

An Initial Placement Research Ranking of U.S. Accounting Doctoral Programs

Amelia Annette Baldwin

University of Arkansas – Fort Smith

Brad S. Trinkle

Mississippi State University

Abstract

This study provides a ranking of U.S. accounting doctoral programs based on the initial placement in U.S. academic institutions of two decades of graduates. The rankings focus on the accounting research productivity of the initial employer institutions as measured by Chan, Chen, and Cheng (2007). Rankings are made based on overall placement, placement in doctoral granting institutions, and placement in AACSB accredited institutions. Results show that rankings of doctoral programs may change over time and, in some cases, changes may be dramatic. This study's findings may be useful to potential doctoral students in evaluating programs, as well as to new accounting doctoral graduates and to other accounting academicians considering entering the job market and targeting accounting doctoral granting institutions. Secondly, hiring institutions may use this study for benchmarking expectations of graduates.

Introduction

This study evaluates and ranks U.S. accounting doctoral programs on the basis of the research output of the initial placement institutions hiring the doctoral graduates. While prior research has ranked accounting doctoral programs based upon initial placement of the Ph.D. graduates (Fogarty & Saftner, 1993; Stammerjohan & Hall, 2002), this study is motivated by a need for rankings that are based on more recent graduates as well as more contemporary measures of research output. Therefore, this research differs from prior studies in two ways. First, this study uses a more comprehensive and contemporary ranking of doctoral programs (Chan, Chen, & Cheng, 2007) that includes every institution with faculty publishing in a large selection (24) of journals. Second, the current study uses a more recent time period of graduates (1987-2006) that reflects the changing number of doctoral programs and the continued decrease in the number of doctoral graduates.

The current study's findings may be useful to a variety of stakeholders, including potential doctoral students who are evaluating programs. This ranking will help them identify which programs are placing graduates at their level of interest. The findings may also be useful to new accounting doctoral graduates and to other more experienced accounting academicians considering entering the job market and targeting accounting doctoral granting institutions. Secondly, hiring institutions may use this study for benchmarking expectations of graduates. Finally, these rankings may assist some doctoral programs in illustrating the results of efforts to improve or in establishing their legitimacy (Coyne, Summers, Williams, & Wood, 2010) in placing graduates.

Graduate placement is an important factor when choosing a doctoral program (Meyer & Titard, 2000). While the academic market is the most likely market for accounting doctoral graduates, doctoral studies require a substantial

investment of time and effort (Beard & Elfrink, 1990; Chewing & Deberg, 1991; Plumlee, Kachelmeier, Madeo, Pratt, & Krull, 2006) and opportunity costs (Carcello, Hermanson, Hermanson, & Turner, 1994; Noland, Francisco, & Sinclair, 2007). Most doctoral students forego lucrative jobs in the accounting profession to pursue doctoral studies. Therefore, prospective doctoral students must consider the ability of their future alma mater to place graduates in institutions in which the prospective doctoral student would like to be employed in the future (Baldwin, Brown, & Trinkle, 2010, Fogarty et al. 2011).

Accounting programs are in crisis as they try to meet their demand for accounting faculty in a market that has a short supply of graduates and this struggle is expected to continue (Plumlee et al. 2006; Chang & Sun, 2008). Included in the myriad of reasons that have been offered for this crisis are, on the demand side, the reduction in class sizes by schools that have high research requirements and, on the supply side, the pressure and research requirements for tenure (Chang & Sun, 2008).

These issues are of particular interest to future accounting Ph.D. students as they make their decision regarding which university to attend. Current Ph.D. students would also be interested in these issues as they apply for their initial placement. Universities with lighter teaching loads and higher research expectations for tenure tend to be ranked higher than schools with heavy teaching loads and lower research expectations.

Potential Ph.D. candidates have differing desires for the type of program they want to attend and the placement that they want after graduation. A more comprehensive and contemporary ranking of doctoral programs will provide these current and future students with information that will help them tailor their search for a Ph.D. program and/or an initial placement to best fit their desired research and teaching requirements.

