The Initial Job Selections of New Accounting Professors

Michael E. Bitter

Stetson University

Abstract

The strong market for new accounting faculty coupled with the significant costs of recruiting faculty necessitates an understanding of the preferences of job candidates by employer institutions. Candidates for entry-level positions could also benefit from an understanding of the past experiences of their peers.

This study explores the initial job selections of new accounting faculty. A survey of 196 individuals who accepted an entry-level accounting faculty position during 1996 or 1997 resulted in one hundred seventeen usable responses.

Thirty-eight of the 54 variables in the survey were rated "somewhat important" or "important." Generally, respondents at teaching-oriented schools and schools without doctoral programs regarded personal variables as more important, while respondents at research-oriented schools and schools with doctoral programs placed more importance on research-related variables and graduate education.

Factor analyses indicated that respondents sought adequate research resources, low service expectations, and good benefits from a school located in an area which would afford them quality of life outside of work. Contrary to prior research, compensation variables were not included in any of the reported factors.

Regardless of affiliation and consistent with prior research, the typical faculty work load included a significant research component and research effectiveness was perceived as the most important criteria for promotion and tenure.

Introduction

A significant decline in the supply of new accounting doctorates coupled with increased demand has resulted in a strong market for entry level accounting professors. As such and because of the significant cost of recruiting new faculty, academic employers could benefit from gaining a better understanding of the preferences and desires of job candidates. Candidates for entry-level positions could also benefit from understanding the variables deemed important by their peers and the characteristics of the positions that were accepted.

This study explores the initial job selections of new accounting faculty. Information was gathered from 117 new faculty regarding the variables that were most important to their selection process and about the position that each ultimately accepted.

The motivation for the study is further discussed in the next section. The sections following review prior research, present the research methodology, discuss the results, and provide a summary.

Note: The author wishes to thank the Stetson University Summer Research Grant program for its financial support of this project, Jenny VanGemert for her assistance in data collection and entry, and two anonymous reviewers and Associate Editor Alan Reinstein for their helpful comments. Requests for data should be addressed to the author.

Motivation for Study

In recent years, the supply of new doctorates in accounting has declined dramatically. In fact, the number of doctoral degrees awarded in accounting fell from 199 degrees in 1992 to 124 degrees in 1998 [Hasselback 2000], a decrease of 38 percent.

This decline, coupled with increasing market demand due to position backlog, the creation of new programs, turnover, and retirements, has resulted in a shortage of qualified accounting professors [AACSB 1998]. For example, based on a survey of its 434 member institutions, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) found that, for the 1998-99 academic year, there were 2.0 job openings per accounting doctoral graduate. A total of 273 positions remained unfilled that year, a vacancy rate of 7.7 percent [AACSB 1999].

The strong market for new doctorates in accounting may well continue into the foreseeable future if the limited supply of graduates persists and demand continues to grow. Given this imbalance and because faculty recruiting is an expensive and time-consuming endeavor, it is important for academic employers to understand the preferences and priorities of accounting doctoral graduates selecting their first position. By doing so, employers can evaluate their competitive position and potentially improve the overall effectiveness of their recruiting efforts. For example, institutions with salary constraints may be able to offset this limitation by emphasizing their strong points (such as low cost of living, a favorable geographic location, or reasonable promotion and tenure criteria) that are of importance to candidates.

Doctoral students nearing entry into the job market could benefit from an understanding of the variables considered in the recruiting process by their peers and the characteristics of the jobs that are being accepted. Survey results might also be of interest to individuals contemplating doctoral study and a career in accounting education.

Therefore, the purpose of the study is to explore the initial job selections of new accounting faculty. First, the variables that are most important to the selection process are identified. Second, information about the positions accepted is gathered, including data on teaching load, work load mix, research mix, and tenure/promotion criteria.

Prior Research

Kida and Mannino [1980] (hereafter referred to as K&M) examined the job selection criteria of accounting doctoral students and "seasoned" faculty by collecting importance ratings for 30 selected variables. Doctoral students rated compatibility with other faculty and the criteria used for promotion and tenure as most important. Research support and compatibility with other faculty were most important to faculty at schools with doctoral programs, while faculty at schools without doctoral programs indicated that geographic location and base salary were most important. Factor analyses of the importance ratings indicated that both doctoral students and faculty were most concerned with financial (e.g., salary, fringe benefits, cost of living) and research-related (e.g., research support) factors. More specifically, faculty at doctoral institutions favored research-related factors, while faculty at schools without doctoral programs were more concerned with financial factors.

K&M also asked respondents to identify the emphasis they would like their employer to place on teaching, publishing and service for promotion and tenure purposes as well as the emphasis desired on differing levels of education. Based on an allocation of 100 points, doctoral students desired a position that emphasized teaching (50 percent) at the

undergraduate level (49 percent). Faculty, in general, also desired a position that emphasized teaching (51 percent) at the undergraduate level (52 percent).

Not surprisingly, faculty at doctoral schools placed more emphasis on publishing and less on teaching than doctoral students and faculty at non-doctoral schools. Faculty at doctoral schools also placed more emphasis on gradate education and less on undergraduate education compared to doctoral students and faculty at non-doctoral schools.

Ostrowski [1986] studied the job search, acceptance, and support experiences of first-time accounting faculty. Of relevance are her findings on job acceptance. Candidates who had received more than one job offer cited the work environment as most important to their decision. The "total money package" and the nonwork environment tied for second.

