

**PUBLICATION RECORDS OF FACULTY PROMOTED AT THE TOP 75
ACCOUNTING RESEARCH PROGRAMS**

Steven M. Glover
Mary and Ellis Professor
School of Accountancy
Marriott School of Management
Brigham Young University

Douglas F. Prawitt
Glen Ardis Professor
Marriott School of Management
Brigham Young University

David A. Wood
Doctoral Student
Kelley School of Business
Indiana University

March 2006, Forthcoming in *Issues in Accounting Education*

We are grateful for comments from the editor, associate editor, two anonymous reviewers, participants at the 2004 Brigham Young University Accounting Research Symposium and the 2005 American Accounting Association Annual Meeting, Ted Christensen, Peter Johnson, Robert Libby, Brian Spilker, Earl K. Stice, and Kevin Stocks. We thank the PricewaterhouseCoopers Foundation and the Accounting Development Fund at Brigham Young University for financial support. We would especially like to thank the professors who provided their publication records and other relevant information for use in the study.

PUBLICATION RECORDS OF FACULTY PROMOTED AT THE TOP 75 ACCOUNTING RESEARCH PROGRAMS

ABSTRACT: This paper presents a descriptive analysis of the publication records of faculty promoted from 1995 to 2003 at the top 75 accounting research programs (as ranked by Trieschmann, et al. 2000). The presentation and analyses of these data are designed to be useful to faculty and evaluation committees from a benchmarking and decision-making perspective. From a benchmarking perspective, the results will be useful in helping schools as they develop or refine relevant policies and research expectations. The results may be particularly useful in view of the fact that average accounting faculty publication records differ from the average publication records of faculty in other disciplines. We present results in different ways to help faculty and evaluation committees understand faculty publication records at the time accounting faculty are promoted to associate and full professor at various sets, or portfolios, of universities. Not surprisingly, the results indicate significant differences in publication records across the accounting programs included in the study. While differences are expected given the varied missions and emphases of different schools, we believe the data will be useful to policy makers, evaluation committees, and faculty as they set standards, evaluate performance, and plan scholarship activities in conjunction with other expected activities, such as teaching and service.

KEY WORDS: Accounting Faculty Publications, Promotion Decisions, Benchmarking Publications, and Promotion and Tenure

INTRODUCTION

In December 2000, the American Council on Education (ACE), American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and United Educators of Insurance Risk Retention Group (UE) released a report providing practical suggestions for improving the process of granting tenure (ACE, AAUP, and UE 2000). Three of the major themes of the report are:

- Clarity in standards and procedures for tenure evaluation.
- Consistency in tenure decisions.
- Candor in the evaluation of tenure-track faculty.

The report suggests that development of policies to clearly communicate promotion and tenure criteria to tenure-track faculty would provide important benefits, including a reduced incidence of lawsuits regarding tenure decisions (ACE, AAUP, and UE 2000).

This study provides descriptive data relevant for developing or benchmarking an important promotion and tenure criterion for accounting faculty—published scholarship. Among the three principal factors involved in promotion and tenure decisions at business schools (i.e., research, teaching, and service), publishing research is the most important factor for research-oriented schools and it is equal in importance to teaching at many teaching-oriented schools (Cargile and Bublitz 1986; Street and Baril 1994).¹ However, there is a limited amount of current, relevant publication data that can be used by faculty and administrators to plan and evaluate research productivity and to set research criteria. Previous studies examining faculty research productivity do not present a clear picture of the publication records of successful candidates at the time of promotion because these previous studies had other objectives. This paper provides recent, relevant publication data of accounting faculty promoted from 1995 to 2003 at the top 75 research-oriented accounting programs. Our sample includes approximately

20 percent of all faculty promotions at all four-year institutions with accounting programs in the U.S. during this time period.² By documenting the publication records of faculty at the time of promotion, the data presented in this study should be helpful to faculty members and administrators at the top 75 accounting research programs, as well as other schools with similar scholarship targets, in setting goals, in establishing criteria, and in evaluating performance.

This study was motivated primarily by the experience of two of the authors serving on college evaluation committees and interacting with others in similar capacities. We learned two important lessons that are relevant in motivating this study. First, because accounting scholars have relatively fewer publication outlets and publications than colleagues in other business disciplines (e.g., see Swanson 2004; Buchheit et al. 2002), the promotion packets of accounting faculty with strong publication records are often challenged by colleagues from other business-school disciplines in terms of quantity of publications. Second, while information on publication expectations at peer and other institutions is typically a critical factor in committee deliberations, the available data on peer institution publication rates are largely anecdotal and unreliable. Thus, much of the evaluation discussion often centers on disputes over relevant criteria rather than on the merits of the candidate under examination.

While we recognize that research is only one of the important factors considered for promotion decisions, we believe this study will contribute to the quality and consistency of tenure and promotion discussions and decisions by making available descriptive data on the publication records of successful candidates. This paper provides recent, relevant data that will be useful to faculty and administrators at schools in our study as well as some not included because (1) some schools not included in our study may have research expectations similar to the schools included in our study, and (2) our data presentation allows for flexibility in adjusting for

individual circumstances (e.g., outstanding teaching) and institution-specific missions and objectives.

Several prior studies have reported publication rates of accounting faculty for various purposes such as describing the breadth of journals in which accounting faculty publish or determining if promotion standards have changed over time (e.g., Christensen et al. 2002; Hasselback et al. 2000; Zivney et al. 1995; Englebrecht et al. 1994; Hagerman and Hagerman 1989; and Campbell and Morgan 1987). Our study extends these studies in terms of the ability to benchmark research productivity at promotion points in three ways: focus, timeliness and completeness.

Focus

The focus of this paper is to provide useful benchmarking data so accounting faculty and administrators can determine relevant publication criteria or standards for promotion and tenure decisions at their schools. Many prior studies provide individual professor publication rankings, institutional rankings, or examinations of numbers of pages published in top journals; however, their rankings are not sharply focused on publication criteria or standards for promotion and tenure decisions. Two studies that are useful in providing benchmarking data are Hasselback et al. (2000) and Zivney et al. (1995), which provide data for virtually the entire accounting publishing population. Our study provides an incremental contribution over these studies in terms of focus in at least three ways: (1) our data reflect the publication records only of faculty who were successfully promoted, while both of the studies cited above considered the entire accounting faculty population and thus do not distinguish between those who were promoted and those who were not; (2) we organize and report our data by university “portfolios” (i.e., schools ranked 1-15 in research productivity form a portfolio) of universities and faculty with similar

research expectations to enable direct comparisons with sets of peer schools and to reduce the effects of outliers; (3) we report disaggregated publication records by journal categories typically considered important to promotion and tenure committees so that decision makers can more specifically determine the type and quantity of publications of promoted faculty. By focusing on publication records of successful candidates from a number of different perspectives, our study provides information directly relevant for benchmarking and for providing useful information for promotion and tenure decision makers.³

To improve the flexibility and usefulness of the data set, we analyze and present results from a number of different perspectives. We present faculty publication rates at the time of promotion by year for the years leading up to promotion, and by journal.

Timeliness

Prior research has shown that publication requirements have changed over time (Swanson 2004; Buchheit et al. 2002; Read et al. 1998; Milne and Vent 1989) suggesting current information is important. Our data provide recent, relevant information by compiling the publication records of faculty receiving promotion to associate professor (156 promotions) and to full professor (85 promotions) at the top 75 accounting research-oriented universities in the U.S. from 1995 through 2003.

