

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF FACULTY RECRUITING BY NON-DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN ACCOUNTING

Timothy J. Fogarty

*Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio
USA*

Brian Hogan

*College of Business Administration
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts
USA*

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a description of the relative success of non-doctoral programs at securing accounting faculty of choice. Using the logic that faculty from more prestigious doctoral programs possess more choice in the jobs they take, this paper accumulates the result of these decisions. Focusing on the non-doctoral sector, this paper provides a measure of how successful schools have been at recruiting faculty. These descriptive results are shown to be mostly consistent through time, and resistant to variations in measurement. Moreover, geographic proximity does not seem to be a strong alternative explanation. When only considering faculty employment decisions that occur immediately after doctoral training (rather than those later in academic careers) a not too different version of non-doctoral recruiting success emerges from the historical record.

Key words: Accounting faculty, academic careers, institutional prestige, doctoral student placement, non-doctoral schools.

Data availability: Data used in this paper are available upon request from the second author.

Every August, accounting academics convened at the annual meetings of the American Accounting Association (AAA), are stunned anew by the imbalance in their job market. Available positions have outstripped candidates for those positions for many years. Testament to this imbalance also appears with every successive edition of the *Accounting Faculty Directory* (Hasselback) and anecdotal accounts of impending “baby boomer” generation retirements. Now made official by an AAA commissioned study, the supply of new accounting Ph.D.s do not approximate that need to replace retiring faculty (Leslie, 2008). No one would question that many schools, seeking the many benefits of a full-time accounting faculty, must engage in an unprecedentedly fierce competition for a shrinking pool of professoriate talent.

The market failure conditions that we face necessitate a renewed consideration of the distribution of faculty to schools. Despite years of study on related questions, we still only have a very vague impression about why faculty take the jobs that they do. Against bad odds, some universities win the battle for faculty talent, while others do not. The latter schools must fill in with part time faculty or hire faculty that are unlikely to be long-term solutions to their staffing problem.

As a first step toward studying the elements of faculty attraction to positions, we must identify a means of score-keeping. To do so, this paper addresses the market for faculty in a different way than prior research. First, it focuses upon the non-doctoral programs. This segment of the academy has been forced somewhat “beneath the radar” relative to doctoral programs. Second, the paper mitigates the measurement of intellectual contributions approach that has made other aspects of institutional quality difficult to appreciate. Schools are much more than loci of research productivity.

Many reasons exist in the calculus of job decisions. Each candidate possesses a wide variety of attributes whose desirability schools must weigh. Likewise, from the perspective of candidates, any job that might be taken presents a bevy of salient characteristics. Given this level of complexity, the lack of research on the issue is not surprising.

The paper is organized through the use of four subsequent sections. The first examines the available literature and offers testable research questions. The second describes the methods and data used to shed light on these questions. The last two sections describe the results and discuss them. That discussion includes a consideration of the limitations of the work and future research that should be attempted.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The General Issue

Anyone who has served in the academy will agree that not all schools are equal. Schools possess different missions that communicate where they strike a balance between several desirable outcomes. How schools value teaching, research and service make differential demands on their faculty. *Ceteris paribus*, this range should create a self-selection process for faculty who see their skills and interests fitting with these broad institutional priorities. In an increasing number of schools, a higher level of specificity can be reached. Often at the departmental level, school leadership make varying demands on their faculty. Compounding these choices, sometimes schools prioritize certain sub-fields of a broader area and become identified with a disciplinary niche. All of these institutional efforts tend to invoke a self-selection of faculty interested in careers that prioritize certain major dimensions (e.g., teaching, research) and more specific specialties within those dimensions (e.g., critical thinking pedagogy, experimental research).

Most schools are organized into academic departments. These constituent units organize people around disciplines, and provide the prospective faculty recruits an identity within their institution. Prospective faculty may be attracted by the prospects of close interaction with those individuals. This gravitation could be personal, but it is likely to be built upon the belief that the association will further career aspirations. Often, recruits seek out mentorship experiences or co-authorship opportunities. These calculations greatly complicate the simple attraction of individuals to institutions.

Each job decision by a candidate also represents a balancing of personal and career factors. The focus on the attributes of the university and the department are mostly confined to the career element. Faculty members and their families also have distinct preferences for parts of the country and the types of population density (i.e., urban, suburban, rural). In most instances, a location decision must satisfy both dimensions. As a partial recognition of the importance of life style factors, location decisions might not allow one to optimize career relevant factors. The consideration of familial and personal bonds and ties makes the question of why faculty choose one position over another challenging to adequately quantify.

These numerous employee factors necessitate looking at the question from the perspective of the employing institution. This vantage seems to be appropriate if for no other reason than the initiative required by the employer to extend interview invitations and, subsequently, offers of employment. The institutional perspective also enables the exclusion of the personal and non-career dimensions that made the individual's job selection choice range from messy to chaotic.

At first glance, the criteria used for the selection of faculty by accounting departments would seem to mirror those elements of the individual's choice. Departments with varying appetites for research productivity, teaching ability and service willingness should pick faculty that they believe can deliver the best portfolio of services in the areas deemed critical. For schools that value the three dimensions equally, there has to be a reason to believe that the preferred candidate can and will perform well in each area. For research schools, the burden lies primarily upon the scholarship case that the candidate can make. Other dimensions will be either not discussed or superficially examined. Departments with important specialties in teaching or research will prioritize a consideration of what each candidate can contribute to the furtherance of that distinctiveness.

In a perfect world, the market would function smoothly. "A thousand flowers" would bloom and faculty would painstakingly fit themselves into slots where their talents could be optimally deployed. However, the actual world is much less particularized. Prospective faculty members possess an imperfect self-concept of what they want to do and what they can do, in advance of opportunities and effort. Likewise, schools are prone to large evaluative error in the recruitment process (Lewis, 1997).

Individuals in "research schools" have benefited for some time in having a relatively unambiguous agenda for their efforts. When these schools hire, they naturally attempt to assess the candidate's ability to publish in the types of journals that are valued. There may have been a time when "teaching schools" cared as exclusively about teaching ability and experience. However, the very category of "teaching school" now is endangered. When all schools need faculty engaged in the production of intellectual contributions to some degree, these schools' selection criteria for new faculty must also include research criteria.

The reasons that the accounting academy has swerved toward research are complex and beyond the scope of this paper. Many would include accreditation as a sizable force in this process (see Dillard, 2002; Vaughn, 2010). The need for a research-active faculty approximates a *sine qua*

non for the “academically qualified” status that currently serves as a key ingredient of a successful AACSB accreditation. A “new world order” of the business school may be emerging that requires faculty research for institutional branding and intellectual property revenue generation purposes (see Gioia and Corley, 2002). These pressures combine in exacerbating the demand for faculty research in the business academy. This trend, combined with a specific shortage of those able to respond to it in accounting (see Fogarty and Markarian, 2007), creates a scarcity that had previously not been experienced by schools more accustomed to a deeper teaching-enabled candidate pool.

Official recognition of the shortage of terminally qualified faculty in the accounting discipline has been slow in developing. After several years of problematizing the issues in the academic and practice community (e.g., AAA, 2005), a coalition of funding sources formed to finance the transition of accountants into doctoral programs (see www.adsp.org). Even after individuals from this non-renewed source filter into the job market, insufficient candidates will be present. As non-doctoral schools attempt to create more of a research profile, they intensify the demand for both the freshly-minted degree holders and for those with suitable degrees of past research productivity.