Respondents were asked to list and rank the most important characteristics of an ideal work environment and an ideal nonwork environment. Only two characteristics, research support and harmony among faculty (both "work environment" characteristics), were cited by the majority of the respondents.

Holland and Arrington [1987] studied the relocation decisions of experienced accounting faculty. The study was modeled after K&M, but focused on experienced faculty that had actually relocated. Four of the five variables rated as most important were personal rather than professional. Holland and Arrington concluded that while professional variables are more important to the initial job choice, personal variables are most important to relocation decisions. A factor analysis of the data found that financial variables are of diminishing importance to the relocation decision relative to the initial job choice decision. Not surprisingly, when Holland and Arrington compared faculty at doctoral institutions to those at non-doctoral schools, "doctoral" faculty rated research-related variables as more important than did the other faculty.

Finally, Hermanson, et al. [1996] (hereafter referred to as HHII) examined the teaching, research, and service expectations of new (entry-level) accounting faculty and the resources available to them. Of relevance to this study are the work load differences between faculty at doctoral schools and those at non-doctoral schools (both accredited and non-accredited). As might be expected, new hires at doctoral schools taught fewer courses and had fewer preparations than those at non-doctoral schools, didn't spend as much of their work time on teaching activities, and perceived teaching effectiveness to be less important to tenure and promotion decisions.

HHII also found that while all schools required publication in refereed journals, doctoral institutions had the highest expectations and provided the most research support. Faculty at doctoral schools spent much more of their work time on research than those at non-doctoral schools and research-effectiveness was viewed as vital to the tenure and promotion process at doctoral institutions.

My study differs from these earlier works in two important ways. First, it provides data on new accounting faculty who had recently completed (in 1996 or 1997) their initial job selection process, thus updating the findings of prior research. K&M [1980] surveyed "seasoned" faculty members who had received their doctoral degree between 1972 and 1975 and students who were enrolled in a Ph.D. program in 1978. Ostrowski [1986] surveyed first-time faculty who started their jobs in 1981. HHII [1996] surveyed those receiving a doctoral degree in 1991-1994 and beginning employment as an assistant professor during 1992-1994.

Second, the study focuses on the variables that were actually considered in the job selection process and the characteristics of the position ultimately accepted. K&M [1980], while researching job selection criteria, focused on Ph.D. students (who had not yet made an actual job selection decision) and "seasoned" faculty members (who had made their initial job selections two to five years prior). The job acceptance decision was only a small part of Ostrowski's [1986] research. Her discussion of job acceptance centered on characteristics of the ideal work environment rather than on the specific variables that influenced the decision. Holland and Arrington [1987] researched the relocation decisions of experienced faculty. HHII [1996] focused on the expectations of new faculty rather than on the job selection process. HHII's findings with regard to certain teaching and promotion/tenure expectations are updated by this study.

Research Methodology

Subjects

A two page survey was mailed to individuals with doctorates (or who were ABD) who had accepted an entry-level accounting faculty position at a U.S. college or university during 1996 or 1997. The mailing list was compiled from Hasselback's 1998-1999 Accounting Faculty Directory. To encourage response, subjects were provided with a postage-paid return envelope, guaranteed anonymity, and offered an executive summary of the results.

Research Instrument

The research instrument contained three sections. The first listed 54 variables that may be important to the initial job selections of accounting faculty.1 For presentation purposes, the 54 variables were judgmentally categorized into one of two groups--institutional variables and personal variables. The institutional variables group was further subdivided into eight categories: general, compensation, teaching, research support, service, faculty/administration, facilities, and resources.

Subjects were asked to indicate the relative importance of each variable to their selection process using a five point scale ranging from "1" (not important) to "5" (very important). They were also given the option of selecting "NA" (not applicable to their decision). Subjects were also provided with space to identify any other variables of importance to their decision.

Section two included questions about the respondent's chosen position (teaching load, level of teaching assignments, summer teaching, work load mix, research mix, and promotion/tenure weightings) and institution (geographic location, funding, description, degree programs, accreditation, enrollment and faculty size).2 Section three requested demographic information.

Analysis

Mean importance ratings for each variable were computed for the overall sample as well as for four partitions of the sample (hereafter called sub-samples): respondents at research-oriented (R-O) institutions, teaching-oriented (T-O) institutions, schools with an

---

1.. The variables included in the survey were based upon the work of K&M [1980] and Holland and Arrington [1987], the experiences of faculty colleagues, and the author's experience as both a candidate and a search committee member.

2.. Some of the work load information included in this section was adapted from HHII [1996], and Holland and Arrington [1987], and K&M [1980].

accounting-related doctoral program (DOC), and schools without a doctoral program (NONDOC). The responses from those at R-O and T-O schools as well as DOC and NONDOC schools are expected to differ in many cases due to varying missions and faculty expectations.[3]

The Mann-Whitney U (MW) test was used to determine the extent to which institutional attributes (R-O, T-O, DOC or NONDOC) impacted respondents' importance ratings for each of the 54 variables.[4] Factor analyses were also completed for the overall sample and the four sub-samples.

Results

Characteristics of Respondents

Surveys were mailed to 196 entry level faculty. Usable responses were received from 117 of them, yielding a response rate of 60 percent. The majority of the respondents were white (76 percent) and married (74 percent) and had completed their doctoral degree prior to beginning work (57 percent). The average age of the respondents was 38.

On a satisfaction scale ranging from one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied), respondents indicated that they were satisfied (4.07) with their school and position. Therefore, it can be inferred that the variables of importance to the initial job decision are also fairly predictive of the level of job satisfaction experienced. See Table 1.