Completeness

We start with the set of all accounting professors who have the rank of associate or full professor at the top 75 research-oriented universities and then apply additional criteria described below (e.g., received promotion during our study period) in an attempt to capture all accounting professors who received a rank advancement during our time window. To compile a complete publication record for each professor, we follow methodology similar to that used by Gomez-

Mejia and Balkin (1992), gathering information directly from the curriculum vitae of professors where possible rather than relying solely on existing databases. By compiling data obtained directly from curriculum vitae, we identify all publications for the majority of professors included in the study rather than being limited to the articles included in existing databases, which do not cover the entire range of publications outlets used by accounting academics.⁴ In most cases, we are also able to capture the year that faculty members were promoted rather than using a proxy for year of promotion.

Defining Possible Proxies for Minimum Research Expectation within University Portfolios

We offer a few words of caution for those using the data in this study to plan, evaluate, or establish criteria for faculty publication expectations. Our methodology captures only successful promotion and tenure candidates within our study period. While each professor in the study was granted promotion, we do not believe it would be appropriate to use the *weakest* publication record within each university portfolio as a proxy for the minimum research expectation for that set of schools because these promotions likely represent exceptional cases. Some candidates may have been promoted in spite of their publication records based on unusual potential and/or exceptional performance in other areas. Likewise, we do not believe the *overall mean* publication record within a particular ranked portfolio of universities is an appropriate proxy for the minimum research expectation for promotion decisions within that portfolio; such an approach would imply that about half of the *successfully promoted* applicants actually had unacceptable levels of research.

While there is no single “right” benchmark, we suggest that a more reasonable proxy for a university portfolio’s minimum research expectation is somewhere between the portfolio’s minimum and its overall mean. For this reason, we partition our data into terciles and suggest

that decision makers consider publication levels around the mean of the lower tercile as a reasonable proxy for the minimum research expectation within a university portfolio. We suggest this proxy primarily to draw attention away from the minimum, maximum, and overall mean publication rates in estimating minimum research expectation of faculty within the schools comprising a portfolio. While we believe the suggested proxy is reasonable for the “typical” minimum research expectation within each portfolio, the actual minimum acceptable research expectations are unknown and likely depend on a variety of factors, including teaching quality and department politics (Cargile and Bublitz 1986, Street and Baril 1994). While we suggest the reader consider the mean of the lower tercile in each portfolio as a reasonable starting point for a minimum research expectation, the data are presented in a format that is flexible enough for readers to determine other possible proxies.

In the next section, we explain the methodology used to collect and analyze the data and describe the sample of professors included in the study. The following section discusses the results. The final section describes limitations of our study, areas for future research, and conclusions.

METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

This section describes (1) the universities we include in the study and the basis for inclusion, (2) the characteristics that qualify accounting faculty members for inclusion in the study, (3) the data-collection method and the processes we use to ensure we capture complete publication records for professors in the defined sample period, and (4) how publications are ranked and grouped for reporting purposes.

Accounting Program Selection

Accounting program rankings come from the website associated with Trieschmann et

al.'s (2000) study.⁵ The Trieschmann et al. (2000) study ranked *accounting programs* by considering the total number of pages published in 20 “top-tier” business research journals (including the Top 3 accounting journals considered in this study), weighted by the number of faculty at a given school, over the 13-year period from 1986 to 1998. The universities and their rankings are presented in Exhibit 1. The Trieschmann et al. (2000) study did not include the names of the 64th and 70th ranked accounting programs so we could not include these universities in our analysis.⁶ Included in our sample of the top 75 research school are 62 of the 92 accounting doctoral granting institutions in the United States. Thus, our results are particularly suited for decision makers at doctoral granting institutions.

[Insert Exhibit 1 about here]

By focusing on schools that publish the most in top-tier journals, our results document what can be viewed as the “top performance” in publication productivity. Schools that are not included in our study can adjust their benchmarking in terms of publication criteria in accordance with their school’s mission and the various constraints they may face. Grouping schools by their publication productivity divides the data into portfolios of universities that are relatively homogeneous in terms of research missions.⁷

Accounting Professor Selection

To identify professors to include in the study, we began with Hasselback’s *2003-2004 Accounting Faculty Directory*. We captured all accounting professors at the top 75 research-oriented universities who graduated with a Ph.D. in 1982 or later, listed teaching/research interests that include traditional accounting topics (to enhance homogeneity of the data set we excluded professors with interests listed solely as systems or law), and had achieved the rank of associate or full professor. In addition, we searched each school’s webpage to identify any

professor listed there who met these criteria, which captured an additional 30 professors. These procedures resulted in a total of 298 accounting professors for potential inclusion in the study.⁸

Three separate e-mailings were sent to faculty included in the professor population. Of the original 298 professors, we received a response or were able to locate a current vita online for 203 professors (68 percent). Of the 203 professors for whom we were able to obtain a current vita, 12 were removed from the study because they earned promotion before 1995, two were removed because they were hired by a top 75 accounting school after earning promotion and tenure at a non-top 75 university, and 14 were removed because they were promoted outside two standard deviations from the overall mean years to promotion, leaving a total of 175 professors in this group. For faculty promoted to associate professor, this filter excludes associate professors who were promoted more than 9 years after graduation. For faculty promoted to full professor, this filter excludes professors who were promoted more than 15 years after graduation.⁹ Of the 95 professors for whom we could not locate a vita, 41 were not included because they did not receive a promotion between the 1995-2003 year range and 17 were not included because we could not identify the school where they received their first promotion. We gathered publication records for the remaining 37 non-responders (using procedures described below) for a total sample of 212 professors (175 with a vita plus 37 non-responders).

The results are based on 156 professors promoted to associate during our time window and 85 professors promoted to full (27 professors received advancements to both associate and full within the defined time window). Two assistant professors applied for and received rank advancement to associate simultaneously at two schools. Because the simultaneous promotions can be seen as providing useful data for both schools, we include the publication record for these

two faculty members at both schools.¹⁰ In sum, the final sample of 212 professors results in a total of 241 promotions during our study period.

On average, professors included in the study took 6.29 (std. dev. = 1.2, median = 6.0) and 11.78 (std. dev. = 1.65, median = 12.0) years to achieve rank advancements to associate and to full, respectively.¹¹ The associate rank advancement date is used as a proxy for the tenure promotion decision. Of the 156 faculty promoted to associate in our sample, 70 provided us with both a promotion date to associate and a tenure promotion date. Of the 70 responses, 54 (77 percent) indicated that the date of their promotion to associate was the same as their tenure date, while 14 professors received tenure within four years after their promotion to associate.¹² Thus, our benchmarking data will be most useful for universities that typically grant promotion and tenure simultaneously to candidates in year six or seven of employment.