The recruitment of a faculty person can only be considered a success if that person stays on the faculty for a material number of years. This invites the consideration of the candidate’s prospect of earning tenure and promotion. For some time, this feat has been contingent upon research success in all sectors of the accounting academy (see Campbell et al. 1983). The difficulty of satisfying the research criteria for the career advancement of the recruited faculty suggests that a strong research aptitude be present (see also Glover et al. 2006). This threshold leads some schools to prefer candidates that have already published enough to be promoted.

Several writers have studied the structure of publishing opportunity for accounting faculty relative to similarly situated others. The general conclusion of the literature is that accounting faculty have lower odds of achieving career success. Buchheit et al. (2002) show that fewer top-tier articles are published in accounting than in disciplines such as finance, management, and marketing. Furthermore, accounting faculty publishing in those journals are more likely to come from a relatively smaller set of schools. Similar conclusions have been reached, using a different set of journals, year and disciplinary comparisons by Swanson (2004). Whether this is evidence of rigid gatekeeping or the absence of sufficient numbers of doctoral programs providing suitable training, a sizeable premium appears to exist in accounting for those having doctoral preparation from the “right” school. Whereas this is very true for the top journals, a “trickle down” effect exists throughout the discipline.

Caplow and McGee (1956) observe that the recruitment of faculty was a poor science at best. They suggest that faculty selection committees do little evaluative work beyond weighing the institutional pedigree of candidates. Where very little causal knowledge exists that would help predict scholarly success, using candidate pedigree in this way represents a viable heuristic in many disciplines.

Institutional prestige seems to be a strong predictor of the mobility of academic accountants (Fogarty et al. 2012). Where one obtains a doctoral degree may not determine where one will be employed, but it strongly shapes where one cannot be employed. Thus, the accounting discipline is like most others, wherein prestige functions as the very “oxygen” of academic life (Burke, 1988).

The above reasoning suggests that accounting departments should prefer to hire faculty from the schools best known for producing productive accounting researchers. This does not suggest that all good researchers have to have been trained at the select schools. Nor does it imply that all people

who obtain their degrees from the top schools will be productive researchers. In a world such as the academic, where future behavior is so unpredictable and where performance incentives are relatively weak, institutional pedigree often is the signal of choice for those seeking to extend offers of employment.

If a large number of schools prefer candidates from the better accounting doctoral programs, a certain number of assumptions are necessary. Most importantly, there has to be some degree of agreement on the positioning of the schools on this dimension. However, this assumption does not require that there be an exact consensus on the ordering of quality. Instead, there must be some general distinctions between tiers of schools that most individuals with decision-making authority over personnel decisions share. Such a general preference ordering may be developed through the large number of ranking studies that have been published, and the fact that their results are highly correlated (Fogarty, 1995). Knowledge of past rankings can be continuously recreated or updated because senior accounting academics appear to share ideas about journal quality (Wu et al. 2009). This agreement enables one to observe which schools make the largest contributions to the important journals, and thus collectively re-calibrate the premium for doctoral graduates of those programs over time.

The logic of the job market in academic accounting amounts to the possession of considerable advantage to those with doctoral credentials from the relatively prestigious schools. This attribute could be thought of as a higher present value for the publications that are likely to occur in the future. This tendency may be logical since it is grounded in a plethora of beliefs about the superior socialization of doctoral education at some schools that include the “right” values about research, better familiarity with sanctioned databases and methodologies, and access to a more productive and committed coauthor network.

The relative advantage of some individuals in the job market should translate into more job options than are possessed by those without this edge. As schools compete for candidates, in what has become a permanent “sellers market,” more employment offers should accrue to those with a credential advantage. This benefit is not only enjoyed by elites, but also exists for mid-tier school graduates vis-à-vis lower-tier graduates. Those people with more options that accept employment overtures do so by forsaking other possibilities. The exercise of this capacity by desired candidates can be taken as a credit to that school that they join, and the absence of such a credit to the schools that are scorned.

Very few studies have directly taken up the question of how academics choose their employing institutions. Ostrowski (1986) used survey evidence to show that accounting faculty value a large set of tangible and intangible attributes when contemplating an employment offer. While a supportive research environment was seen as very consequential, it was not exclusive among the factors that matter. A consistent survey-based study was conducted by Eaton and Hunt (2002). They add gender differences to our appreciation of what accounting faculty value. These authors also stress previously ignored variables such as spousal geographic preferences. Hunt (2004) takes a different tack, surveying those that interview at AAA meetings about their experiences, preferences and information searches.

Over time, research has become a larger factor in the academic accounting job market. Rather than simple self-selection, wherein those with a preference for research would select research schools, a premium attaches to those candidates perceived to be profiled as likely successful researchers. Differential salaries can signal the strength of a particular school’s desire for research-enabled faculty. Nonetheless, the shortage of candidates allows individuals to gravitate toward

schools with higher perceived quality, however that might be defined by the satisfaction of their preferences. Schools lacking important quality elements that candidates perceive to be important will be less able to hire, even if they offer a competitive wage. In the tough competition for the best candidates, schools lacking the attributes sought by candidates will not be routinely successful. These schools must select from the less desirable candidates, including those trained by schools with lower research credibility.

The influence of special circumstances in the accounting discipline suggests that market failure conditions exist, and that a simple market clearance through self-selection will not occur. Instead, pressure should be intense for schools to demonstrate their quality to the inadequate number of terminally qualified individuals in the academic labor market.

Research Questions

The designation of some schools as distinctively enabled is only useful if it describes conditions more enduring than the proverbial “snapshot” at one moment in time. Some confidence must exist that the attributes that produce a mark of distinction relate to conditions of quality that adhere less temporarily than could be produced by events or decisions that are not normal or repetitive.

The relative desirability of the non-doctoral programs described in this paper is portrayed as the reaction of self-motivated faculty to a set of positive circumstances. If this is the case, these desirable conditions should persist through time. Otherwise, occupational location decisions must be considered as the pursuit of attributes that are more fleeting. If institutions of higher education can be successful in making themselves more attractive and more accomplished in the achievement of their missions, some sustainable advantage should be expected in their attractiveness to new faculty. Contrariwise, schools that had an advantage based on some temporary resource or fleeting notoriety will not necessarily retain it through time.

Over long periods of time, some change in the relative desirability of schools should be expected. School and university administrators are occasionally successful at convincing faculty constituents that some new attribute is both appealing and novel. Although much about a school is fixed in the short term, other aspects are subject to consequential alteration. Most importantly, recruiting can be tipped in a positive or negative direction. If one discipline becomes a priority for a school, more resources can be made available to attract faculty in that area. If donors designate chaired positions in the domain of a discipline, better recruiting could occur even without the purposeful plan of administrators. Recruiting also can be a “snowball” phenomenon. The fortuitous selection of one person can make subsequent recruitment efforts easier, as people wish for co-author opportunities and to replicate the behavior of possible incumbent role models.

The persistence of a permanent advantage by select non-doctoral schools that results in greater labor market attractiveness is an untested empirical question. Therefore, an important initial research question is as follows:

RQ₁: The relative ability of non-doctoral accounting programs to attract faculty will not significantly change over time.

As discussed in the previous section, nobody would assert that job choices made by accounting faculty are pure reflections of career opportunities. Nonetheless, personal motivations

and life style preferences are so diverse that their impact could be considered to be sufficiently random such that it should not systematically influence location decisions in the aggregate.

People are known to be predisposed toward the geographic areas in which they currently reside (Flowerdew, 1992; Schachter, 2004). Accordingly, many doctoral students may prefer to take positions that are not geographically distant from their doctoral school. This choice may reflect a wish to minimize the disruption of relocation. Such a tendency also may illustrate the wish to preserve the many types of utility found in an area to which the degree recipient has grown accustomed. A test of this tendency is suggested by the following:

RQ₂: The relative ability of non-doctoral accounting programs to attract faculty is not significantly attributable to geographic factors.