Graduates accepting positions at prestigious schools are more likely to succeed in publishing in top journals (Fogarty & Yu, 2010). Unsurprisingly, an institution's research standing, research support (Stammerjohan, Seifert, & Guidry, 2009), and faculty research interests are three of the top six factors considered by new faculty in job decisions for graduates hired by doctoral programs (Hunt, Eaton, & Reinstein, 2009). Other research related factors that influence job decisions by doctoral graduates include background and research orientation of faculty, research assistants, release time for research, secretarial assistance, and support for conference travel (Hunt et al., 2009).

At most research-oriented institutions, research output is the most important factor in evaluating professor performance. The *publish or perish* mentality persists in U.S. accounting academia (Miller, 1966; Fellows & Spence, 1985; May, Windal, & Sylvestre, 1995; Mathews, 2007). Accordingly, doctoral programs are designed to train graduates to conduct publishable research. Thus, this study focuses on accounting research productivity of initial placement institutions and uses measures of that productivity to rank the doctoral programs of the graduates who have been initially placed.

Literature

Numerous researchers have provided relative rankings and descriptions of U.S. doctoral accounting programs. Programs have been ranked based on faculty performance measures and graduate performance measures. Faculty performance measures include faculty research productivity (Bazley & Nikolai, 1975; Andrews & McKenzie, 1978; Bublitz & Kee, 1984; Jacobs, Hartgraves, & Beard, 1986; Hasselback & Reinstein, 1995a; Everett, Klamm, & Stoltzfus, 2004), citations of faculty research (Brown & Gardner 1985; Brown, 1996), and faculty editorial board representation (Mittermaier, 1991).

Graduate performance measures include research productivity of graduates (Bublitz & Kee, 1984; Jacobs et al., 1986; Sriram & Gopalakrishnan, 1994; Hasselback & Reinstein, 1995b; Stevens & Stevens, 1996; Coyne et al., 2010; Stephens, Summers, Williams, & Wood, 2011), and graduates' editorial board representation (e.g. Mittermaier, 1991). Fogarty and Markarian (2007) combined the rankings in two prior studies (Hasselback & Reinstein 1995a; Fogarty, 1995) to create a diverse prestige construct to rank doctoral programs. Accounting doctoral programs have also been ranked based on reputation (Estes, 1970; Carpenter, Crumbley, & Strawser, 1974),

including in *Public Accounting Report's* annual survey. More recently, Brown and Laksmana (2004) ranked accounting Ph.D. programs based on downloads of individuals' working papers on the Social Science Research Network (SSRN), and Urbancic (2008) ranked accounting doctoral programs based on national research awards, editorial board memberships and endowed positions held by graduates. Most recently, Stephens et al. (2011) ranked doctoral programs based on graduates' research productivity using eleven accounting journals over a 20 year period.

Initial placement measures can be used to examine questions other than ranking programs. For example, Collins, Reitenga, Collins, and Lane. (2000) examined the interaction of gender and quality of doctoral training on initial placement in accounting doctoral institutions. Maranto and Streuly (1994) and Fogarty and Ruhl (1997) both found strong correlations between the status of doctoral programs and the status of their graduates' initial employment institutions, but provided no rankings.

Few studies, however, have attempted to rank doctoral programs on the basis of the initial placement of graduates. Fogarty and Saftner (1993) ranked accounting doctoral programs using measures of placement quality, but only addressed placement in other doctoral granting programs. Basically, they ignored placements into non-doctoral institutions, which are the majority of placements, by rating them all as zero in the analysis.

A decade ago, Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) were the first to comprehensively evaluate and rank virtually all the U.S. accounting doctoral granting institutions using initial placement. They evaluated 80 U.S. doctoral accounting programs according to initial placement using a combination of measures: a measure of general academic environment issues (derived from *U.S. News & World Report's* America's Best Colleges) and a measure of accounting research productivity (using Hasselback & Reinstein, 1995a).

Clearly, the environment of doctoral accounting education is in flux. Many programs are shrinking, including some of the largest and longest running programs (Baldwin & Brown, 2010). Concerns for the supply and demand of accounting doctoral graduates have been voiced in many quarters (Plumlee et al., 2006; Chang & Sun, 2008). A newer ranking may show significant changes due to the observed volatility in the doctoral market.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate and rank U.S. accounting doctoral institutions using a more contemporary measure of accounting research productivity and a more contemporary period of graduate data. The goal is to rank as many programs as possible, given the limitations of available data, and to use a broader (in terms of schools ranked) and more recent measure of accounting research productivity than was available to Stammerjohan and Hall (2002). The remainder of this paper includes an explanation of the research and quality measures as well as the general methodology in the next section. Then, results are presented and discussed. Finally, conclusions, limitations and future research are addressed.