Publication Completeness

For the data to provide information useful for decision making, they must provide a complete picture of the publication records of the professors in the study. By directly requesting vitae, we capture all publications that professors had through the year of their promotion (to the extent the vitae are complete). For the 37 professors who failed to respond to our direct requests, but who qualified for inclusion in our study, we reconstructed their publication records by conducting online searches, using the ProQuest and EBSCO database services. In addition, we searched for professor publications using the professor's university website, Amazon.com, a general Internet search using Google.com, and a limited manual record search.¹³ We tested the efficacy of this search methodology on a random sample of 10 percent of the professors for whom we had a curriculum vita and found that the our search methodology captured 100 percent

of publications in the Top 25 accounting journals and the Top 40 business journals and 51.6 percent of all other publications.¹⁴

In order to include the 37 non-respondents in our study we had to estimate a promotion date. The average promotion time for professors who responded in our sample was 6.29 and 11.78 years for promotion to associate and to full, respectively. Thus, we used 7 years for promotion to associate and 12 years for promotion to full as estimated promotion dates for non-respondents. We tested these estimates by comparing the publication totals of the non-respondents to the publication totals of the respondents within a university ranking portfolio. With few exceptions, we found no statistically significant differences (using a p-value cut-off of 0.10) between non-respondents' average publications and respondents' average publications.¹⁵

For both non-respondents and respondents, we had to determine the appropriate cut-off date for including publications in the professors' records at promotion. Based on discussions with respondents, it appears that most universities require a packet to be submitted for promotion at or near the beginning of the fall semester prior to the decision year and then announce the decision the following spring or summer. The data in this study include work published through the notification year (the year after the promotion packet was submitted) in an attempt to capture publications that were counted as accepted or published in the professor's promotion packet but not yet printed; however, this approach might slightly overstate publication totals if articles that were published in the year of notification were not included as being "accepted for publication" in the promotion packet. This approach seems reasonable considering the typical time between manuscript acceptance and journal publication.¹⁶

Journal Categorization

Categorizing journals for reporting purposes is important because promotion and tenure committees typically consider the relative strength of journals when making promotion decisions, and journals differ in perceived quality. In accounting there seems to be relatively strong consensus regarding the set of top-tier journals. The journal list and groupings used in this study are presented in Exhibit 2. To group journals, we relied on survey results performed by Fetyko and BarNiv (2001) and on the 2004 *Financial Times* Business School Journal Rankings.¹⁷ Fetyko and BarNiv (2001) surveyed members of the American Accounting Association and their results are consistent with an averaging of four previous accounting journal-ranking studies (Hasselback and Reinstein 1995; Brown and Huefner 1994; Smith 1994; and Hull and Wright 1990).¹⁸ The top journal rankings are also consistent with recent studies on cross-discipline publication productivity (e.g., Swanson 2004). We made one deviation from the empirical journal rankings by categorizing *Review of Accounting Studies* as a Top 6 journal rather than a Top 15 journal, because at the time of the Fetyko and BarNiv (2001) survey, the *Review of Accounting Studies* was a relatively new journal. Based on our discussions with professors at a number of top-ranked universities and new empirical work (Brown 2003) we believe the journal is now generally considered to be one of the Top 6 accounting journals.

[Insert Exhibit 2 about here]

We grouped the journals as follows. The top three accounting journals and the top business journals in other disciplines (e.g., *Journal of Finance*) are all treated as top-tier publications and are labeled Top 3 and Through Top Business, respectively. The additional three journals in the Through Top 6 category represent journals that are considered similar in quality and impact to those in the Top 3 category at some schools and somewhat lower quality and

impact at other schools. The additional accounting journals in the Through Top 15 and Through Top 25 categories represent journals of high quality that are weighted differently by different schools depending on the school's mission and strategy. We provide both disaggregated and cumulative data by journal group so that decision makers can adapt the reported results to their own weighting systems.

RESULTS

We present our results in three different ways: grouped by university portfolios, publications per year after earning a Ph.D., and publications per journal.¹⁹ Results are presented in tabular form in the paper.²⁰

University Ranking and Performance Portfolios

Tables 1 and 2 present the minimum, maximum, and tercile average publications for faculty promoted to associate professor and faculty promoted to full professor, respectively. Each university portfolio (e.g., schools 1-15) is based on the ranking listed in Exhibit 1. The professors within each university portfolio were ranked in descending order, first by publications in the "Through Top Business" category, followed by "Through Top 6" and so forth, through the "All" category.²¹ Each university portfolio was then divided into three equal groups and the arithmetic mean taken for each tercile. This approach gives the approximate mean publication productivity at the 16.5th, 50th, and 83.5th percentiles.²²

As noted earlier, while the minimum publication totals reflect records of faculty members who earned promotion, the minimum performance levels likely involved exceptional circumstances (e.g., exceptional potential, exceptional performance in non-research areas, etc.). We suggest that a more reasonable starting point in estimating the unknown minimum research

expectation is the mean of the lower tercile (i.e., the average of the lower third of the successful professors in each university ranking portfolio, or the 16.5th percentile).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The means of each publication portfolio within the tercile groupings are reported (rather than the publication record of an individual professor at a certain percentile) in view of the variance in publication records. Because individual records can vary greatly in terms of the mix of publication outlets, we believe individual records are not as useful for benchmarking as the average of several professors in a meaningful grouping.

Table 1 shows that the mean of the lower tercile for faculty promoted to associate professor in the Through Top Business publication category is 2.3, 1.4, 0.8, 0.2, and 0.0 publications for portfolios 1-15 to 61-75 respectively.²³ Although faculty promoted to associate at the top schools published more articles in highly-ranked journals, the most-inclusive All Publication category shows the opposite trend with 5.6, 6.4, 6.4, 7.3, and 8.1 publications for university portfolios 1-15 to 61-75, respectively. These results are consistent with anecdotal evidence suggesting that faculty promoted to associate professor at top-ranked research schools focus their efforts on publishing in academic journals considered of higher quality, rather than publishing a greater number of articles in professional or other less highly-ranked academic journals.

A similar trend in publications by faculty promoted to full professor can be seen in Table 2. The mean publications of the lower tercile in the Through Top Business category for university portfolios 1-15 to 61-75 are 5.3, 2.0, 2.2, 0.6, and 0.0. In The All Publication category the means are 18.7, 18.0, 23.4, 31.0, and 26.0 respectively. These results indicate that faculty promoted to full remain active in academic research beyond the promotion to associate. Further,

faculty promoted to full at lower-ranked universities published a greater number and variety of publications than faculty promoted to full at higher-ranked schools suggesting a compensating model, trading off quantity of articles with journal quality.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Publications by Year

Table 3 provides mean publications accumulated by year after Ph.D. for faculty promoted to associate professor while Table 4 provides mean publications accumulated by year after Ph.D. for faculty promoted to full. This time-line information is useful for universities with different time requirements for promotions, for interim performance reviews (e.g., 3rd year review), and for professors benchmarking their progress as they advance toward promotion.²⁴

[Insert Table 3 and Table 4 about here]

The data in Tables 1 through 4 suggest that the majority of the faculty in our study had at least one publication in the Through Top Business category (which includes the Top 3 accounting journals and the Top 40 business journals). In fact, we find that over 80 percent of the faculty included in our study had at least one publication in the Through Top Business category. Over 60 percent of the faculty in our sample published at least two articles in the Through Top Business category by the time they were promoted to associate professor.