The profile of the typical respondent's employer was as follows: a public (66 percent), teaching-oriented (68 percent) and research-oriented (54 percent) institution located in the southeast (26 percent), midwest (21 percent), or northeast (21 percent). The vast majority of the respondents' institutions offered an accounting-related bachelor degree (87 percent) and a MBA degree (82 percent) and were AACSB accredited (81 percent). Sixty-two percent of the institutions offered an accounting master's degree and 39 percent offered an accounting-related doctoral degree.

The enrollments for employer institutions ranged from 1,100 to 50,000 students, with an average of 15,960 students. The average accounting faculty numbered twelve full-time, tenured/tenure-track members. See Table 2.

Descriptive Results

Variables with a mean importance rating exceeding four were interpreted as "important" to the hiring decision, while mean ratings ranging from three to four were interpreted as "somewhat important." Where appropriate, the results are compared with those of prior research. Specifically, comparisons are made to K&M's "Ph.D. Students" sample[5] and to

---

3.. While most, if not all, DOC schools are research-oriented, not all research-oriented schools have doctoral programs. Further, some respondents, at both DOC and NONDOC schools, consider their institutions to be both teaching-oriented and research-oriented. As such, I will examine R-O and T-O subsamples as well as DOC and NONDOC sub-samples as unique groups even though a particular respondent's institution could fall into as many as three of these sub-samples.

Consideration was initially given to comparing only three subsamples--respondents at DOC schools, NONDOC schools that were research-oriented, and NONDOC schools that were teaching-oriented. Unfortunately, the NONDOC/research-oriented subsample contained only 20 respondents.

Consideration was also given to comparing two other subsamples--AACSB accredited schools and nonaccredited schools. However, only 18 respondents indicated that they were not AACSB accredited.

4.. Consistent with K&M [1980], this non-parametric test was used to avoid the assumptions of parametric t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

5.. K&M's Ph.D. student sample is used rather than their "seasoned" faculty samples as the ratings of Ph.D. students are likely to be more comparable to those of new accounting faculty.

HHII's samples of new accounting faculty at doctoral, non-doctoral accredited, and non-accredited institutions.

Overall Sample. Six of the 54 variables had a mean importance rating above four. Three of these were concerned with the faculty at the employer institution: the compatibility of the respondent with the faculty (4.47), the collegiality of the faculty (4.41), and the quality of the faculty (4.23). Two teaching factors, teaching load (4.14) and the opportunity to teach desired courses (4.03), and one personal factor, happiness of the respondent's spouse and/or family (4.47), were also among the six.

Thirty-two of the remaining 48 variables had a mean importance rating above three. Variables relating to tenure and promotion, the likelihood of obtaining tenure (3.99) and promotion/tenure criteria (3.91), and personal matters, overall nonprofessional quality of life (3.95) and the geographic location of the school (3.91), rated very highly among this group. Note that base salary (3.91) just missed ranking among the top ten variables. See Table 3. Sixteen subjects chose to add an additional variable that had been important to their decision.[6]

Subsamples. Four variables (three of them faculty-related) had a mean importance rating exceeding four for all four sub-samples: compatibility with faculty, happiness of the spouse and family, collegiality of the faculty, and quality of the faculty. Additionally, four research-related variables had an importance rating exceeding four from respondents comprising the R-O and DOC sub-samples: computing resources, reputation of the department, research support, and research interests of the faculty. Respondents from both T-O and NONDOC schools gave the likelihood of obtaining tenure, the overall nonprofessional quality of life, promotion and tenure criteria, and the geographic location of the school mean importance ratings above four. See Table 3.

Subsample Differences. The mean importance ratings of respondents at R-O schools differed from those of respondents at other schools for 20 of the 54 variables. In particular, respondents at R-O schools rated 10 research-related variables and three variables related to graduate education as more important. Alternatively, these respondents did not rate four of the personal variables as highly as other respondents. They also did not rate the likelihood of obtaining tenure as highly, perhaps acknowledging that obtaining tenure at R-O schools is rather difficult and therefore not a primary consideration in job selection.

The mean importance ratings of respondents at T-O schools differed from those at other schools for only ten variables. Not surprisingly, these respondents rated two research-related variables and the two doctoral education variables as less important. However, the respondents placed more importance on two personal variables (geographic location and ties to the region) and compatibility with the department chair and dean.

Differences between the mean importance ratings of respondents at DOC and NONDOC schools were significant for 21 of the 54 variables. For example, those at DOC schools rated nine research-related variables, a variable that could potentially impact research effectiveness (teaching load), and the two doctoral education variables as more important than did those at NONDOC schools. Alternatively, respondents at NONDOC schools rated four personal variables as more important than those at DOC schools. See Table 3.

6.. Five subjects indicated that their chosen position represented their best or only job offer. Another six respondents listed a variable that was related to the geographic location of the school. Two subjects cited the recruiting process and the recruiter.

Comparison of Importance Ratings with K&M

To facilitate comparisons with K&M, the differences in the number of variables (30 in K&M versus 54 in this study) and the rating scale employed (a four point scale by K&M versus a five point scale by this study) were overcome by focusing on variable rankings based on mean importance scores. Specifically, K&M's ranking of variables for the Ph.D. sample was compared to a ranking of comparable variables for the overall sample in this study.7 Ranking order differences exceeding three were judgmentally deemed to be significant.