Sample

Starting with Hasselback's (2007) listing of accounting doctoral graduates, likely graduates earning accounting doctorates during a two decade period between 1987 and 2006 were identified. In comparison, Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) also included graduates from a two decade period, 1978-1997. The graduates included from 1978, 1979 and 1997 were, however, a small subset of the total graduates for those years. Clearly, data on the early graduates was not readily available at that time and data on the more recent graduates was probably not yet complete.

Graduates and programs were researched to ensure doctorates were earned in accounting. In total, 3,206 graduates were identified from 96 doctoral granting institutions. This compares favorably with the 3,343 graduates reported by Hasselback (2009) in the same period. The initial placement of each individual was researched using a combination of sources, such as many issues of the *Accounting Faculty Directory* (Hasselback, 1988-2008), university websites, online vitae, and emails and phone calls to graduates.

Graduates whose initial placement was identified as being in a U.S. academic institution numbered 2,732. Placement is defined as the initial academic position accepted by a doctoral graduate. Because graduates are normally expected

to seek permanent academic positions, placements in visiting positions and lecturer positions were excluded from the study. A placement is presumed to be an initial placement if it occurs within two years (\pm) of the graduation year.

Clearly, some graduates have start dates that far pre-date their graduate year. These graduates likely held those positions before pursuing the doctorate and then returned to those institutions to resume employment. Graduates (249) with initial placements more than two years prior to matriculation¹ were excluded from the study since their employment was determined well before earning the doctorate.

Likewise a few graduates have initial placements more than two years² after earning the degree. This could be caused by family situations, dual career issues, or any number of factors. Accordingly, these graduates (9) were excluded from the study.

A few graduates are employed immediately upon graduation by their alma mater. Since this is not the norm in accounting and since these may be temporary positions, these (32) graduates are also excluded³ from the study. Generally, placements are to employing institutions ranked lower than the degree granting institution; therefore including these graduates' placements in the study could artificially inflate their alma maters' rankings.

A small number of accounting doctoral graduates (11) are initially employed outside of traditional accounting departments or schools, or even outside of business schools. Some graduates are employed in economics, finance or management information systems departments (even when the employer has an academic accounting department), math, or in health-related colleges. As these are unusual placements, these graduates were also excluded from the study⁴.

After these exclusions, a further twelve doctoral institutions⁵ representing a total of 28 U.S. placements had less than five graduates remaining in study. In line with Fogarty and Saftner (1993) and Stammerjohan and Hall (2002), these institutions and the associated placements were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, the study includes 2,403 graduate placements representing 83 accounting doctoral programs.

The majority of these graduates (77.7% or, 1,866 of 2,403) were initially placed in AACSB accredited institutions. Each employing institution's AACSB accreditation, or lack of it, was determined as of the year of each placement using accreditation status and initial accreditation dates provided by the AACSB. Many institutions received accreditation during the study period. Only those placements on or after the accreditation date are considered AACSB placements. This percentage (77.7%) is less than the percentage reported by Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) at 84.4%. This might be partially explained by the fact that the Accounting Faculty Directory (Hasselback, 1978-2008) in former years did not list the schools employing many graduates causing those graduates to not appear in the prior study's sample. Over time as more and more schools have been added, many of those may have not been AACSB accredited.

¹ These 249 graduates were placed from three to thirty-one years prior to the year the doctorate was earned.

² These 9 graduates were placed three or four years after the doctorate was earned.

³ These degree-granting/hiring institutions were Boston U., Florida Atlantic, Florida State, Georgia, Harvard, Houston, Illinois, Jackson, LSU, Louisiana Tech, Mississippi, Missouri, North Texas, North Carolina, NYU, Pennsylvania, Southern Cal, St. Louis, Tulane, Texas A&M, Texas-Austin, VCU and Washington State.

⁴ These earned doctorates from Boston U., Florida, Florida State, George Washington, Mississippi, Nebraska, Tennessee, Texas A&M, Virginia Tech, and Wisconsin.

⁵ These twelve institutions are California-Irvine, Florida Atlantic, Florida International, Georgia Tech, Hawaii, Jackson, Miami, Rice, SUNY-Binghamton, Tulane, Texas-San Antonio, and Yale.