Schools recruit faculty in at least two markets. Each year, newly-minted Ph.D.s take their first full-time academic positions. These moves are often closely monitored by Ph.D. programs since many believe they both reflect and further the reputation of the producing school. Usually a loose coordination and interdependency exists that allows the market for new graduates to clear in an organized manner. Many believe that institutional prestige provides the guiding structure for this market (Fogarty et al. 2012).

Separate from these initial or primary placements, a secondary market exists for seasoned faculty. Faculty members that have already been employed and are seeking an alternative position represent a large fraction of the faculty available to a school with a position. These individuals possess a longer and deeper track record of accomplishment, both in terms of research and teaching, than the freshly-graduated candidates. In many ways, the promise represented by the prestige of the doctoral degree may be replaced by actual accomplishment, as faculty work through their careers. The movement of these established faculty to new positions tends to be less organized, and more “one off” than the primary market. Survey differences between the preferences of these two groups have been found by Eaton and Hunt (2002) and others.

The rationale for separating the primary and the secondary markets is the possibility that some schools might be more successful at recruiting in one than the other. The primary market may be driven more by research facilitation factors than is the secondary market. New faculty, concerned over the establishment of their research, may prefer schools that can better support these efforts. Those faculty looking for non-initial placements may be more settled in their work, and, therefore, pursue a more balanced set of attributes in the school that they choose. In fact, those in the secondary market may be granted tenure as a condition of the new employment. This award should reduce the anxiety felt by candidates over the adequacy of research facilitation factors provided by a school. Seasoned faculty present much more variation than new faculty in salary demands and years of work until retirement, two factors that may be relevant to those that seek to hire.

The many reasons that differentiate the markets for new and seasoned faculty necessitate a formal empirical separation. Accordingly, a focus on the new faculty market presents an opportunity to control for the complexity of hiring faculty that are in the midst of their career. Similar to what RQ attempted with geography, a cleaner view of the labor market is available if only new faculty recruitment is considered.

The extent to which the recruitment of new faculty is different than overall faculty recruitment is an interesting empirical question. This can be approached by comparing the non-

doctoral school faculty recruitment hierarchy of initial recruits with the hierarchy formed by considering all faculty, as was done in the first two research questions. Stated in the null:

RQ₃: The relative ability of non-doctoral accounting programs to attract faculty will not significantly differ when only recent doctoral program graduates are considered.

Together, these three specific research questions are aimed at the need to develop new information about the movement of faculty into positions in the non-doctoral sector. The first research question considers potential temporal variation. The others attempt to control for more personal factors such as geographic location and mid-career adjustments. In large part, evidence on these questions will offer first impressions on worthwhile questions.

METHOD

A recent printed edition of the *Accounting Faculty Directory* (Hasselback, 2010) was used to identify non-doctoral accounting programs. Schools that had active doctoral programs were eliminated from consideration. Doctoral programs were considered inactive when they had not produced a graduate in ten or more years. Inactivity of this duration reclassified the school into the non-doctoral category. Schools from outside the USA were also not considered. In order to mollify the impact of individual cases, non-doctoral schools with fewer than three accounting faculty were also deleted.

For each remaining program, accounting faculty members with Ph.D. degrees were considered. From this group, qualified faculty were defined to exclude individuals serving as Deans. Visitors at all ranks and emeriti were also deleted since their appointments are likely to be either temporary or honorific. The doctoral origins of each remaining accounting faculty person at the identified non-doctoral programs served as the primary data of this study.

The main means of measuring the relative successfulness of a school's recruiting efforts was to assign ranks to the doctoral school origins of all non-doctoral school faculty. These ranks were then summed, and averaged to create a composite portrait of the doctoral credentials of the resident non-doctoral school's accounting faculty. Since lower ranks connote the most prestigious programs (as in the expression "We are #1"), a school that was attractive enough to regularly attract faculty from doctoral programs judged to be relatively more desired would produce a low total and a low average. Contrariwise, a school that was unable to get its faculty from such doctoral programs, but instead recruited faculty with doctoral degrees from less highly regarded programs, would produce a higher total and higher average. This measure suggests that non-doctoral programs should not be ranked directly on the research productivity, but instead on their ability to recruit those relatively more likely to be research productive.

Because the measurement of doctoral program prestige is central to this research, more than one approach was taken. The main measure that was used was a composite index used by Fogarty and Markarian (2007) as a measure of institutional prestige. This measure draws upon a vast number of other rankings, most of which pertain to a doctoral school's publication productivity and earned citations. Other elements include a doctoral school's relative presence in the journal editorial functions, its doctoral student placement ability, and its overall reputation. As a second measure, a composite was created from a set of rankings constructed by Everett et al. (2004). These authors offered separate rankings on quantity of publications, quality of outlets, breadth and depth. In addition to tapping new scholarship dimensions, the Everett et al. (2004) study draws upon a more

exclusive set of recent information. Thus, it serves as a useful counterpart to the first measure in the effort to detect the methodological robustness of the primary measure.

The first research question required numerous points in time. For this purpose, there is no uniquely appropriate interval. Therefore, a twenty year difference was chosen. As shown by previous studies, such a time period includes elements of both a rise and a decline in the population of full time accounting professoriate (see Fogarty and Markarian, 2007). The beginning, middle and end points of the last twenty years created the three data points. This used the same data collected from the 1986, 1996 and 2006 editions of the *Accounting Faculty Directory*. The year 2006 was chosen as an end point in order to reserve more recent placements as a holdout sample that could further test the hierarchies that are depicted.

Since the selection of an employing institution by a candidate might reflect little more than personal convenience, geography has to be considered. The second research question attempts to purify the ordering of the most successful school of a possible geographic advantage. This was done by deleting any faculty that graduated from the doctoral program closest to their current school of employment. For example, a faculty member employed by Ithaca College, located in Ithaca NY, that earned a degree from Cornell, also located in Ithaca NY, would be deleted. No deletion was made if the non-doctoral school's resident faculty did not have a member from the closest doctoral program. For example, if Ithaca College did not have a faculty person with a degree from Cornell, but did have one with a degree from Syracuse, no faculty person would be deleted because of the existence of Cornell as more proximate to that non-doctoral program. In the isolated cases where more than one doctoral program was located in the same city, multiple doctoral schools were used for the deletion of faculty. On-line geography tools, such as *Mapquest.com* were used to determine physical proximity. This procedure was designed to mitigate the geographic-based advantage of non-doctoral programs that happen to be located close to prestigious doctoral programs. Since this elimination procedure could cause the deletion of more than one faculty person (if they came from the same nearby doctoral program), it has the potential to cause consequential changes to the ranking of non-doctoral programs that recruit nearby faculty.

The final research question requires the distinction between the recruitment of freshly minted doctoral degree recipients and others. To eliminate the latter from consideration, a comparison was made between the year the Ph.D. was awarded and the year in which the person joined the current department. If the latter was before or within one year after the former, the placement was deemed part of the primary market. If the two points depart by two or more years, the existence of a previous full-time academic appointment is indicated, making it appropriate to not consider this recruitment. Previous editions of the *Accounting Faculty Directory* and other sources were consulted to resolve ambiguous cases.

RESULTS

Measurement Results

Since the measurement of institutional prestige is not settled, the sensitivity of results to how the variable is specified was first considered. Using both measures, the top 50 non-doctoral programs (according to the prestige of the doctoral credentials of resident faculty) were constructed. The correlation of the resultant ranks was 0.69, a result significant at the $p < .01$ level. This level of significance was also attained when the ranks were collapsed into quartiles. The similarity of ranks was particularly pronounced for the top 25 schools. Although the two measures do not produce identical results, the extent of their parallelism offers confidence that the prestige construct has been

approached with suitable measurement. Thus supported, the test of the research questions proceeded with the Fogarty and Markarian (2007) index since it offers the broader-based of the two measures, both in terms of criteria and time.