Prior research performed by Hasselback et al. (2000) suggests that professors who publish one article in any of the Top 3 journals or the *Journal of Finance* in the first seven years after Ph.D. school are among the top 10 percent of the 3,289 accounting faculty they sampled. One important difference between that study and ours is that our sample includes only professors actually promoted at the top 75 accounting programs, whereas the Hasselback et al. (2000) sample includes essentially all accounting faculty in the United States without differentiating by

school affiliation or promotion status. Another source of variation between the Hasselback et al. (2000) results and those reported in this study are differences in the definitions of “top journals.” Hasselback et al. (2000) include only four journals—the Top 3 accounting journals and the *Journal of Finance*. When we use Hasselback et al.’s definition, we find that 76.3 percent of the professors promoted to associate professor in our sample had published at least one article in the Top 3 accounting journals or in the *Journal of Finance*, and 46.8 percent of these professors had published at least two articles in these top journals. The differences between our findings and those of Hasselback et al. (2000) are consistent with Swanson et al.’s (2006) conclusion that publication in top academic accounting journals is heavily concentrated in the highly ranked research universities.

At the time of promotion to full professor, every professor in the study had published at least one article in a journal ranked in the Through Top 15 journal category (which includes the Top 15 accounting journals and the Top 40 business journals) and only about 5 percent of the faculty promoted to full professor in the study lacked a publication in the Through Top Business category at the time of promotion to full. More than 15 percent of the faculty promoted to full professor had published 10 or more articles in the Through Top Business category and almost 30 percent had published 10 or more articles in the Through Top 6 category (which includes the Top 6 accounting journals and the Top 40 business journals) at the time of promotion to full.²⁵

Publications by Journal

Table 5 shows the number of articles published by the professors in this study, by journal, at the time of promotion. The table includes all journals from Exhibit 2 that had more than 3 total publications from the professors in our study. Panel A shows a cumulative total of publications

by journal for faculty promoted to associate professor since their Ph.D. grant date; Panel B shows similar information for faculty promoted to full professor.

The data in Table 5 indicate that of the Top 3 accounting journals, *The Accounting Review (TAR)* published more articles from professors promoted outside of the top 30 schools than the other two journals. This result is consistent with the fact that *TAR* serves a broader constituency as an American Accounting Association publication, and thus likely is open to a broader spectrum of topical areas. This result is also consistent with the findings reported in Swanson et al. (2006), which show that association-sponsored journals publish articles from a broader set of authors than university-sponsored journals, which tend to publish a disproportionate concentration of articles by faculty at private schools.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

The next three highest-ranked accounting journals as defined by prior studies, *Accounting Organizations and Society (AOS)*, *Contemporary Accounting Research (CAR)*, and *Review of Accounting Studies (RAS)* show interesting results. At the time of promotion to associate, no professors in the top 30 schools had published in *AOS*, whereas several professors in the top 30 schools had published in this journal for promotion to full professor. Assistant professors in our sample were apparently less likely to target journals outside the Top 3 than were associate professors. This pattern of results could suggest changes in preferred outlets over time. *RAS* has a surprisingly high number of publications for professors at the top 30 universities considering that the journal was initiated in 1996. This suggests that *RAS* is considered a top publication outlet by the top research schools, providing further support for its inclusion in the Through Top 6 journal category. Authors in all university portfolios had published more in *CAR* than in the other two journals (*AOS* or *RAS*) at the time of promotion to both associate and full.

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This paper presents publication data useful for faculty and administrators in planning, evaluating, and determining criteria for publication performance. The data collection and presentation approach of this study represent an important contribution relative to previous publication studies because the publication data are relevant, timely, and complete, and are focused sharply on professors achieving promotion at the 75 top research-oriented accounting programs between 1995 and 2003.

We report data that decision makers can use in developing or evaluating research expectations for promotion decisions. Future researchers could attempt to develop a better measure for the minimum acceptable publication rate within various university portfolios by not only examining professors who achieved a promotion, but also separately examining those professors who were denied a promotion. We are aware that some schools have relatively explicit guidance on research thresholds. Future studies might seek to consider various schools' policies (written and implied), though such studies would not capture the extent to which schools' decisions actually reflect their policies.

The limitations of this research present opportunities for future research. Some of the inputs to this study are based on work performed in prior studies (e.g., journal rankings, accounting program rankings, etc.). This study's results are dependent to some extent on the validity of this prior work. We attempt to mitigate this possible limitation by presenting results in multiple ways and by aggregating our results into school ranking portfolios and journal groups. By pooling schools and journals into portfolios, we lessen the overall impact of a school or journal that is not "correctly" ranked. Another limitation is that our study focuses on the top 75 accounting programs, as defined by prior research. Our sample of universities includes 68

percent of all U.S. accounting doctoral granting institutions and the faculty promotions included in our study represent nearly 20 percent of all promotions at four-year universities with accounting programs during the 1995 to 2003 time period; however, the universities and faculty included in our study are not representative of all four-year universities. Despite this limitation, we believe the data will be of interest to a large number of faculty and universities with scholarship missions similar to those of the universities included in our study. Future research could expand the number of universities studied.

REFERENCES

- American Council on Education (ACE), American Association of University Professors (AAUP), United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group (UE), 2000. Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenure Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators. Available at: <http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/tenure-evaluation.pdf>.
- Bonner, S.E., J.W. Hesford, W.A. Van der Stede, S. M. Young, 2006. The most influential journals in academic accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, forthcoming.
- Brown, L.D. 2003. Ranking journals using social science research network downloads. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, (May): 291-307.
- Brown, L.D. and R.J. Huefner, 1994. The familiarity with and perceived quality of accounting journals: Views of senior accounting faculty in leading U.S. MBA programs. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, (Summer): 223-250.
- Buchheit, S., D. Collins, and A. Reitenga, 2002. A cross-discipline comparison of top-tier academic journal publication rates: 1997-1999. *Journal of Accounting Education*: 123-130.
- Campbell, D.R. and R.G. Morgan, 1987. Publication activity of promoted accounting faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Spring): 28-43.
- Cargile, B.R. and B. Bublitz, 1986. Factors contributing to published research by accounting faculties. *The Accounting Review*, (January): 158-178.
- Christensen, A.L., C.A. Finger, and C.K. Latham, 2002. New accounting scholars' publications in accounting and nonaccounting journals. *Issues in Accounting Education*, (August): 233-251.
- Englebrecht, T.D., G.S. Iyer, and D.M. Patterson, 1994. An empirical investigation of the publication productivity of promoted accounting faculty. *Accounting Horizons* (March): 45-68.
- Fetyko, D. and R. BarNiv, 2001. From unpublished working paper, Kent State University.
- Financial Times. 2004. MBA rankings [online]. Available on World Wide Web: (<http://news.ft.com/management/mba>)
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R. and D.B. Balkin, 1992. Determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal* (December): 921-955.
- Hagerman, R.L. and C.M. Hagerman, 1989. Research promotion standards at selected accounting programs. *Issues in Accounting Education*, (Fall): 265-279.