There were six variables that were rated significantly higher by respondents in this study. These included two personal variables (happiness of spouse/family and ties to the region) and two institutional variables (likelihood of obtaining tenure and reputation of the department) as well as travel funds and class size. Five variables were rated significantly lower. Respondents to this study placed less importance on three institutional variables (promotion/tenure criteria, existence of a masters program, and history/funding of pay raises) as well as research support and cost of living. See Table 4.

Overall, it appears that the variables of importance to respondents in this study are fairly comparable to those important to the Ph.D. students in K&M's study. Three variables that were not included in K&M's survey, but that were rated highly in this study include collegiality of faculty, quality of faculty, and the overall nonprofessional quality of life.

Factor Analyses

Given the redundancy inherent in a 54 item questionnaire and in the interest of providing a more manageable set of variables with which to understand the hiring process, responses were factor analyzed. The analyses employed a varimax rotation in order to eliminate multicollinearity problems. A factor loading of .60 was used as a cutoff point for inclusion of a variable within a factor. An eigenvalue cutoff of 1.0 yielded 15 factors for the aggregate sample and for each of the sub-samples. In the interest of parsimony, a scree test of the eigenvalues (as suggested by Catrell 1966) was used to reduce the number of factors. Table 5 summarizes loadings for the remaining factors. These factors were then descriptively labeled and are presented in Table 6.

Overall. The factor explaining the most variance in the data space (10 percent) was labeled Research Resources I. Variables comprising this factor were teaching load, research support, travel funds, computing resources, and databases/tapes. The Service Requirements factor (which included student advising, department/school service, university service, and professional service) accounted for another seven percent of the variance. The Benefits factor, also explaining seven percent of the variance, included retirement benefits, other benefits, and state taxes. The Quality of Life/Location factor, explaining five percent of the variance, was comprised of geographic location, location: urban-suburban-rural, availability of recreation/culture, and overall nonprofessional quality of life.

It appears that new faculty sought positions at schools providing adequate research resources, having low service expectations, offering good benefits, and located in an area which would afford them quality of life outside of work. The importance placed on research resources and benefits is consistent with the findings of K&M. Unlike K&M,

7.. Twenty-nine variables were identified that were comparable to those of K&M.

compensation variables (such as base salary and history/funding of pay raises) were not included in any of the reported factors.

R-O Institutions. Similar to the overall sample, the Research Resources II and Service Requirements factors explained the most variance in the data space (eight percent each) for R-O schools. The Research Resources II factor (as opposed to the Research Resources I factor for the overall sample) included the availability of summer grants and excluded teaching load.

The third factor, Facilities/Compensation, included state taxes, availability of summer teaching, classrooms, and faculty offices. The mean importance ratings for these four variables were uniformly low, indicating that none of the variables were overly important to respondents' decisions. In summary, new faculty taking jobs at R-O schools focused on positions providing an environment conducive to research--adequate resources and low service expectations.

T-O Institutions. The Service Requirements factor explained the most variance for T-O schools (eight percent). Factor two, the Benefits factor, accounted for seven percent of the variance and included retirement benefits, other benefits, and state taxes. The Doctoral Education factor, also explaining seven percent of the variance, included the existence and quality of a doctoral program. Mean responses to both these variables were very low (below two) and were significantly lower than the mean ratings of other respondents, indicating that a doctoral program was unimportant to respondents employed by T-O schools.

The fourth factor, Research Resources III, also accounted for seven percent of the variance and was similar to the Research Resources II factor for R-O schools, except that it excluded travel funds and included library resources. In summary, respondents at T-O schools preferred positions at schools that had low service expectations, provided good benefits and research resources, and did not support a doctoral program.

DOC vs. NONDOC Schools. Factor analyses yielded four primary factors for DOC institutions versus three for NONDOC schools. The top factor for respondents at both schools, accounting for eight percent of the variance, was Service Requirements. Apparently, low service expectations are universally desirable to new faculty. The remaining factors for DOC schools revolved around research and graduate education. The Research Support factor, also accounting for eight percent of the variance, included research support, travel funds, and the availability of summer grants. The Doctoral Education II factor was composed of the existence and quality of a doctoral program and the university/school/department's mission. The Graduate Education factor included the existence and quality of master's programs. Both factors accounted for seven percent of the variance.

Factor two for NONDOC schools was Compensation, which included base salary, retirement benefits, other benefits, and state taxes and accounted for seven percent of the variance. Respondents at NONDOC schools were also interested in research support, albeit a different type of support than that desired by those at R-O schools. The Research Support II factor, also accounting for seven percent of the variance, included research support, the research interests of the faculty, and outside support for faculty endeavors.

In summary, new faculty at DOC schools sought positions with low service expectations, adequate research support, and a commitment to quality graduate education. Respondents from NONDOC schools shared a desire for low service expectations and adequate research support, but were also concerned with compensation packages.

Profile of Teaching Assignments and Load

Respondents at semester (quarter) system schools averaged five (five) classes and two (three) preparations per academic year (excluding summer) and taught three (two) days per week. Respondents at R-O and DOC schools, on average, taught fewer classes with fewer preparations. See Panel A of Table 7. These findings are consistent with those of HHII, where teaching loads ranged from an average of four classes per year with 1.9 preparations for new faculty at doctoral schools to 6.2 classes with 3.6 preparations for new faculty at non-accredited institutions.