Descriptive Information

Table 1 provides an ordered ranking of the top 50 non-doctoral schools using the Fogarty and Markarian (2007) measure, based on their success in attracting faculty who were trained at the top accounting PhD programs. As of 2006, these schools could be seen as the “winners” of the competition for the faculty with the most prestigious doctoral degree credentials. Low ranks and scores on this table are superior because schools of doctoral origin were arranged on the index from the most prestigious (#1) to least prestigious (#83).

TABLE 1

2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Non-Doctoral School</u>	<u>Composite Score</u>	<u>Quartile</u>
1	Yeshiva University	14.00	1
2	Santa Clara University	14.38	1
3	Illinois at Chicago	21.45	1
4	SUNY - New Paltz	22.00	1
5	Emory University	25.00	1
6	Cal State - Northridge	25.08	1
7	Ohio University	25.92	1
8	Rice University	26.30	1
9	Notre Dame	27.37	1
10	Cal State - Riverside	27.67	1
11	Cal State - Fullerton	28.63	1
12	Denver	28.70	1
13	North Carolina at Charlotte	29.92	2
14	Southern Methodist University	29.93	2
15	Portland	30.00	2
16	Howard University	30.43	2
17	Portland State University	30.75	2
18	Brigham Young University	31.05	2
19	Texas Christian University	31.27	2
20	Iowa State University	31.67	2
21	Northern Arizona University	31.88	2
22	Naval Postgraduate School	32.00	2
23	Rhode Island	32.13	2
24	Illinois State University	32.20	2
25	Cal State - Long Beach	32.50	3
26	San Diego State	32.72	3

(continued)

TABLE 1 (continued)

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Non-Doctoral School</u>	<u>Composite Score</u>	<u>Quartile</u>
27	Boston College	32.77	3
28	New Hampshire	32.83	3
29	Northeastern University	32.90	3
30	Central Michigan University	33.11	3
31	Missouri - St. Louis	33.67	3
32	St. Thomas - MN	33.86	3
33	Wisconsin - Whitewater	33.88	3
34	Babson College	34.56	3
35	Grand Valley State	35.18	3
36	Georgetown University	35.50	3
37	Cal State - East Bay	35.60	3
38	Cal State - Chico	35.75	4
39	Miami University	36.15	4
40	Northern Illinois University	36.25	4
41	Scranton	36.70	4
42	College of William & Mary	37.14	4
43	Western Michigan University	37.55	4
44	Colorado State University	37.75	4
45	St. Cloud State University	37.75	4
46	Cal State - Dominguez Hills	38.25	4
47	Oregon State University	38.43	4
48	Eastern Michigan University	38.85	4
49	Boise State University	38.86	4
50	Virginia - Darden	39.40	4

The list in Table 1 includes many well-known schools. The list includes at least two schools that used to have active doctoral programs (Rice, Santa Clara). There are other programs on this list that have doctoral programs in other business areas, as well as in many non-business fields. Several schools are well known for their active research focus and their faculty's representation in the pages of the best journals in the discipline. The list also includes lesser-known schools that could be thought of as the hidden gems that have been unearthed by well-credentialed accounting faculty. The list includes several elite private schools and many prominent state universities.

This group has considerable geographic variation. Although schools located in California appear to be overrepresented, the list includes schools located in every corner of the nation. Nineteen schools are located in the West, fourteen in the Midwest, twelve in the Northeast, and five in the South.

The schools on the list are ranked according to the cumulative average rankings of the doctoral origins of their current faculty. Although this summation constructs an apparently continuous variable, statements that differentiate relative positions on the list are somewhat tenuous. Ranks may change based on the movement in or out of a school by a single faculty member. The

sensitivity of the data is especially true in the smaller programs, given the nature of average calculations. Even with this caveat, the scores from top to bottom offer some degree of interesting comparison. Very few scores are less than 20, and the majority are between 30 and 40. This suggests that the large number of graduates from the most prestigious programs (ranks 1-20) take positions at other doctoral programs, and are mostly unavailable for even the best non-doctoral schools. Scores in the 30-40 range require a non-doctoral school to consistently recruit from the upper half of US doctoral schools. This outcome suggests quite successful competition for faculty against the majority of doctoral schools, as well as the many other non-doctoral programs.

The scores in Table 1 are also tightly clustered. This suggests that more should be made of the collective quality of these schools, rather than their precise ordering. The fact that all these schools prefer to hire faculty with doctoral degrees in such a small range of the prestige scale (full range: 1-83) also suggests considerable inter-school agreement on the expected caliber of graduates from these doctoral programs.

Change Over Time: Research Question 1

The first research question considers the degree to which the relative position of the non-doctoral schools changes over time. This proposition suggested the lack of significant change over time. For these purposes, the score of years between 1986 and 2006 were marked off to form first, last, and midpoint (1996) years. Table 2 summarizes data on this point at these three points in time, each separated by a decade.

In order not to overemphasize small differences between successive ranks, the rankings produced in each year (1986, 1996, 2006) were organized into quartiles of twelve or thirteen schools (for 2006, also see Table 1). A new ranking covering the twenty-year time frame can be produced when quartile position is summed and averaged. For computational purposes, any school present in the list of top 50 schools but not present at another of the three points in time was deemed to belong to a 5th quartile for the year in which it did not place in the top 50.

Table 2 contains all 71 schools that were ranked at least once in the four quartiles of the three top 50 lists. Membership in the top 50 non-doctoral schools, as defined by this research, tends not to be very fluid. Only 21 instances of schools not found in Table 1 (the 2006 rankings) would have been included in a 1986 or 1996 listing of the top 50 schools. In other words, Table 2 identifies 31 non-doctoral schools that would have their recruiting distinction recognized at any one of the three measuring points during the twenty-year period.

In total, 29 of the 71 schools either did not change quartiles over the three measurement points or changed by only one quartile. However, while quartile membership tends to remain consistent, some movement across these groups is not unusual. Less change is noted at the top than at the bottom of this list. The schools near the top of this list demonstrate sustained differential recruiting ability. Eleven schools never fall below the second quartile. Schools toward the bottom are less able to maintain even fourth quartile membership. As one would expect, a wider set of schools can claim occasional membership in the fourth quartile. Twelve schools manage only a single fourth quartile appearance constituting their only presence on the three top 50 lists.