- Hasselback, J.R. 2004. Accounting faculty directory (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall).
- Hasselback, J.R. and A. Reinstein, 1995. A proposal for measuring scholarly productivity of accounting faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education*, (Fall): 269-306.
- Hasselback, J.R., A. Reinstein, and E.S. Schwan, 2000. Benchmarks for evaluating the research productivity of accounting faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Fall): 269-306.
- Hull, R.P. and G.B. Wright, 1990. Faculty perceptions of journal quality: An update. *Accounting Horizons* (March): 77-98.
- Milne, R.A. and G.A. Vent, 1989. Publication productivity: A comparison of accounting faculty members promoted in 1981 and 1984. *Issues in Accounting Education*, (Fall): 94-102.
- Read, W.J., D.V. Rama, and K. Raghunandan, 1998. Are publication requirements for accounting faculty promotions still increasing? *Issues in Accounting Education*, (May): 327-339.
- Smith, L.M. 1994. Relative contributions of professional journals in the field of accounting. *The Accounting Educators' Journal*, (Spring): 1-31.
- Street, D.L. and C.P. Baril, 1994. Scholarly accomplishments in promotion and tenure decisions of accounting faculty. *Journal of Accounting Education*, (Spring): 121-139.
- Swanson, E.P. 2004. Publishing in the majors: A comparison of accounting, finance, management, and marketing. *Contemporary Accounting Research* (Spring): 223-253.
- Swanson, E.P., C.J. Wolfe, and A. Zardkoohi. 2006. Concentration in the Major Business Journals: Evidence and Consequences for Accounting, Finance, Management, and marketing. *Working Paper*, Texas A&M University.
- Trieschmann, J.S., A.R. Dennis, G.B. Northcraft, and A.W. Niemi, 2000. Serving multiple constituencies in the business school: MBA program versus research performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, (December): 1130-1141.
- Zivney, T.L., W.J. Bertin, and T.A. Gavin. 1995. A comprehensive examination of accounting faculty publishing. *Issues in Accounting Education*, (Spring): 1-25.

EXHIBIT 1
ACCOUNTING PROGRAM RANKINGS

Rank	University
1	Pennsylvania
2	Michigan
3	Chicago
4	Stanford
5	Washington – Seattle
6	Rochester
7	Northwestern
8	UNC - Chapel Hill
9	Iowa
10	Columbia
11	California – Berkeley
12	Cornell
13	Texas – Austin
14	Southern California
15	Washington - St. Louis
16	Harvard
17	Florida
18	Arizona
19	Duke
20	New York University
21	Illinois
22	Minnesota
23	California - Los Angeles
24	Colorado – Boulder
25	Carnegie Mellon
26	Ohio State
27	Yale
28	Arizona State
29	CUNY-Baruch College
30	Penn State
31	Georgia
32	Emory
33	Wisconsin – Madison
34	Indiana
35	Michigan State
36	Notre Dame*
37	Massachusetts Inst Tech
38	Florida State

Rank	University
39	Texas Christian*
40	Purdue
41	SUNY- Buffalo
42	California-Davis*
43	Missouri - Columbia
44	Connecticut
45	Tulane
46	Rutgers - Newark
47	Pittsburgh
48	Southern Methodist*
49	Oklahoma
50	Texas A & M
51	Oregon
52	Houston
53	Boston College*
54	Georgetown*
55	Santa Clara University
56	Temple
57	Brigham Young University*
58	North Carolina State*
59	Syracuse
60	Vanderbilt
61	Boston University
62	Alabama Tuscaloosa
63	Massachusetts
64	<i>Not included in TDNN (2000)</i>
65	Northeastern*
66	Louisiana State
67	Maryland - College Park
68	Georgia State
69	Illinois-Chicago*
70	<i>Not included in TDNN (2000)</i>
71	Kansas
72	Dartmouth*
73	Utah
74	South Carolina
75	Texas – Arlington

* Non-doctoral granting institution.

Rankings are based on accounting program rankings by Trieschmann, et al. (2000). For information on how the ranking was formulated, see <http://www.kelley.indiana.edu/ardennis/rankings/>.

EXHIBIT 2

JOURNAL CATEGORY BREAKDOWN

Top 3 Accounting Journals

- Journal of Accounting and Economics
- Journal of Accounting Research
- The Accounting Review

Through Top Business Journals (*includes Top 3*)

- Academy of Management Executive
- Academy of Management Journal
- Academy of Management Review
- Administrative Science Quarterly
- California Management Review
- Econometrica
- Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice
- Harvard Business Review
- Human Resource Management
- Information Systems Research
- International Journal of Human Resource Management
- Journal of Applied Psychology
- Journal of Business Venturing
- Journal of Consumer Research
- Journal of Finance
- Journal of Financial Economics
- Journal of International Business Studies
- Journal of Marketing
- Journal of Marketing Research
- Journal of Operations Management
- Journal of Political Economy
- Journal of Small Business Management
- Journal of the American Statistical Association
- Long Range Planning
- Management International Review
- Management Science
- MIS Quarterly
- Operations Research
- Organization Science
- Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes

- Review of Financial Studies
- Sloan Management Journal
- The American Economic Review
- The Journal of Business Ethics
- The Rand Journal

Through Top 6 Accounting Journals (*includes Through Top Business*)

- Accounting Organizations and Society
- Contemporary Accounting Research
- Review of Accounting Studies

Through Top 15 Accounting Journals (*includes Through Top 6*)

- Accounting Horizons
- Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory
- Behavioral Research in Accounting
- Journal of Accounting and Public Policy
- Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance
- Journal of Accounting Literature
- Journal of Business Finance and Accounting
- Journal of the American Taxation Association
- National Tax Journal

Through Top 25 Accounting Journals (*includes Through Top 15*)

- Abacus
- Accounting and Business Research
- Advances in Accounting
- Advances in Taxation
- Issues in Accounting Education
- Journal of Accounting Education
- Journal of Information Systems
- Journal of Management Accounting Research
- Research in Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting
- Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting

All Other Publications

- Includes all other journals, books, monographs, and article reviews. Excludes committee publications and conference proceedings.

This listing was derived from 2004 Financial Times Top 40 Business School Journals and survey results of Fetyko and BarNiv (2001).

**TABLE 1
PUBLICATIONS BY UNIVERSITY RANKING PORTFOLIOS FOR FACULTY
PROMOTED TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

			Publications*					
	# of Prof	Minimum Terciles Maximum	Top 3	Through Top Business	Through Top 6	Through Top 15	Through Top 25	All
Schools 1-15	1	Overall minimum	0	1	2	2	2	2
	11	Lower tercile mean	1.9	2.3	2.6	4.0	4.4	5.6
	12	Middle tercile mean	3.9	4.7	5.8	6.5	6.7	8.9
	11	Upper tercile mean	6.2	6.9	7.6	9	9	10.8
	1	Overall maximum	10	12	13	13	13	18
Schools 16-30	1	Overall minimum	1	1	1	1	1	4
	10	Lower tercile mean	1.0	1.4	1.7	3.9	4.1	6.4
	10	Middle tercile mean	2.6	3.0	3.8	4.5	4.5	11.2
	10	Upper tercile mean	4.2	5.4	6.0	6.9	7.2	9.3
	1	Overall maximum	5	7	7	8	8	8
Schools 31-45	1	Overall minimum	0	0	0	0	0	4
	8	Lower tercile mean	0.6	0.8	1.1	2.0	2.5	6.4
	9	Middle tercile mean	2.4	2.7	3.0	4.3	4.9	8.0
	8	Upper tercile mean	2.9	3.8	4.5	5.9	6.8	11.0
	1	Overall maximum	3	4	6	7	10	12
Schools 46-60	1	Overall minimum	0	0	0	0	0	7
	15	Lower tercile mean	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.4	1.7	7.3
	15	Middle tercile mean	1.1	1.3	2.0	3.8	4.5	8.9
	15	Upper tercile mean	2.2	2.7	3.1	4.8	5.1	8.0
	1	Overall maximum	4	5	5	6	6	6
Schools 61-75	1	Overall minimum	0	0	0	0	1	3
	7	Lower tercile mean	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.6	2.1	8.1
	8	Middle tercile mean	0.6	0.6	1.5	3.0	3.8	10.1
	7	Upper tercile mean	2.1	2.4	3.0	3.7	4.0	7.3
	1	Overall maximum	4	6	6	6	6	6

Professors inside each university ranking portfolio of 15 schools (See Exhibit 1 for university rankings) were ranked in descending order by number of publications in the “Through Top Business” category, followed by the totals in the “Through Top 6” category, and so forth to the “All” category (See Exhibit 2 for journal rankings). The first and last professor publication totals resulting from the ordering are listed under minimum and maximum. The ranking portfolio was then divided into three equal groups (0 to 33 percent, 34 to 66 percent, and 67 to 100 percent) and the average computed for each of these terciles is reported.

