0.59	1.05
1994	196	155	187	282	0.79	0.95	1.44
1995	170	172	138	238	1.01	0.81	1.40
1996	163	144	129	200	0.88	0.79	1.23
1997	159	140	134	243	0.88	0.84	1.53
5-year avg.	178.6	140.2	141.6	235.6	0.80	0.80	1.33

subject to the influence of both unusually "strong" and "weak" graduates. We attempted to compensate for this by providing distributional data in addition to averages. Next, we examined only 38 journals, (excluding notes and commentaries), which admittedly omits data from many other potential accounting faculty publication outlets. We also ignore the effects of co-authorship; and, thus our numbers may overstate productivity. We did not attempt to measure and contrast the "impact" of articles but inferred quality based on where the articles were published. We recognize, moreover, that various types of schools have distinct research missions and resources, and thus our examples apply to only a limited set of schools; but our data is more robust and can be variously aggregated and used by schools of all types.

4. Conclusions

Comparing the research productivity of accounting faculty graduating from US doctoral programs one decade apart, we find greater productivity associated with more recent graduates...but those modest increases hardly justify the much enhanced employment contracts offered recent graduates. While expectations of recent graduates are significantly higher, productivity is only modestly so, despite lower teaching loads and reduced service obligations.

Factual data also calls into question the "reasonableness" of tenure and promotion standards espoused by many faculty and institutions. Only about 5% of U.S. doctoral program graduates, for example, publish four articles or more in five premier journals during their probationary period. And only between 10% and 15% publish a total of 5 articles of more in fourteen top accounting journals in their first 12 years after graduation.

Our institutions today routinely deal with budget shortfalls and limited resources. Decisions relating to compensation packages to offer new faculty, relating to merit pay raises or bonuses, and relating to tenure and promotion decisions are thus immensely important to the financial well-being as well as the emotional well-being of our institutions and faculties, and in turn, our students. Data in this report hopefully will assist in better informed decisions.

Exhibit 5
Track research productivity over time.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>9		
Part I: 1999–2003 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus six more years													
1999	101	9	12	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	129	129
2000	74	17	5	5	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	107	107
2001	99	12	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	125
2002	90	8	7	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	114	114
2003	75	14	5	5	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	105	105
1999	79	22	11	7	6	1	0	1	2	0	0	129	129
2000	57	18	12	7	5	2	4	2	0	0	0	107	107
2001	73	25	10	9	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	125	125
2002	59	31	8	7	6	0	1	0	1	1	0	114	114
2003	63	13	11	10	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	107	105
1999	57	29	16	10	9	5	0	1	2	0	0	129	129
2000	44	18	16	9	9	4	4	3	0	0	0	107	107
2001	46	36	11	14	7	6	1	2	1	1	0	125	125
2002	43	24	21	8	13	1	0	1	1	1	1	114	114
2003	44	21	10	11	5	3	2	3	1	1	4	105	105

	# Grads	Total articles			Average number of articles		
		Category A	Category B	Category C	Category A	Category B	Category C
1999	129	67	50	58	0.52	0.39	0.45
2000	107	72	59	47	0.67	0.55	0.44
2001	125	52	57	86	0.42	0.46	0.69
2002	114	62	53	67	0.54	0.46	0.59
2003	105	75	58	70	0.71	0.55	0.67
5-year avg.	116	65.6	55.4	65.6	0.57	0.48	0.57

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>9		
Part II: 1989–1993 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus six more years													
1989	176	23	7	3	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	216	216
1990	130	20	9	7	2	4	0	2	1	0	0	175	175
1991	160	18	11	3	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	198	198
1992	165	16	8	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	201	201
1993	181	15	2	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	205	205
1989	137	35	24	6	6	5	1	1	0	1	0	216	216
1990	99	33	17	9	3	4	5	2	2	1	0	175	175
1991	132	30	15	8	9	2	1	0	0	1	0	198	198
1992	128	36	19	4	4	4	2	1	1	1	1	201	201
1993	145	30	17	5	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	205	205
1989	85	46	30	24	16	7	4	1	1	0	2	216	216
1990	68	42	22	11	8	9	4	6	2	2	1	175	175
1991	86	39	18	23	13	8	5	4	0	1	1	198	198
1992	88	42	24	14	13	6	7	2	3	1	1	201	201
1993	102	49	19	15	8	5	1	3	2	0	1	205	205

	# Grads	Total articles			Average number of articles		
		Category A	Category B	Category C	Category A	Category B	Category C
1989	216	77	94	168	0.36	0.44	0.78
1990	175	109	86	112	0.62	0.49	0.64
1991	198	79	66	168	0.40	0.33	0.85
1992	201	89	80	145	0.44	0.40	0.72
1993	205	49	72	126	0.24	0.35	0.61
5-year avg.	199.0	80.6	79.6	143.8	0.41	0.40	0.72