Overall, the quartile ranks of the three individual years are not significantly different than the composite quartile at a $p < .01$ level. Moreover, each year's listing is positively correlated with the next year's rankings. Thus, 1986 is significantly correlated with 1996 ($p < .01$), and 1996 is significantly correlated with 2006 ($p < .05$). However, 1986 is not significantly related to 2006 ($p > .10$). The correlation evidence supports the expectation that the contemplation of the recruitment-

TABLE 2

1986 - 2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools - Quartile Comparison

<u>Non-Doctoral School</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Pattern</u>
Emory University	1	1	1	1.00	No Change
Rice University	1	1	1	1.00	No Change
Cal State - Riverside	2	1	1	1.33	Increase
Illinois at Chicago	2	1	1	1.33	Increase
Iowa State University	1	1	2	1.33	Decrease
North Carolina at Charlotte	1	1	2	1.33	Decrease
Cal State - Fullerton	2	2	1	1.67	Increase
Cal State - Northridge	2	2	1	1.67	Increase
Denver	3	1	1	1.67	Increase
Portland State University	1	2	2	1.67	Decrease
Santa Clara University	3	1	1	1.67	Increase
Notre Dame	3	2	1	2.00	Increase
Rhode Island	2	2	2	2.00	No Change
Southern Methodist University	2	2	2	2.00	No Change
Georgetown University	1	3	3	2.33	Decrease
Hofstra University	1	1	5	2.33	Decrease
Illinois State University	1	4	2	2.33	No Direction
Northeastern University	2	2	3	2.33	Decrease
Yeshiva University	5	1	1	2.33	Increase
Cal State - Los Angeles	1	2	5	2.67	Decrease
North Florida	1	2	5	2.67	Decrease
Ohio University	3	4	1	2.67	No Direction
College of William & Mary	2	2	4	2.67	Decrease
Boston College	3	3	3	3.00	No Change
Brigham Young University	3	4	2	3.00	No Direction
Cal State - Dominguez Hills	2	3	4	3.00	Decrease
Pace University	1	3	5	3.00	Decrease
Rutgers - Camden	1	3	5	3.00	Decrease
San Diego State	3	3	3	3.00	No Change
SUNY - New Paltz	4	4	1	3.00	Increase
Texas Christian University	3	4	2	3.00	No Direction
East Carolina University	2	3	5	3.33	Decrease
George Mason University	4	1	5	3.33	No Direction
Nevada - Las Vegas	2	3	5	3.33	Decrease
Portland	4	4	2	3.33	Increase
Towson University	4	1	5	3.33	No Direction
Virginia - Darden	2	4	4	3.33	Decrease
Alabama at Birmingham	3	3	5	3.67	Decrease
Alabama in Huntsville	4	2	5	3.67	No Direction

(continued)

TABLE 2 (continued)

<u>Non-Doctoral School</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Pattern</u>
Boise State University	4	3	4	3.67	No Direction
Cal State - San Bernadino	4	2	5	3.67	No Direction
Missouri - St. Louis	4	4	3	3.67	Increase
Western Kentucky University	3	3	5	3.67	Decrease
Bentley College	3	4	5	4.00	Decrease
Cal State - Chico	4	4	4	4.00	No Change
Howard University	5	5	2	4.00	Increase
Naval Postgraduate School	5	5	2	4.00	Increase
Northern Arizona University	5	5	2	4.00	Increase
Villanova University	4	3	5	4.00	No Direction
West Virginia University	3	4	5	4.00	Decrease
Babson College	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
Cal State - Long Beach	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
Central Michigan University	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
Gonzaga University	4	4	5	4.33	Decrease
Grand Valley State	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
New Hampshire	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
St. Thomas - MN	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
Wichita State University	4	4	5	4.33	Decrease
Wisconsin - Whitewater	5	5	3	4.33	Increase
Cal State - East Bay	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Cal State - Santa Barbara	5	4	5	4.67	No Direction
Colorado State University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Eastern Michigan University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Miami University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Montana	4	5	5	4.67	Decrease
Montana State University	4	5	5	4.67	Decrease
Northern Illinois University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Oregon State University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Scranton	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
St. Cloud State University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase
Western Michigan University	5	5	4	4.67	Increase

Correlations

Significance Level

1986 - 1996	0.6915	<.0001
1986 - 2006	0.1468	0.2219
1996 - 2006	0.2518	0.0341
1986 - average	0.7985	<.0001
1996 - average	0.8463	<.0001
2006 - average	0.6204	<.0001

relevant elements that could be considered by candidates in the near term are those factors that tend not to change. These results offer support for Research Question 1.

The ranking of non-doctoral programs based on the credentials of their current faculty tends toward statistical similarity in the shorter run (10 years). However, change is noted over the longer time frame of 20 years. The rankings of the earliest year (1986) are not correlated with those of the latest year (2006). Therefore, gradual change is underway. The latter finding, while literally inconsistent with Research Question 1, illustrates the importance of the length of the measuring period.

Much can happen in the decades between any of these two measuring points. Nonetheless, the majority of schools that changed quartile positions did so in a consistent direction. Only 11 schools moved in opposite directions (up then down or down then up) in the 20 year time frame. In other words, the general trajectory was for schools to either improve or to worsen over the twenty years. Although movements in both directions are not rare, perhaps indicating a more recent or more short-lived enhancement initiative, the sustained direction or plateau is more consistent with the ability of institutional proactivity to develop deeper vectors of quality to which accounting faculty candidates are likely to respond. In other words, continuous effort is needed to either sustain one's advantage, or to increase it in the recruiting wars.

A slightly stronger correlation existed for the first two measurement points (1986 and 1996; $p < .01$) than the second two ones (1996 and 2006; $p < .05$). This faltering of level may be attributable to the deepening shortage of accounting faculty over the last decade and the more systematic efforts being expended by school in recruitment. If some schools that might have recruited a terminally qualified accounting faculty in an earlier period instead withdraw from the pursuit, available candidates will trickle down to other schools.

On balance, the evidence suggests that some non-doctoral accounting programs have a sustained recruiting advantage. Those qualities that attracted the accounting faculty who presumably had relatively more choices to these schools twenty years ago continue to be factors valued in the job market in years thereafter. Although not without qualification, support exists for the first research question.

Geographic Factors: Research Question 2

The second research question pertains to the impact of geographical proximity. Table 3 offers an alternative list to the collection found in Table 1. The Table 3 list represents an adjustment of Table 1 through the deletion of any faculty member with a doctoral degree from the most proximate doctoral granting program. Most (31) of the 50 schools were not directly affected by this consideration of geographical element, either because they had no faculty from the nearest doctoral program, or deletion was not material to their quartile position. However, some schools slid down the rankings as they lost professors from closely located and highly ranked Ph.D. programs. Specifically, eight schools fell out of the top 50 as a result of the geographic adjustment (indicated in Table 3 as positioned in the 5th quartile). Most notable among these is Illinois State which had been positioned in the middle of the initial ranking. This fall was the result of a large contingent of the Illinois State faculty that acquired their degrees at Illinois. Other schools, like Miami University and the University of Portland, improved their quartile rankings because of the removal of educators hailing from geographically-proximate but lower-ranked Ph.D. universities. Nonetheless, a high correlation (0.721) significant at $p < .01$ still exists between the pre- and post-removal rankings. This result indicates that the ranked positions are not systematically affected. Support exists for the

acceptance of Research Question 2. Notwithstanding some individual cases to the contrary, rankings are not materially affected by the geographic factor considered.

TABLE 3

**Comparison of 2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools With Ranking
After Removal of Professors from Closest PhD Program**

<u>2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools</u>	(1) <u>Pre-Deletion Market Quartile</u>	(2) <u>Post-Deletion Market Quartile</u>	<u>Difference (1) - (2)</u>
Yeshiva University	1	1	0
Santa Clara University	1	1	0
Illinois at Chicago	1	1	0
SUNY - New Paltz	1	1	0
Emory University	1	1	0
Cal State - Northridge	1	1	0
Ohio University	1	1	0
Rice University	1	1	0
Notre Dame	1	1	0
Cal State - Riverside	1	1	0
Cal State - Fullerton	1	2	(1)
Denver	1	1	0
North Carolina at Charlotte	2	2	0
Southern Methodist University	2	2	0
Portland	2	1	1
Howard University	2	2	0
Portland State University	2	2	0
Brigham Young University	2	2	0
Texas Christian University	2	2	0
Iowa State University	2	3	(1)
Northern Arizona University	2	2	0
Naval Postgraduate School	2	2	0
Rhode Island	2	2	0
Illinois State University	2	5	(3)
Cal State - Long Beach	3	3	0
San Diego State	3	3	0
Boston College	3	3	0
New Hampshire	3	3	0
Northeastern University	3	3	0
Central Michigan University	3	5	(2)
Missouri - St. Louis	3	2	1
St. Thomas - MN	3	5	(2)