*Publication totals are cumulative through columns (i.e., Through Top 6 includes Top 3 and Through Top Business).

TABLE 2
PUBLICATIONS BY UNIVERSITY RANKING PORTFOLIOS FOR FACULTY
PROMOTED TO FULL PROFESSOR

			Publications*					
	# of Prof	Minimum Tercile Maximum	Top 3	Through Top Business	Through Top 6	Through Top 15	Through Top 25	All
Schools 1-15	1	Overall minimum	3	3	3	10	12	16
	11	Lower tercile mean	4.5	5.3	7.0	10.8	12.6	18.7
	11	Middle tercile mean	6.7	8.3	9.7	11.1	11.1	14.4
	11	Upper tercile mean	9.2	12.5	14.4	15.6	15.6	20.2
	1	Overall maximum	16	16	21	24	24	46
Schools 16-30	1	Overall minimum	1	1	1	7	7	12
	4	Lower tercile mean	1.0	2.0	3.5	6.3	6.8	18.0
	5	Middle tercile mean	3.0	5.2	5.6	8.4	9.2	14.6
	4	Upper tercile mean	7.8	9.8	11.8	13.0	13.8	20.8
	1	Overall maximum	9	12	15	17	17	27
Schools 31-45	1	Overall minimum	1	2	2	8	15	36
	5	Lower tercile mean	1.6	2.2	2.6	8.4	10.4	23.4
	6	Middle tercile mean	3.8	4.2	5.2	7.2	8.3	14.3
	5	Upper tercile mean	5.4	6.2	7.4	10.6	11.6	16.6
	1	Overall maximum	6	7	7	9	9	10
Schools 46-60	1	Overall minimum	0	0	0	1	3	33
	5	Lower tercile mean	0.4	0.6	0.8	4.8	8.4	31.0
	6	Middle tercile mean	1.8	1.8	2.3	4.2	6.0	13.8
	5	Upper tercile mean	4.6	5.8	6.4	8.6	9.2	14.6
	1	Overall maximum	8	11	11	13	14	15
Schools 61-75	1	Overall minimum	0	0	0	1	3	19
	2	Lower tercile mean	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	26.0
	3	Middle tercile mean	0.7	0.7	1.7	4.3	8.0	24.3
	2	Upper tercile mean	4.5	7.0	7.0	7.5	7.5	13.0
	1	Overall maximum	9	11	11	11	11	11

Professors inside each university ranking portfolio of 15 schools (See Exhibit 1 for university rankings) were ranked in descending order by number of publications in the “Through Top Business” category, followed by the totals in the “Through Top 6” category, and so forth to the “All” category (See Exhibit 2 for journal rankings). The first and last professor publication totals resulting from the ordering are listed under minimum and maximum. The ranking portfolio was then divided into three equal groups (0 to 33 percent, 34 to 66 percent, and 67 to 100 percent) and the average computed for each of these terciles is reported.

*Publication totals are cumulative through columns (i.e., Through Top 6 includes Top 3 and Through Top Business).

TABLE 3
AVERAGE ACCUMULATED PUBLICATIONS BY YEAR FOR
FACULTY PROMOTED TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

		Years since Ph.D. Grant Date					
Category*		2 Years Overall Mean	3 Years Overall Mean	4 Years Overall Mean	5 Years Overall Mean	6 Years Overall Mean	7 Years Overall Mean
Schools 1-15	Top 3	0.9	1.6	2.5	4.0	5.2	7.0
	Top Bus	1.0	1.8	2.9	4.6	5.9	8.1
	Top 6	1.1	2.1	3.3	5.4	6.9	10.0
	Top 15	1.3	2.5	4.0	6.5	8.3	11.8
	Top 25	1.3	2.5	4.1	6.7	8.5	12.0
	All	1.8	3.1	5.1	8.4	10.9	15.1
Schools 16-30	Top 3	0.6	1.0	1.6	2.3	2.6	3.4
	Top Bus	0.7	1.3	1.9	2.8	3.1	4.2
	Top 6	0.8	1.3	2.1	3.2	3.7	5.1
	Top 15	0.9	1.7	2.7	4.2	4.9	6.8
	Top 25	0.9	1.8	2.7	4.3	5.1	7.1
	All	2.0	3.2	4.9	7.2	8.5	12.1
Schools 31-45	Top 3	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.4
	Top Bus	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.6	2.1	2.9
	Top 6	0.4	0.9	1.4	1.8	2.5	3.5
	Top 15	0.6	1.2	1.9	2.6	3.6	5.1
	Top 25	0.6	1.3	2.0	2.9	4.0	5.9
	All	1.5	2.6	3.9	5.6	7.3	10.1
Schools 46-60	Top 3	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.5
	Top Bus	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.8
	Top 6	0.4	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.7	2.3
	Top 15	0.7	1.2	1.8	2.3	3.1	4.3
	Top 25	0.8	1.3	2.0	2.6	3.5	4.8
	All	2.2	3.2	4.5	5.7	7.7	10.4
Schools 61-75	Top 3	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.2
	Top Bus	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.3
	Top 6	0.1	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.9
	Top 15	0.4	0.6	1.4	2.0	2.6	3.7
	Top 25	0.5	0.9	1.7	2.4	3.1	4.4
	All	1.3	2.5	4.0	6.1	8.2	11.9

To determine the average accumulated publication per year, we first determined the total the number of articles published each year after graduation for each ranking portfolio of 15 schools and then divided this amount by the total number of professors in each ranking portfolio of 15. Once an assistant professor in the study was promoted to associate (say in year 5) they were not counted in subsequent year computations (year 6 and year 7). We exclude the columns before two years after graduation. See Exhibit 1 for university rankings and Exhibit 2 for journal rankings and categories.

*Publication totals are cumulative through columns (i.e., Top 6 includes Top 3 and Top Bus).