Overall, respondents taught primarily upper division courses (48 percent), splitting the remainder of their teaching load between introductory (27 percent) and graduate courses (25 percent). These findings indicate a significant change in teaching mix over the past 20 years. K&M found that Ph.D. students preferred to spend more time teaching at the graduate level (51 percent) than the undergraduate level (49 percent).

Respondents at R-O and DOC schools spent more time teaching upper division and graduate courses and less time teaching introductory courses than respondents at T-O and NONDOC schools. See Panel B of Table 7. Given the emphasis of R-O and DOC institutions on graduate education and the likely availability of graduate assistants to teach introductory courses, this finding is not unexpected. These results are also consistent with the findings of HHII, where the teaching mix ranged from 29 percent (71 percent) at the graduate (undergraduate) level for new faculty at doctoral schools to 13 percent (87 percent) at the graduate (undergraduate) level for new faculty at non-accredited schools.

Thirty-six percent of the respondents teach summer school and, on average, teach two courses. Respondents at T-O and NONDOC schools are much more likely to teach summer school (43 percent and 47 percent, respectively) than are those at R-O and DOC schools (24 percent and 20 percent, respectively). See Panel C of Table 7.

Profile of Work Load and Tenure/Promotion Criteria

Respondents were asked to estimate their work load mix. Overall, the average work load was split almost evenly between teaching (46 percent) and research (43 percent), with only 11 percent of respondents' time devoted to service activities. As might be expected, the research component of the work load at R-O (51 percent) and DOC (55 percent) schools dominated. The reverse was true at T-O and NONDOC schools, although research did consume a significant amount of respondents' efforts (39 percent and 36 percent, respectively). See Panel A of Table 8.

These findings are consistent with those of HHII, where the average work load mix ranged from 47 percent teaching, 48 percent research, and six percent service for new faculty at doctoral schools to 62 percent teaching, 27 percent research, and 12 percent service for new faculty at non-accredited schools. Additionally, in comparison with HHII, my results suggest that the importance placed on research continues to grow at both DOC and NONDOC schools.

Of the research that was being conducted by the respondents, the vast majority (81 percent) was focused toward academic journals. While academic journals were obviously the focus of respondents at R-O (91 percent) and DOC (93 percent) schools, it was surprising that respondents at T-O and NONDOC schools were so much more focused on publishing in academic journals (75 percent and 72 percent, respectively) as opposed to practitioner journals (19 percent and 21 percent, respectively). See Panel B of Table 8.

Respondents were also asked to indicate their perception of the importance of teaching, research, and service effectiveness in tenure and promotion decisions at their schools. Overall, and for each of the four sub-samples, research effectiveness was perceived as most important. See Panel C of Table 8. This represents a major shift in focus over the past twenty years. In K&M, Ph.D. students desired a relative emphasis on teaching (50 percent) for promotion and tenure purposes, with less emphasis placed on research (32 percent) and service (19 percent).

My findings, however, are consistent with research subsequent to K&M (e.g., HHII; Schultz, et al. 1989; and Street, et al. 1993), although the magnitude of the difference between the importance ratings for research and teaching by respondents at T-O and NONDOC schools was a bit unexpected considering that these schools typically require heavier teaching and service loads (as indicated in Panel A).

Summary

Overall, there were a number of variables important to the initial job selection decision. In fact, 38 of the 54 variables listed in the survey received a mean importance rating exceeding three ("somewhat important"); six of these variables received a mean importance rating higher than four ("important"). Rated most important were three faculty-related variables (compatibility with faculty, collegiality of faculty, and quality of faculty) and the happiness of the spouse and family. The mean importance rating for these four variables exceeded four ("important") for each of the four sub-samples as well.

Respondents at T-O and NONDOC schools, on average, rated personal variables as more important than those at R-O and DOC schools, while respondents at R-O and DOC schools rated research-related and graduate education variables as more important. Generally, the variables of importance identified in this study are comparable to those important to K&M's Ph.D. student sample. However, the importance of certain personal variables (happiness of spouse/family and ties to the region) and institutional variables (likelihood of obtaining tenure, reputation of the department, and class size) was rated significantly higher by respondents in this study. Financial variables (cost of living and history/funding of pay raises), promotion/tenure criteria, and research support were rated as less important than by K&M's respondents.

Factor analyses for the overall sample and the four sub-samples shed additional light on the variables of importance to new faculty. Overall, respondents sought adequate research resources, low service expectations, and good benefits from a school located in an area which would afford them quality of life outside of work.

The importance placed on research resources and benefits is consistent with the findings of K&M. Contrary to K&M, however, compensation variables were not included in any of the reported factors.

The typical respondent taught five classes per year with two preparations. Respondents at R-O and DOC schools generally taught fewer classes with fewer preparations. Respondents from R-O and DOC schools, on average, taught over 70 percent of their classes at the upper division or graduate level. Respondents from T-O and NONDOC schools tended to teach less at the graduate level and more at the introductory level. Thirty-six percent of respondents taught summer school. Respondents at T-O and NONDOC schools were much more likely to teach summer school than those at R-O and DOC schools.

Not surprisingly, the work load of respondents at R-O and DOC schools was weighted heavily (over 50 percent) toward research. While the work load for respondents at T-O and

NONDOC schools was more heavily weighted toward teaching, it still contained a significant research component. This is consistent with prior research that has found that research has become an increasingly important part of the faculty work load. Regardless of affiliation, respondents reported that the vast majority of their research was targeted toward academic journals and that research effectiveness was the most important criteria for tenure and promotion.