(continued)

TABLE 3 (continued)

2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools	(1) Pre-Deletion Market Quartile	(2) Post-Deletion Market Quartile	Difference (1) - (2)
Wisconsin - Whitewater	3	5	(2)
Babson College	3	3	0
Grand Valley State	3	4	(1)
Georgetown University	3	3	0
Cal State - East Bay	3	5	(2)
Cal State - Chico	4	3	1
Miami University	4	2	2
Northern Illinois University	4	3	1
Scranton	4	3	1
College of William & Mary	4	3	1
Western Michigan University	4	5	(1)
Colorado State University	4	4	0
St. Cloud State University	4	3	1
Cal State - Dominguez Hills	4	5	(1)
Oregon State University	4	5	(1)
Eastern Michigan University	4	4	0
Boise State University	4	4	0
Virginia - Darden	4	4	0

NOTE: Ranking above is for each school out of 122 total schools ranked with closest PhD school removed Correlation (1) & (2) = 0.7206
 Significance Level < .0001

Eliminating Seasoned Faculty Hiring: Research Question 3

The final research question pertained to the likely need to consider the difference between the recruitment of recently graduated doctoral students and experienced faculty. The focus on doctoral degree credentials suggests that it would be prudent to focus upon the first group. Because the recruitment of seasoned faculty is quite a bit more multi-faceted, this research question required that information be produced solely on the success a school had in recruiting novice faculty (i.e., people taking their first academic position). Table 4 shows how the rankings of the 2006 top 50 schools changed when only recently graduated hires are considered. In essence, Table 4 offers a comparison of credential-based hierarchies when only initial hiring is considered and when the two types of recruiting are combined.

A visual examination of the Table 4 data attests to the conclusion that the produced restriction of recruiting to the primary market can be quite consequential in some cases. Illinois-Chicago provides a good illustration of a school whose high overall faculty ranking seems to be a product of its differential success recruiting seasoned faculty. When such individuals are excluded, this school changes from the first to the fourth quartile. However, the correlation of the two sets of quartiles is 0.136, significant at $p < .01$. This result attests to the fact that, despite differences, new

TABLE 4

**Comparison of 2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools Complete
Market Versus Initial Hires (Primary) Market Ranking**

<u>2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools</u>	(1) Complete Market Quartile	(2) Primary Market Quartile	Difference <u>(1) - (2)</u>
Yeshiva University	1	1	0
Santa Clara University	1	1	0
Illinois at Chicago	1	4	(3)
SUNY - New Paltz	1	4	(3)
Emory University	1	3	(2)
Cal State - Northridge	1	1	0
Ohio University	1	4	(3)
Rice University	1	1	0
Notre Dame	1	2	(1)
Cal State - Riverside	1	1	0
Cal State - Fullerton	1	1	0
Denver	1	1	0
North Carolina at Charlotte	2	1	1
Southern Methodist University	2	2	0
Portland	2	4	(2)
Howard University	2	-	2
Portland State University	2	2	0
Brigham Young University	2	3	(1)
Texas Christian University	2	4	(2)
Iowa State University	2	3	(1)
Northern Arizona University	2	-	2
Naval Postgraduate School	2	-	2
Rhode Island	2	3	(1)
Illinois State University	2	2	0
Cal State - Long Beach	3	-	3
San Diego State	3	2	1
Boston College	3	3	0
New Hampshire	3	-	3
Northeastern University	3	2	1
Central Michigan University	3	-	3
Missouri - St. Louis	3	1	2
St. Thomas - MN	3	-	3
Wisconsin - Whitewater	3	-	3
Babson College	3	-	3
Grand Valley State	3	-	3

(continued)

TABLE 4 (continued)

2006 Top-50 Non-Doctoral Schools	(1) Complete Market Quartile	(2) Primary Market Quartile	Difference (1) - (2)
Georgetown University	3	2	1
Cal State - East Bay	3	-	3
Cal State - Chico	4	3	1
Miami University	4	-	4
Northern Illinois University	4	-	4
Scranton	4	-	4
College of William & Mary	4	3	1
Western Michigan University	4	-	4
Colorado State University	4	-	4
St. Cloud State University	4	-	4
Cal State - Dominguez Hills	4	1	3
Oregon State University	4	4	0
Eastern Michigan University	4	4	0
Boise State University	4	2	2
Virginia - Darden	4	1	3

Correlation (1) & (2) = 0.1360
Significance Level < .0042

accounting faculty respond to non-doctoral programs in a similar way to all faculty recruited by those institutions. Seventeen schools from Table 1 had not recently participated in the new faculty market, and did not appear in the “primary market only” listing, as designed by a non-appearance in the quartile system employed in Table 4. The evidence suggests that Research Question 3 is supported. School ranking change does not tend to result if one only considers the recruiting of recently graduated academic accountants.

Additional Analysis

Several recruiting seasons have elapsed since the accumulation of data used in the construction of the above tables. Information that was not contained therein, reflecting more recent recruiting activity, formed a hold-out sample that could be used to test the integrity of the hierarchies of non-doctoral schools.

In total, 474 individuals with Ph.D.s took positions with U.S. institutions of higher education after graduating in 2006 or later. After eliminating the 19 people who possessed doctoral degrees from foreign schools, 455 remained. Of these 174 (38.2%) were placed at doctoral programs, leaving 281 (61.8%) for the nondoctoral sector.

The recruiting advantage enjoyed by the schools listed in Table 1 seems to have continued after the tabulation shown there. Fifty-nine of the 281 students (21.0%) taking nondoctoral school jobs took them with the 29 schools from that list that hired a “freshly minted” faculty person in 2006

or thereafter. Half of these schools (14) hired more than one individual. Given the hundreds of schools that have accounting programs, the “market share” possessed by the top ranked nondoctoral programs is quite impressive.

The impact of hiring 2006 and afterwards would have had only a modest impact on Table 1. Obviously, the 21 schools that did not hire in this market would have seen no change here. Those that hired would have changed the overall prestige scores of their faculty but not in a major way, given the number of continuing faculty.

An analysis was performed to assess the direction of change caused by more recent hiring. Fourteen schools would have reduced their prestige scores, thereby perhaps improving their relative position. A different fifteen schools would have moved in the other direction, but usually in modest magnitudes. Thirteen schools hired new faculty from doctoral programs with prestige scores within ten ranks of their previous faculty average, thus not materially changing their school’s position. The other 16 showed slightly larger deviations. Some examples of schools in the latter group that were larger improvers were Illinois-Chicago, Notre Dame, Portland State, Texas Christian and Iowa State. Schools that experienced some opposite results in recent recruiting, in that the prestige of their recruits’ credentials were lower than average included Northern Arizona, San Diego State and Northern Illinois. Schools in the top half of Table 1 tended to recruit faculty with uncharacteristically high prestige credentials. The opposite was true for those schools in the lower half of Table 1. Notwithstanding this tendency for the “rich to get richer,” the general rule of this analysis was that Table 1 schools were able to recruit new faculty such that they would preserve their relative position. In other words, Table 1 schools continue to be the preferred destinations for the doctorally qualified candidates from high ranking Ph.D. programs that do not go to other doctoral schools.