TABLE 4
AVERAGE ACCUMULATED PUBLICATIONS BY YEAR FOR
FACULTY PROMOTED TO FULL PROFESSOR

Category*		Years since Ph.D. Grant Date											
		2 Years Overall Mean	3 Years Overall Mean	4 Years Overall Mean	5 Years Overall Mean	6 Years Overall Mean	7 Years Overall Mean	8 Years Overall Mean	9 Years Overall Mean	10 Years Overall Mean	11 Years Overall Mean	12 Years Overall Mean	13 Years Overall Mean
Schools 1-15	Top 3	1.3	1.9	2.7	3.6	4.3	4.8	5.2	5.8	6.6	7.1	8.2	9.8
	Top Bus	1.5	2.4	3.4	4.5	5.4	6.1	6.5	7.3	8.2	9.2	10.5	12.9
	Top 6	1.5	2.5	3.5	4.7	5.8	6.8	7.5	8.5	9.7	11.0	12.6	15.7
	Top 15	1.6	2.7	4.1	5.6	7.0	8.1	9.0	10.2	11.7	13.3	15.1	19.1
	Top 25	1.6	2.8	4.4	5.9	7.3	8.5	9.4	10.7	12.1	13.9	15.8	19.9
	All	2.3	3.8	5.6	7.6	9.4	11.1	12.4	14.1	16.0	18.5	21.5	27.4
Schools 16-30	Top 3	0.4	0.6	1.2	1.5	2.3	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.7	3.7	4.0	5.5
	Top Bus	0.5	0.8	1.5	1.9	2.8	3.5	3.8	4.4	5.1	5.3	5.9	8.4
	Top 6	0.5	0.9	1.8	2.5	3.5	4.3	4.7	5.5	6.2	6.6	7.4	9.9
	Top 15	0.7	1.5	2.6	3.5	4.7	5.7	6.6	7.4	8.3	8.7	9.9	13.4
	Top 25	0.7	1.5	2.8	3.8	4.9	6.0	7.0	7.8	8.8	9.3	10.8	14.3
	All	1.3	2.3	4.3	6.0	8.5	10.1	11.8	13.1	15.0	16.3	18.9	28.4
Schools 31-45	Top 3	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.8	2.0	2.4	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.6	4.1
	Top Bus	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.7	2.1	2.3	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.6	4.2	4.9
	Top 6	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.8	2.3	2.7	3.2	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.9	5.7
	Top 15	1.0	1.4	1.9	2.6	3.5	4.4	5.2	6.1	6.5	7.4	8.2	9.9
	Top 25	1.2	1.6	2.3	2.9	4.1	5.1	6.0	7.2	7.6	8.7	9.7	11.5
	All	2.3	3.1	4.1	5.4	7.3	8.8	10.5	12.1	12.9	14.5	16.4	19.7
Schools 46-60	Top 3	0.5	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.8
	Top Bus	0.5	0.9	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.8	3.3
	Top 6	0.5	0.9	1.3	1.5	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.3	4.3
	Top 15	0.8	1.3	1.6	2.3	3.1	3.7	4.3	4.8	5.3	5.7	6.1	8.1
	Top 25	1.0	1.9	2.4	3.4	4.4	5.0	5.8	6.6	7.3	7.7	8.1	11.1
	All	2.9	4.5	6.2	8.5	10.8	12.1	13.4	15.3	17.1	18.9	20.7	26.7
Schools 61-75	Top 3	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.8
	Top Bus	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.5
	Top 6	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.7	3.0	3.0
	Top 15	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.7	2.1	2.3	2.9	3.1	3.6	4.0	4.8	5.8
	Top 25	0.7	1.3	1.7	2.3	3.4	3.6	4.4	5.0	5.4	6.1	6.9	8.9
	All	2.6	4.6	6.0	8.1	10.3	12.4	14.9	16.4	17.9	19.9	22.6	31.6

To determine the average accumulated publication per year, we first determined the total the number of articles published each year after graduation for each ranking portfolio of 15 schools and then divided this amount by the total number of professors in each ranking portfolio of 15. Once an associate professor was promoted to full (say in year 11) he or she was not counted in subsequent year computations (year 12 and year 13). We exclude the columns before two years after graduation. See Exhibit 1 for university rankings and Exhibit 2 for journal rankings and categories.

*Publication totals are cumulative through columns (i.e., Top 6 includes Top 3 and Top Bus).

TABLE 5
PUBLICATION TOTALS BY JOURNAL

Panel A: Faculty Promoted to Associate Professor

Publication Name	Schools 1-15 n = 34	Schools 16-30 n = 30	Schools 31-45 n = 25	Schools 46-60 n = 45	Schools 61-75 n = 22	Publication Totals*
Accounting and Business Research				2	2	4
Accounting Horizons	5	1	3	9	2	20
Accounting Organizations and Society			3	4	4	11
Advances in Accounting	2	1	2	1	1	7
Advances in Taxation				4		4
Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory	7	7	6	15	5	40
Behavioral Research in Accounting	1	3	2	8	8	22
Contemporary Accounting Research	15	12	6	12	6	51
Issues in Accounting Education		2	5	4	6	17
Journal of Accounting and Economics	36	28	13	8	3	88
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy	2	4	2	6	1	15
Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance	3	8	9	7	2	29
Journal of Accounting Education	1	1		3	1	6
Journal of Accounting Literature	1	1		1	2	5
Journal of Accounting Research	59	21	12	18	9	119
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	2	2	2	1	1	8
Journal of Finance	7	6		3	1	17
Journal of Financial Economics	8	3	1	1	1	14
Journal of Information Systems		1	2	1		4
Journal of Management Accounting Research	3		5	3	1	12
Journal of the American Taxation Association	13	8	5	21	6	53
Management Science	1	4		2		7
National Tax Journal	6	4	1	1		12
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	4	6	5	4		19
Review of Accounting Studies	9	5	3	1	2	20
The Accounting Review	41	29	25	25	8	128

TABLE 5 – Continued

Panel B: Faculty Promoted to Full Professor**

Publication Name	Schools 1-15 n = 33	Schools 16-30 n = 13	Schools 31-45 n = 16	Schools 46-60 n = 16	Schools 61-75 n = 7	Publication Totals*
Accounting and Business Research				3	1	4
Accounting Horizons	14	3	5	9	2	33
Accounting Organizations and Society	8	3	3	1	1	16
Advances in Accounting	1		5	6	4	16
Advances in Taxation	5		5	2		12
Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory	16	4	14	7	2	43
Behavioral Research in Accounting	1		5	4		10
Contemporary Accounting Research	37	11	9	5	1	63
Issues in Accounting Education	7	6	4	8	3	28
Journal of Accounting and Economics	70	15	18	2	5	110
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy	6	4	9	6	1	26
Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance	8	11	13	6	1	39
Journal of Accounting Education			3	9	2	14
Journal of Accounting Literature	4	1	2	2	1	10
Journal of Accounting Research	79	19	12	11	3	124
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	1	1	2	1	3	8
Journal of Finance	16	1	2	2	1	22
Journal of Financial Economics	16	5			1	22
Journal of Management Accounting Research	7	1	2	2	1	13
Journal of the American Taxation Association	14	4	6	6	1	31
Management Science	4	9	2	3		18
National Tax Journal	7	2	1	1		11
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	9	2	1			12
Research in Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting			1	1	4	6
Review of Accounting Studies	11	2	2	1	1	17
Review of Financial Studies	6	1		1		8
The Accounting Review	75	16	28	23	3	145
The Rand Journal	5					5

All publications published during the year of advancement or earlier were summed by school portfolios of 15 (see school rankings in Exhibit 1).

*Only the top 25 accounting journals and 40 top business journals that have more than 3 total publications are included in this table (see journal rankings in Exhibit 2).

** Publications since Ph.D. grant date.

¹ Of note, Cargile and Bublitz (1986) found that publishing research is the most important criterion for promotion, tenure, and salary increases by 1.5 to 2 times the next closest factor, teaching, and that, overall, faculty perceive publishing research to account for approximately 50 percent of the total promotion decision. Their results were similar for schools with an emphasis in research and schools with an emphasis in teaching. For teaching-focused schools, Street and Baril (1994) found that research and teaching were equally important.