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>9		
Part III: 1993–1997 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus 12 more years													
1993	172	19	6	0	1	0	1	2	1	3	0	205	205
1994	138	23	12	10	3	4	1	2	2	0	1	196	196
1995	114	21	13	4	5	4	2	1	4	0	2	170	170
1996	120	14	9	6	4	1	1	4	1	1	2	163	163
1997	115	15	9	6	3	3	1	3	2	1	1	159	159
1993	133	33	17	6	3	0	4	1	2	2	4	205	205
1994	102	31	21	9	5	6	8	4	4	2	4	196	196
1995	86	25	16	12	7	5	4	4	2	4	5	170	170
1996	91	26	11	6	8	9	3	1	2	0	6	163	163
1997	83	31	9	8	5	3	6	4	2	2	6	159	159
1993	89	36	21	15	17	4	2	7	4	4	6	205	205
1994	60	28	28	22	8	10	9	9	3	6	13	196	196
1995	58	24	14	14	10	9	9	8	4	5	15	170	170
1996	61	28	15	9	6	12	10	5	5	1	11	163	163
1997	48	28	16	13	11	2	12	6	4	7	12	159	159

(continued on next page)

Exhibit 5 (*continued*)

	# Grads	Total articles			Average number of articles		
		Category A	Category B	Category C	Category A	Category B	Category C
Part III: 1993–1997 doctoral graduates research activities: year of graduation, plus 12 more years							
1993	205	90	120	215	0.44	0.59	1.05
1994	196	155	187	282	0.79	0.95	1.44
1995	170	172	138	238	1.01	0.81	1.40
1996	163	144	129	200	0.88	0.79	1.23
1997	159	140	134	243	0.88	0.84	1.53
5-year avg.	178.6	140.2	141.6	235.6	0.80	0.80	1.33

References

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) (2010). *Accreditation standards*. St. Louis, Missouri: AACSB.

AACSB. 2009–2010 U.S. Salary Survey Report. http://www.aacsb.edu/datadirect/samples/salary-survey-exec-summary-09-10.pdf.

Barniv, R., & Fetyko, D. (2007). Perceived quality of accounting journals. *Journal of Business Issues*, 1–27.

Carpenter, C. G., & Robson, G. S. (2004). Declining doctoral output in accounting. *The CPA Journal*, *74*(8), 68–69.

Chan, K. C., Chan, K. C., Seow, G. S., & Tam, K. (2008). Ranking accounting journals using dissertation citation analysis: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *34*, 875–885.

Englebrecht, T. D., Hanke, S. A., & Kuang, Y. (2008). An assessment of co-authorship within premier journals for U.S. and international accountants: Evidence from 1979–2004. *Advances in Accounting*, *24*, 172–181.

Everett, T. O., Klamm, B., & Stoltzfus, R. (2004). Developing benchmarks for evaluating publication records at doctoral programs in accounting. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *22*(3), 229–252.

Freeman, L. A., Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Wheeler, B. C. (2000). The supply and demand of information systems doctorates: Past, present, and future. *MIS Quarterly*, *24*(3), 355–380.

Glover, S. M., Prawitt, D., & Wood, D. A. (2006). Publication records of faculty promoted at the top 75 accounting research programs. *Issues in Accounting Education*, *21*(3), 195–218.

Hasselback, J. R. (2011). *Accounting Faculty Directory 2010–2011*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hasselback, J. R., Reinstein, A., & Schwan, E. S. (2000). Benchmarks for evaluating the research productivity of accounting faculty. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *18*, 79–97.

Hasselback, J. R., Reinstein, A., & Schwan, E. S. (2003). Prolific authors of accounting literature. *Advances in Accounting*, *20*, 95–125.

Heck, J. L., & Danielson, M. (forthcoming). Giving credit where credit is due: Summary analysis 299 of the most prolific authors in 15 high-impact journals. Advances in Accounting.

Hunt, S. C., Eaton, T. V., & Reinstein, A. (2009). Accounting faculty job search in a seller's market. *Issues in Accounting Education*, *24*(2), 157–185.

Leslie, D. W. (2008). Accounting faculty in US colleges and universities: Status and trends: 1993–2004.*American Accounting Association* (February 19, 2008).

Matherly, M., & Shortridge, R. T. (2009). A pragmatic model to estimate journal quality in accounting. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *27*(1), 14–29.

Nelson, T. A. (1983). Accounting for education's coming crisis. *Journal of Accountancy*, *155*(3), 70–80.

Pickerd, J., S.L. Summers, N. Stephens, G., and D.A. Wood. forthcoming. Individual accounting faculty research rankings by topical area and methodology. Accounting Horizons (forthcoming).

Rebele, J. E., Stout, D. E., & Hassel, J. M. (1991). A review of empirical research in accounting education: 1985–1991. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *9*(2), 167–231.