Summary

In sum, the results lend support to the proposition that non-doctoral schools can be credibly compared based upon their success in recruiting faculty. To the extent that pedigrees matter, they translate into higher relative degrees of opportunity and choice that people have in the labor market, and, therefore, their distribution across institutions is neither random nor idiosyncratic. The measurement that was deployed, while imperfect is reasonably consistent whether conceived as a combination of objective and subjective conditions, or simply as relative institutional contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline. The resultant hierarchy was shown to be reasonably stable through a relatively long period of time. Although the effort to evaluate non-career personal-choice decision making was limited, the evaluation showed that the non-doctoral school hierarchy was not inordinately defeated by geographical factors. Finally, while a good case can be made that the recruitment of doctoral students as new faculty offers a better view on the recruiting abilities of non-doctoral programs than does the recruiting of all faculty, non-doctoral schools of choice tend to be such for both new and seasoned faculty.

DISCUSSION

This research attempts to quantify accounting faculty recruiting success in a way previously unexplored by the literature. This research draws its motivation from a need to understand how programs have adjusted to a seemingly permanent condition of inadequate supply of terminally qualified accounting faculty.

The results suggest that the idea that many schools tend to gravitate toward faculty with training at high prestige doctoral programs is warranted. The use of this foundation allowed the construction of a list of schools that have had considerable success at offering accounting faculty those elements of quality relevant to the furtherance of their careers.

The focus on non-doctoral schools allows us to appreciate the demand function for accounting faculty with greater clarity. Since none of the recruiting schools considered by this research produces doctoral students in accounting, the complexities caused by “exchange networks” (Howard and Nikolai, 1992) do not have to be incorporated. Instead of trading graduates with each other, the non-doctoral schools are dependent upon a system managed by other schools. Nonetheless, if prestige patterns the distribution of accounting doctoral students within the universe of doctoral programs (Fogarty et al. 2012), an extension of its logic to the non-doctoral programs should be expected.

The results suggest that there is some, but not much, fluidity among the set of non-doctoral programs best able to attract faculty from the top accounting doctoral programs. When measured at ten year intervals, stability was the rule rather than the exception. The schools that were able to make considerable advances within the pecking order should be the objects of greater scrutiny for those interested in this sort of organizational transformation.

The tendency toward stability should not be equated with failure to improve. In fact, maintaining ones relative position through time is a considerable achievement in a world in which the steepest declines in doctoral student production has occurred at the most prestigious schools (Fogarty and Markarian, 2007). The fact that all the schools mentioned in this paper have distinguished themselves from the many others in the non-doctoral sector should be more important than their exact positioning.

This research has taken on the task of working with the value choices that are imprinted on the job market by decision makers. We know that the graduates of certain programs are held in higher esteem than the graduates of other programs. This belief is sustained by an understanding that the former are more likely to publish the sort of scholarship that would reflect favorably upon the employing institution. To the extent that an approximate inter-subjective agreement exists about the hierarchy that scholarly preference and peer judgment creates, a market premium exists in terms of the number of participants that demand a particular individual’s services. Based on work that has shown accounting to be considerably less democratic than other business disciplines (Swanson, 2004; Buchheit et al. 2002), such a consensus should be easier to achieve.

Residing as a social convention, the exact specifications of the hierarchy of doctoral programs are not as well articulated for research purposes as other variables used to study the academy. This research responded to that situation in several ways that reflected its application to the nondoctoral school environment. First, the Fogarty and Markarian (2007) scale is itself assembled from multiple sources, only some of which is publication, and pulls information from the necessarily distant times considered in Research Question 1. Second, that scale was compared to results that would have been produced by a different scale (Everette et al. 2004). Third, the Research Questions were tested using quartile ranks that mitigated any tendency to depend excessively on small rank differences between doctoral schools.

Faculty are like other people in that they may harbor deeply-held preferences for living in certain parts of the country. To the extent that job market results reflect the pursuit and attainment of these preferences, this paper cannot ignore geographic considerations. Under normally favorable job market conditions, job candidates can secure employment in areas of their choice without too

much difficulty. Unfortunately, as shown by the geographic dispersion of the listed schools, faculty members possess quite different ideas about where they want to live. However, in that academic mobility increases costs (Richardson, 2009), the tendency to stay put should be expected.

Rather than taking on the “noisy” geographic preference issue, this paper considered the converse problem. Faculty members that are reluctant to move away from the geographic area where they earned their doctoral degree might distort our understanding of the quality of their employing institution. Employment choices might not reflect the specific attributes of that institution, but represent acceptable institutions within easy relocation distance. The results produced by this paper suggest that the impact of this geographic factor was relatively small. However, in a few cases, proximity to a highly rated doctoral program was consequential. On balance, the paper points to a modest value in correcting for the geographic location of the non-doctoral program.

Another approach to geography would have attempted to rate the consensus desirability of certain geographic areas. This was not done, in part because of the subjectivity of such judgments. For example, one often hears of the “best place to live” of one year inexplicably plummeting the next year even though nothing important has changed. Nonetheless, future research might find a way to incorporate more of the personal dimensions of a faculty relocation decision.

The final finding of this paper might be the most practical one. Faculty come to their present employer either as recently graduated doctoral students, or as veteran faculty conducting a mid-career relocation. *A priori*, one would expect that the first group would be more concerned by research facilitation factors at employing schools. This group should be prioritizing those resources (including talented colleagues) that could increase their successful tenure assault. Seasoned faculty are likely to be more heterogeneous in their job selection preferences. Some might be granted tenure as a condition of the move, and therefore not as worried about research productivity variables. Others might have a sustainable research portfolio that does not depend upon the type of resources that schools might offer, even if they must subsequently earn tenure.

The results suggest that schools that are most effective in attracting recent graduates from prestigious doctoral programs are not different from the schools that are effective at attracting candidates at various stages of their careers. In other words, the statistical evidence does not point toward the need to separate these two markets when discussing the attractiveness of various non-doctoral schools for accounting faculty. How candidates perceive quality in potential academic employments may be a function of the career stage in which faculty find themselves, but radical differences are not present. Nonetheless, the differences might be strong enough for future research to continue to consider the placement of new accounting Ph.D.s as a more homogeneous phenomenon.

Recent changes in the standards for the accreditation of business schools and accounting programs also should be considered as part of the environment that surrounds this research. Although the accredited designation derives from the mission of the institution, standards applicable to all schools are particularly insistent upon the “academic qualification” of faculty members. This designation tends to reiterate and deepen the need for schools of all sorts to be concerned with the publication activity of faculty, which continues as the *sine qua non* of academic credibility. The problem that this standard causes tends to fall disproportionately upon non-doctoral programs. These institutions typically exhibit a more balanced mission statement. Nonetheless, recruiting faculty that are sufficiently well-trained and correctly motivated to produce research has considerable consequence for the attainment of institutional accreditation. In other words, accreditation creates

pressure to recruit faculty with doctoral degrees that suggest sufficient research ability to satisfy school designated research standards.

The attractiveness of any particular university is, in part, attributable to the colleagues that reside in the target department. Therefore, there is a self-fulfilling component to the attraction of good faculty. Once a productive researcher locates at a particular school, that school becomes more attractive to others, especially if they envision co-authoring with that person. Conversely, a school can be made less attractive by departures of such cornerstone faculty. Thus, the assets possessed by a school should include the human capital of their resident faculty. Even though the tools that enable research today partially can overcome the disadvantages of inadequate proximity to co-authors, propinquity still matters in labor market decision-making.