² We calculated this percentage by counting the number of associate professors and full professors in *Hasselback's 2003-2004 Accounting Faculty Directory* for all 4-year institutions. We considered an associate professor as promoted to associate in our time period if the professor was listed as an associate professor and graduated after 1989 or if they were listed as a full professor and graduated after 1989 (and were not listed as solely interested in law or systems). We considered a full professor as promoted to full in our time period if the professor was listed as a full professor and graduated after 1984 (and were not listed as solely interested in law or systems). We then divided the promotions included in this study by our estimated overall promotion total.

³ Hasselback et al. (2000) provides comparisons of 4, 12, 22, and 40 top business journals. Zivney et al. (1995) provides comparisons of 66 business journals and of 26 accounting and finance journals. We report separate data on the top 3, 6, 15, and 25 accounting journals as well as the top 40 business journals and we compile a statistic for the quantity of publications in all sources. We also provide an analysis of the quantity of articles published in the top accounting and business journals by individual journal.

⁴ Our data enable us to determine whether accounting databases often used in this type of descriptive research accurately capture all the publications of accounting professors. As explained in more detail later in the paper, we find that the databases we examined captured 100 percent of the top 25 publications (as defined in this paper) for a sample of professors in our study; however, the databases captured only about 50 percent of publications not found in top 25 journals.

⁵ In-depth information about how Trieschmann et al. (2000) ranked universities can be found at <http://www.kelley.indiana.edu/ardennis/rankings/>. The ranking by accounting discipline is used for our study.

⁶ The missing data were caused by Trieschmann et al.'s validation process. To be included in the top 75 accounting programs, a school had to also be included in the top 100 research business schools. Schools outside the 100 research schools occupied the 64th and 70th positions for accounting programs and were thus excluded from the study.

⁷ From conversations with professors at these schools, we found that there is a general agreement that schools within university ranking portfolios have similar research goals. Readers who disagree with the ranking can use the data to set criteria and evaluate performance based on the portfolio to which they believe their school should be compared.

⁸ Professors who earned a promotion at a top 75 program during our study window, but who were no longer at a top 75 program at the time we gathered data are not included in this study.

⁹ We exclude these professors because their promotions occurred outside the typical time frame (often due to employment at multiple universities) and thus their publication records may not be indicative of typical publication records that will be more useful for benchmarking purposes.

¹⁰ In all other cases, we only included rank advancements for professors at the first school they received an advancement.

¹¹ School ranking portfolios differed significantly in the amount of time before advancement to associate professor (ANOVA p-value < 0.001). We analyzed all pair-wise comparisons using Tukey's HSD procedure and found that Schools 1-15 required significantly less time than Schools 16-30 (p-value = 0.006), Schools 46-60 (0.004), and Schools 61-75 (0.051). All other comparisons were not significantly different (p-values > 0.85). On average, Schools 1-15 required 5.59 years to be promoted to associate professor. School ranking portfolios differed significantly in the amount of time before advancement to full professor (ANOVA p-value < 0.001), but an analysis using Tukey's HSD procedure of all pair-wise comparisons did not reveal any individually significant differences (all p-values > 0.10).

¹² Some of these candidates indicated that they did not receive tenure at the same time because they received rank advancement during a transfer and that it was a school formality to wait one year to grant tenure, while professors at two schools indicated that tenure was given with the full rank advancement rather than associate rank advancement.

¹³ In our sample testing we found that a professor who was a fourth author on an *Accounting Horizons* article was not listed as an author on EBSCO and ProQuest databases. We manually examined the table of contents of all *Accounting Horizons* from 1987 to 2003 and did not find this problem for any other authors. In addition, we manually compiled articles published in the *Review of Accounting Studies* because publications in this journal were not all captured in the electronic databases.

¹⁴ Accounting professors in our database published in more than 470 different journals, making a complete reconstruction impractical. Therefore, the column labeled "All" in our charts is not entirely complete, although a two-tailed *t*-test revealed no statistically significant differences in publication records ($p > .10$) between respondents and non-respondents. Since promotion decisions are typically weighted more heavily toward higher ranked

academic publications, we are satisfied that our data represent reliable information for the higher ranked academic journals, and reasonably reliable information for the others.

¹⁵ For associates we found a significant difference between respondents and nonrespondents in university ranking portfolios 31-45 and 61-75. The significance was caused by one nonrespondent in each portfolio who had fewer publications in the Top 15 journals; neither professor had published in journals ranked in the Through Top 15 category. For full professors, significant differences were found in ranking portfolios for schools 1-15 and schools 46-60. The significant results in both cases were due to the fact that the highest performing professor in each portfolio did not respond. It appears that the overall publication records included in our sample are reasonably accurate.

¹⁶ Note that the effect of such articles would be at least partially offset by articles published after the year of promotion that were listed as “accepted for publication” but not yet in print in the candidates’ promotion packets.

¹⁷ The *Financial Times* considers a basket of top-tier business journals to rank professors’ research strength across all disciplines at MBA programs. The list of journals is not published in *Financial Times*; however, the *Financial Times* provides the journal list upon request.

¹⁸ Also see Bonner et al., 2006 for a thorough discussion and analysis of prior articles that have ranked academic accounting journals.

¹⁹ We analyzed the effect of number of authors and found that the average number of authors per paper was 2.34. There was not a significant difference in the average number of authors for any of the portfolios (which ranged from 2.32 to 2.36 authors per article). Only “Through Top 15” and “Through Top Business” categories differ significantly from the “All” category with both groups having more authors than the “All” category (Tukey-Kramer p-value < 0.05). Since the number of authors does not differ between portfolios, we do not consider it in our analysis.

²⁰ We present the data graphically as well as provide additional analysis not included in this paper due to space limitations at the following website <http://marriottschool.byu.edu/emp/GloverPrawittWood/>.

²¹ The journal ranking and grouping approach captures non-accounting “A” publications via the *Financial Times* list (see Exhibit 1). Non-accounting journal publications not on the *Financial Times* list are included in the “All” category.

²² The means of each university ranking portfolio are not significantly different from the means of the middle tercile (two tailed t-test, $p > 0.10$) with one exception: for Schools 1-15, the “Through Top 25” mean is statistically higher ($p < 0.05$) than the mean of the middle tercile. This result is driven largely by a few outliers with extremely high numbers of publications.

²³ The listed minima and maxima in the tables are included in the computation of the means of the lower and the upper terciles, respectively.

²⁴ While Tables 1-4 are based on the same underlying data, direct comparisons of publication totals between Tables 1 and 3 and between Tables 2 and 4 are difficult. The tables provide consistent results when promotion date is considered. Table 1 and Table 2 provide results based on the time of promotion and faculty are promoted at different times at different universities (e.g., some assistants are promoted after 5 years and others after 7 years). Tables 3 and 4 include publication records of faculty up to the time of promotion. By way of illustration, professors in the 1-15 school portfolio took an average of 5.59 years to be promoted to associate professor. Thus, comparing Table 1 publication totals for faculty in the 1-15 portfolio to the accumulated year 7 total in Table 3 is not a valid comparison. The mean of the middle tercile reported in Table 1 for the All Publications category is 8.9 (school portfolio 1-15), which is between the means of All Publications, 8.4 and 10.9, reported in Table 3 for the same school portfolio 5 and 6 years after Ph.D. grant date, respectively.

²⁵ This analysis includes *all* articles published from Ph.D. grant date to the promotion to full, *not* just the incremental articles published after promotion to associate.