What are the implications of my research for employer institutions? My findings reinforce the importance of taking great care in identifying candidates that are a good "fit" with the institution and, particularly, its faculty. Certain candidates will never be happy at research-oriented schools, just as others will not find happiness at a teaching-oriented school. A poor fit can lead to mutual unhappiness, lower productivity, and, eventually, turnover.

While compensation (realistically) will always carry weight, it appears that personal factors (particularly the happiness of one's spouse and family and quality of life) are more important to the job selection decision. As noted, research continues to become an increasingly important part of the faculty work load and research effectiveness is generally perceived as the most important factor for tenure and promotion purposes. As such, schools need to support the research efforts of their new faculty, whether that be in the form of fewer courses and/or preps (if possible), funding for travel, summer grants, limited service requirements, or other forms of research support.

What are the implications of this research for current doctoral students? Compensation, while important, is not everything. A job candidate needs to carefully consider each potential employer institution, thoughtfully evaluating its faculty, its work load mix and promotion/tenure criteria, its support of faculty research, and the nonwork environment to identify the best match. The profiles of accepted positions summarized in Table 7 and Table 8 may be particularly helpful in evaluating job offers. A poor match may well lead to unhappiness, premature turnover, and a less productive start to one's career.

The findings of this study are subject to certain limitations. First, information provided on the survey was self-reported and may contain errors or omissions. Second, as with most survey research and despite a 60 percent response rate, the results may not be representative of the population due to nonresponse bias. Respondents to this survey indicated a high level of satisfaction with their positions. Perhaps those who were not as satisfied were not motivated to respond. Finally, the survey was sent to faculty accepting their first position during 1996 and 1997. Thus, it is impossible to know whether the findings will hold true in subsequent years.

References

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. 1999. Demand for business Ph.D.S continues slow rise, while doctoral production falls steadily. ***Newsline*** (Spring).

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. 1998. Is a real shortage looming? Doctoral faculty demand edges upward again. ***Newsline*** (Summer).

Bitter, M. E. 1999. An investigation of factors influencing the hiring of entry level accounting professors. ***The Accounting Educators' Journal*** (forthcoming).

Catrell, R. B. 1966. The scree test for the number of factors. ***Multivariate Behavioral Research*** (1): 245-276.

Hasselback, J. R. 2000. ***2000 - 2001 Accounting Faculty Directory***. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hermanson, D. R., H. M. Hermanson, D. M. Ivancevich, and S. H. Ivancevich. 1996. Perceived expectations and resources associated with new accounting faculty positions. ***Accounting Perspectives*** (1): 55-73.

Holland, R. G. and C. E. Arrington. 1987. Issues influencing the decision of accounting faculty to relocate. ***Issues in Accounting Education*** (Spring): 57-71.

Kida, T. E. and R. C. Mannino. 1980. Job selection of accounting Ph.D. students and faculty members. ***The Accounting Review*** (July): 491-500.

Ostrowski, B.A. 1986. First-time accounting faculty: The job search, acceptance, and support process. ***Issues in Accounting Education*** (1): 48-55.

Schultz, J. J., J. A. Meade, and I. Khurana. 1989. The changing roles of teaching, research, and service in the promotion and tenure decisions for accounting faculty. ***Issues in Accounting Education*** (Spring): 109-119.

Street, D. L., C. P. Baril, and R. L. Benke, Jr. 1993. Research, teaching, and service in promotion and tenure decisions of accounting faculty. ***Journal of Accounting Education*** (11): 43-60.

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

	Number	Percentage
Panel A:		
Number of Responses	**117**	**59.7%**
Race/Ethnicity:		
African American	2	1.7%
Asian American	2	1.7%
Native American	2	1.7%
White	89	76.1%
International	11	9.4%
Other	1	.9%
No Response	10	8.5%
Marital Status:		
Single	15	12.8%
Married	86	73.5%
Divorced	6	5.1%
Widowed	1	.9%
Other	3	2.6%
No Response	6	5.1%
Panel B:		
Age of Respondent:		
Average	38	
Range	29-56	
Number of Family Members Residing with Respondent:		
Average for Married	3	
Average for Divorced	2	
Panel C:		
Number of respondents completing their doctoral degree prior to beginning work at their new school	67	57.3%
Panel D:		
Mean level of satisfaction with school/position	4.07	

Note: Satisfaction measured on a scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

Table 2: Characteristics of Employer Institutions

Panel A: Employer Attributes

	Number	Percentage
Geographic Location:		
Far West	14	12.0%
Mid-Atlantic	9	7.7%
Midwest	25	21.4%
Northeast	24	20.5%
Southeast	30	25.6%
Southwest	12	10.3%
No Response	3	2.5%
Primary Funding:		
Public	77	65.8%
Private	37	31.6%
No Response	3	2.6%
Institutional Description:		
National Focus	25	21.4%
Regional Focus	53	45.3%
Research-Oriented	63	53.8%
Teaching-Oriented	80	68.4%
Accounting-Related/Supported		
Degree Programs:		
Bachelor degree	102	87.2%
Master of Accountancy Degree	72	61.5%
MBA Degree	96	82.1%
Other Master Degree	26	22.2%
Doctoral Degree	46	39.3%
AACSB Accreditation:		
Accredited Business Program	95	81.2%

Panel B: Employer Enrollment and Faculty Size

University Enrollment:	
Average	15,960
Range	1,100-50,000
Number of Full-Time Tenured/ Tenure-Track Faculty:	
Average	12
Range	1-30