This research has not attempted to evaluate what role compensation plays in the decision of accounting Ph.D. holders to take certain positions. Competitive financial remuneration would certainly be an important vector that a potential employee would weigh. Given “seller’s market” conditions, it seems unlikely that schools, otherwise low in quality, could succeed in recruiting by having higher than market wages. More likely, is the possibility that a school that would otherwise be quite attractive to accounting academics would not be considered because of remuneration inadequacy. The latter is more likely because of the increase in wages attributable to the inadequate supply of qualified faculty (Leslie, 2008). Therefore, competitive wages would seem a necessary but not sufficient criterion for successful recruiting. The lack of good data here would necessitate experimental research designs to further this inquiry. How much salary a candidate would sacrifice to attain other elements of institutional quality exists as a provocative question. Although the premium paid by research-intensive doctoral programs is unlikely to be duplicated in the non-doctoral sector, consequential intra-sector variations might exist. Compensation differences are likely to be larger and therefore, more important for faculty recruited later in their career since such will reflect early career productivity differences.

This paper could be classified as proximate to the broader inquiry into why accounting doctoral students and seasoned faculty select the jobs that they do. A full decision model is well beyond the scope of this paper. However, as a first step in this direction, this paper illustrates that some schools have a systematic advantage over others in the competition for faculty. Future work will have to detail the nature of this edge, and to identify the circumstances where it can be furthered or overcome.

This work does not imply that the doctoral school credentials of prospective faculty candidates are equally important to all those in a position to extend them employment offers. Acceptance of this idea exists on a continuum from those that believe that this pedigree is overwhelmingly important to those that mostly ignore it. The paper supports the premise that enough people use this information to create considerable regularity for placement results over time. However, since credentials do not always deliver the research productivity that it implies, more factors are involved in successful recruiting.

This research strongly asserts that the relative merits of a non-doctoral program should not be the research productivity of resident faculty. Doing so would judge non-doctoral programs on the same research-centric criteria used for the doctoral programs, and ignore the more balanced ambitions of the non-doctoral sector. However since those other goals (e.g., quality teaching, community service) cannot be well measured, an indirect research criterion is used. If candidates with relatively strong research credentials (the currency of the realm throughout the academy) accept

positions at certain non-doctoral programs they must be reacting to a differentially appealing environment.

This research does not mean to imply that high quality faculty do not exist at lesser ranked doctoral programs. Instead, these findings support the more limited notion that, *ceteris paribus*, those faculty tended to be graduates of doctoral programs less respected for their research. This attribute gave them less opportunity to obtain employment at a wider set of schools. What faculty make of the opportunities offered them by the stratified job market (see Fogarty et al. 2012) might more directly pertain to their individual qualities. Such an investigation unfortunately lies outside of the aims of this paper.

The study does not attempt to get “inside the head” of the parties in the labor market. More surveys on this topic might produce valued self-insights from faculty about why they took the positions that they did from the choices that they had. However, such work tends to ask newly hired faculty “more than they could know” (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977) and tempts post-decisional rationalization. The current research accepted the results of their employment choice and examined it for patterns and regularities. This approach accepts the actual decision-making process as a black box into which certain inputs are made, and outputs are extracted. Thus, the work is primarily descriptive and is humbly offered as a first step in a relatively new direction of inquiry.

Also left to future study is the reasons why schools with better recruiting ability have this advantage. Such an analysis would require a detailed archival research design into collateral dimensions such as endowments, student admission selectivity and institutional size. *Ceteris paribus*, faculty prefer schools with large endowments, high admission selectivity and modest size. Schools with these advantages that do not convert them into a recruiting advantage may have disciplinary priorities that do not run to the benefit of accounting faculty.

REFERENCES

- American Accounting Association. 2005. *Supply and Demand for Accounting Ph.D.s.* (Sarasota, FL: American Accounting Association).
- Buchheit, S., D. Collins, and A. Reitenga. 2002. A Cross-Discipline Comparison of Top-Tier Academic Journal Publication Rates: 1997-1995. *Journal of Accounting Education* (Vol. 20) 123-130.
- Burke, D. 1988. *A New Academic Marketplace.* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).
- Campbell, D., J. Gaertner, and R. Vecchio. 1983. Perceptions of Promotion and Tenure Criteria: A Survey of Accounting Educators. *Journal of Accounting Education* (Vol. 1) 83-92.
- Caplow, E., and R. McGee. 1956. *The Academic Marketplace.* (New York, NY: Basic Book).
- Dillard, J. 2002. Dialectical Possibilities of Thwarted Responsibilities. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* (Vol. 13) 621-641.
- Eaton, T., and S. Hunt. 2002. Job Search and Selection by Academic Accountants: New and Relocating Faculty. *Journal of Accounting Education* (Vol. 20) 67-84.
- Everett, J., B. Klamm, and R. Stoltzfus. 2004. Developing Benchmarks for Evaluating Publication Records at Doctoral Programs in Accounting. *Journal of Accounting Education* (Vol. 22) 299-252.
- Flowerdew, R. 1992. Labour Market Operation and Geographical Mobility, in T-Champion and T-Fielding (eds.) *Migration Processes and Patterns, Vol. 1* (London: Belhaven.)

- Fogarty, T. 1995. A Ranking to End All Rankings: A Meta-Analysis and Critique of Studies Ranking Academic Accounting Departments. *Accounting Perspectives* (Vol. 1) 1-22.
- _____, and G. Markarian. 2007. An Empirical Assessment of the Rise and Fall of Academic Accounting as an Academic Discipline. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Vol. 22) 137-161.
- _____, D. Saftner, and J. Hasselback. 2012. Knowing One's Place: The Distribution of New Accounting Academics into a Segmented US Labor Market. *Journal of Accounting Education* (Vol. 29) 98-99.
- Gioia, D., and K. Corley. 2002. Being Good versus Looking Good: Business School Rankings and the Circean Transformation from Substances to Image. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. (Vol. 1) 107-120.
- Glover, S., D. Prawitt, and D. Wood. 2006. Publication Records of Faculty Promoted at the Top 75 Accounting Research Programs. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Vol. 21) 195-215.
- Hasselback, J. 1986, 1996, 2006, 2007, 2010. 2011. *Accounting Faculty Directory*. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- _____, and A. Reinstein 1995. A Proposal for Measuring Scholarly Productivity of Accounting Faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Vol. 10) 269-306.
- Howard, T., and L. Nikolai. 1992. An Analysis of the Organizational Interaction of Accounting Departments Revisited. *Accounting Educators' Journal* (Vol. 2) 53-68.
- Hunt, S. 2004. The Initial Interview: Job Search of Accounting Ph.D. Candidates and Relocating Faculty. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* (Vol. 8) 91-105.
- Leslie, D. 2008. *Accounting Faculty in U.S. Colleges and Universities: Status and Trends*. (Sarasota, FL: American Accounting Association).
- Lewis, L. 1997. *Scaling the Ivory Tower: Merits and its Limits in Academic Careers*. (New York, NY: Transaction Publishers).
- Nisbett, R., and T. Wilson. 1977. Telling More than We Can Know. *Psychological Review* (Vol. 84) 231-259.
- Ostrowski, B. 1986. First-Time Accounting Faculty: The Job Search, Acceptance and Support Processes. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Vol. 1) 48-35.
- Richardson, J. 2009. Geographic Flexibility in Academia: A Cautionary Tale. *British Journal of Management* (Vol. 20) 160-170.
- Schachter, J. 2004. Geographic Mobility 2002-2003 in *Current Population Reports* (Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau).
- Swanson, E. 2004. Publishing in the Majors: A Comparison of Accounting, Finance, Management and Marketing. *Contemporary Accounting Research*. (Vol. 21) 223-255.
- Vaughn, J. 2010. Accreditation, Commercial Ratings and New Approaches to Assessing the Quality of University Research and Education Programs in the United States. *Higher Education in Europe* (Vol. 27) 433-441.
- Wu, J. Q. Hao, and M. Yao. 2009. Ranking of Academic Journals in Accounting, Finance, and Information System. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management* (Vol. 17) 66-105.