Table 3: Variables Important to the Job Selection Process

		Mean Responses				
Variable	Type	Overall	R-O	T-O	DOC	NONDOC
Compatibility with faculty	FCAD	4.47	4.56	4.45	4.57	4.38
Happiness of spouse/family[8]	PSNL	4.47	4.47	4.46	4.35	4.54
Collegiality of faculty	FCAD	4.41	4.49	4.41	4.46	4.35
Quality of faculty	FCAD	4.23	4.38>	4.19	4.54	4.03
Teaching load	TCH	4.14	4.41>	4.03	4.52*	3.85
Opportunity to teach desired courses	TCH	4.03	4.14	3.90	4.15	3.91
Likelihood of obtaining tenure	GNRL	3.99	3.75<	4.18>	3.63*	4.26
Computing resources	RSRC	3.98	4.21>	3.89	4.26*	3.81
Overall nonprofessional quality of life	PSNL	3.95	3.67<	4.03	3.61*	4.18
Reputation of department	GNRL	3.93	4.19>	3.82	4.15*	3.76
Promotion/tenure criteria	GNRL	3.91	3.76	4.03	3.76	4.03
Base salary	CMPN	3.91	3.98	3.93	4.02	3.87
Geographic location of school	PSNL	3.91	3.47<	4.09>	3.29*	4.28
Research support	RSUP	3.81	4.25>	3.69	4.43*	3.40
Compatibility with department chair	FCAD	3.81	3.76	4.00>	3.83	3.82
Travel funds	RSUP	3.68	3.98>	3.63	4.09*	3.40
Research interests of faculty	FCAD	3.68	4.14>	3.41<	4.35*	3.25
Quality of students	GNRL	3.63	3.62	3.70	3.37*	3.81
AACSB accreditation	GNRL	3.59	3.56	3.69	3.46	3.72
Location: urban -suburban - rural	PSNL	3.59	3.27<	3.71	3.33*	3.79
Quality of under-graduate program	GNRL	3.54	3.40	3.72>	3.15*	3.87
Summer school compensation	CMPN	3.46	3.78>	3.33	3.91*	3.16
Extent of/reason for faculty turnover	FCAD	3.45	3.60	3.51	3.46	3.41
Class size	TCH	3.36	3.38	3.43	3.37	3.35
Library resources	RSRC	3.35	3.57>	3.31	3.54	3.25
Availability of recreation/culture	PSNL	3.34	3.14	3.41	3.09	3.47
Databases and COMPUSTAT/CRSP tapes	RSRC	3.29	3.78>	2.97<	3.98*	2.82
Retirement benefits	CMPN	3.28	3.25	3.35	3.15	3.40
Employment opportunities for spouse[9]	PSNL	3.28	3.33	3.32	3.14	3.39
Cost of living	PSNL	3.25	3.19	3.29	3.22	3.26
Availability of summer research grants	RSUP	3.23	3.90>	3.15	4.13*	2.68

[8] Means calculated for married respondents or respondents with family residing with them.
[9] Means calculated for married respondents only.

Table 3: Variables Important to the Job Selection Process

		Mean Responses				
Variable	**Type**	**Overall**	**R-O**	**T-O**	**DOC**	**NONDOC**
Quality of masters programs	GNRL	3.23	3.56>	3.15	3.52	3.00
Existence of masters program	GNRL	3.16	3.27	3.15	3.29	3.04
University/school/department mission	GNRL	3.12	3.25	3.20	3.09	3.12
Compatibility with dean	FCAD	3.09	3.08	3.24>	2.85	3.25
Other benefits	CMPN	3.08	3.08	3.16	2.96	3.19
Instructional resources	TCH	3.02	3.11	3.06	3.11	2.96
Outside support for faculty endeavors	RSRC	3.02	3.35>	2.91	3.30*	2.87
History/funding of pay raises	CMPN	2.98	3.11	2.99	3.07	2.91
Student placement	GNRL	2.90	2.84	2.95	2.74	3.03
Teaching night/ weekend classes	TCH	2.73	2.70	2.65	2.85	2.63
Classroom facilities	FCLT	2.71	2.56	2.77	2.46	2.87
Ties to region	PSNL	2.69	2.33<	3.03>	1.98*	3.19
Faculty offices	FCLT	2.63	2.54	2.65	2.46	2.76
Availability of summer teaching	TCH	2.50	2.37	2.58	2.28	2.60
State taxes	CMPN	2.45	2.46	2.44	2.41	2.50
Professional service	SRVC	2.38	2.52	2.41	2.35	2.39
Department/school service	SRVC	2.35	2.41	2.32	2.35	2.34
Existence of doctoral program	GNRL	2.28	3.14>	1.92<	3.80*	1.28
Faculty governance	GNRL	2.24	2.41	2.27	2.22	2.28
University service	SRVC	2.22	2.29	2.20	2.20	2.19
Student advising	SRVC	2.16	2.16	2.22	2.00	2.28
Quality of doctoral programs	GNRL	1.74	2.58>	1.33<	3.33 *	.64
Consulting opportunities	GNRL	1.71	1.56	1.74	1.41*	1.85

Key to acronyms:
CMPN – compensation
FCAD - faculty/administration
FCLT - facilities
GNRL - general institutional factors
PSNL - personal factors
RSRC – resources
RSUP - research support
SRVC - service
TCH - teaching

Notes:
* - significant difference between mean responses of respondents at DOC & NONDOC schools at.05 level
< - mean response significantly lower than that of all other respondents at.05 level.
> - mean response significantly higher than that of all other respondents at.05 level.

Table 4: Comparison of Rankings by Mean Response for Current Study vs. Kida & Mannino [1980]

Variables Rated Significantly Higher by Respondents in this Study vs. K&M's Ph.D. Student Respondents:

Variable	Rank Current Study	Rank K&M Study	Difference
Happiness of spouse/family	**2**	**8**	**6**
Likelihood of obtaining tenure	**5**	**13**	**8**
Reputation of department	**7**	**20**	**13**
Travel funds	**12**	**21**	**9**
Class size	**16**	**28**	**12**
Ties to region	**24**	**30**	**6**

Variables Rated Significantly Lower by Respondents in this Study vs. K&M's Ph.D. Student Respondents:

Promotion/tenure criteria	**8**	**2**	**-6**
Research support	**11**	**7**	**-4**
Cost of living	**20**	**14**	**-6**
Existence of masters program	**22**	**12**	**-10**
History/funding of pay raises	**23**	**15**	**-8**

Note: Rankings were based on the mean response for variables. For comparative purposes, variables included in my survey instrument, but not included in K&M's survey were excluded for ranking purposes. Ranking differences exceeding three were considered significant and are included above.

Table 5: Factor Groupings

Factor	Overall	R-O	T-O	DOC	NONDOC
Teaching load	1				
Research support	1	1	4	2	3
Travel funds	1	1		2	
Computing resources	1	1	4		
Databases and tapes	1	1	4		
Student advising	2	2	1	1	1
Department/school service	2	2	1	1	1
University service	2	2	1	1	1
Professional service	2	2	1	1	1
Retirement benefits	3		2		
Other benefits	3		2		
State taxes	3	3	2		2
Geographic location of school	4				
Location: urban-suburban-rural	4				
Availability of recreation/culture	4				
Overall nonprofessional qualityof life	4				
Availability of summer grants		1	2		
Availability of summer teaching		3			
Classrooms		3			
Faculty offices		3			
Existence of doctoral program			3	3	
Quality of doctoral program			3	3	
Library resources			4		
University/school/department mission				3	
Existence of masters program				4	
Quality of masters program				4	
Base salary					2
Retirement benefits					2
Other benefits					2
Research interests of faculty					3
Outside support for faculty endeavors					3
Total Variance Explained by Above Factors	29%	23%	29%	30%	22%
Total Variance Explained by All Significant Factors	73%	79%	77%	82%	78%

Table 6: Descriptive Factor Labels

Factor	Overall		R-O		T-O	
1	Research Resources I	**10%**	Research Resources II	**8%**	Service Requirements	**8%**
2	Service Requirements	**7%**	Service Requirements	**8%**	Benefits	**7%**
3	Benefits	**7%**	Facilities/ Compensation	**8%**	Doctoral Education	**7%**
4	Quality of Life/Location	**5%**			Research Resources III	**7%**

	DOC		NONDOC	
1	Service Requirements	**8%**	Service Requirements	**8%**
2	Research Support	**8%**	Compensation	**7%**
3	Doctoral Education II	**7%**	Research Support II	**7%**
4	Graduate Education	**7%**		

Note: the percentage following each descriptive label represents the variance accounted for by that factor within each group.

Table 7: Teaching Profile of Accepted Positions

	Overall	R-O	T-O	DOC	NONDOC
Panel A: Teaching Loads (Excluding Summer School)					
Quarter System					
Number of responses	14	8	12	6	8
Classes per year:					
Mean	5			5	6
Range	4-9			4-6	4-9
Preps per year:					
Mean	3			3	3
Range	2-5			2-5	2-5
Days taught per week:					
Mean	3			2	2
Semester System					
Number of responses	100	55	68	40	60
Classes per year					
Mean	5			4	6
Range	2-9			2-6	3-9
Preps per year:					
Mean	2			2	3
Range	1-6			1-4	1-6
Days taught per week:					
Mean	3			2	3
Panel B: Level of Teaching Assignments					
Introductory level	27.2%	19.1%	29.9%	15.3%	35.4%
Upper division level	47.6%	50.9%	44.9%	54.6%	42.7%
Graduate level	25.2%	30.0%	25.2%	30.1%	21.9%
Panel C: Summer Teaching					
No. teaching summer	42	15	34	9	33
Percentage	(36%)	(24%)	(43%)	(20%)	(47%)
Mean number of classes taught	2	2	2	2	2
Range	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-2

Table 8: Profile of Work Load and Promotion/Tenure Criteria

	Overall	R-O	T-O	DOC	NONDOC
Panel A: Work Load Mix					
Teaching	46.0%	40.0%	48.5%	37.8%	51.5%
Research	43.2%	51.4%	38.9%	54.5%	35.6%
Service	10.8%	8.6%	12.6%	7.7%	12.9%
Panel B: Research Mix					
Academic Journals	80.7%	90.6%	74.5%	93.4%	71.9%
Practitioner Journals	14.8%	8.8%	19.2%	5.9%	20.9%
Other Research	4.5%	.6%	6.3%	.8%	7.2%
Panel C: Promotion/Tenure Importance Weightings					
Teaching Effectiveness	34.6%	26.5%	39.9%	24.9%	41.3%
Research Effectiveness	56.6%	67.7%	49.4%	69.6%	47.7%
Service Effectiveness	8.8%	5.8%	10.7%	5.5%	11.0%