A significant minority (40.8% or 980 of 2,403) of graduates were initially placed in accounting doctoral granting institutions. This compares to 43.4% in Stammerjohan and Hall (2002). Table 1 summarizes the number of graduates reported by Hasselback (2007), the number of graduates identified in this study, the number of placements in the current sample (degree year \pm 2 years for alma maters with at least five graduates in the study), the number of these placements at AACSB accredited schools, and the number of these placements at accounting doctoral granting institutions. Since the graduate data used in this study is similar to that reported by Hasselback (2009) and Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) where the years overlap, this study appears to include a full range of accounting doctoral degree placements. The placements used in this study's analysis represent 83 accounting doctoral degree granting institutions (who placed at least five graduates in the USA), 530 initial placement institutions, 2,403 total placements, 1,866 placements at AACSB accredited institutions, and 980 placements at accounting doctoral granting institutions.

Placement Quality

This study measures the ranking of the doctoral programs vis-a-vis the research rankings of the institutions hiring their graduates. Research productivity is used because of its importance in evaluating the quality of institutions and because of its importance to prospective faculty considering employment options. The measure of accounting research quality used in this study is derived from Chan et al. (2007), which ranked 1,087 institutions⁶ on the basis of faculty publishing in 24 accounting journals over a 15 year period. These rankings are used as quality measures for each initial placement.

The Chan et al. (2007) ranking is different from Hasselback and Reinstein (1995a), which was used by Stammerjohan and Hall (2002), in two main ways. First, Chan et al. (2007) is a more recent ranking based on journal publications than Hasselback and Reinstein (1995a). While Hasselback and Reinstein (1995a) covers a longer period of journal publications (1967 through 1991), that period is mostly prior to the period of graduates investigated here. Second, Chan et al. (2007) is a comprehensive ranking that includes every institution with faculty publishing in the selected 24 journals during the period. Hasselback and Reinstein (1995a) actually began researching with a target list of schools and then looked for publications in their list of journals by faculty at those schools, thus some potential hiring schools of doctoral graduates may have been ignored. Hasselback and Reinstein (1995a) determined ranking scores (other than zero) for 446 schools. Chan et al. (2007) includes ranking scores (other than zero) for 1,087 schools.

Since Chan et al. (2007) ranked many institutions that do not appear as placements for the graduates in the current study's sample, this study's initial placement institutions have been ordered according to the ranks given by Chan et al. (2007) and assigned to deciles (1 is the highest). All schools not ranked in Chan et al. (2007) are assigned to the 10th decile since schools not ranked are those with zero publications in the journals studied. The rank deciles for all graduates' initial placement institutions are summed and divided by the number of placements to obtain an average placement research rating for each doctoral program, i.e. mean placement decile rank.

These measures are further refined to measure the mean rank deciles for graduates initially placed in AACSB accredited institutions and for graduates initially placed in accounting doctoral granting institutions. Each alma mater's average decile rank for AACSB (doctoral) placement rank was adjusted downward for non-AACSB (non-doctoral) placements by assigning those placements to the 10th decile using the same method used by Stammerjohan and Hall (2002).

In contrast to Stammerjohan and Hall (2002), a measure of general academic environment issues was not used in this study. Clearly, graduates may choose employment based on a number of factors including geography and climate, salary, research funds, summer support, proximity to family and other factors. These preferences are difficult to predict and to measure and will not be addressed in this study.

⁶ Chan et al. (2006) very graciously shared their complete ranking results for all schools via an excel spreadsheet.

Results

Doctoral program placement information is presented in Table 2. The first column (first degree) lists the year the first accounting doctorate was awarded. The second column (1987-2006 grads) shows how many doctorates were awarded during the sample period. The third column (ALL Placed) provides the number of placements included in this study, that is, the placements meeting the requirements described previously. Next, ACC Placed and DOC Placed columns show the number of placements at AACSB-accredited programs and doctoral granting programs. The Acc% and Doc% columns show this data in percentage format. The placement means for initial placement rank (ALL), adjusted ACC mean and adjusted DOC mean are shown in the right-most columns (placement measure).⁷ Eleven degree granting institutions (Berkeley, Carnegie Mellon, Case Western, Cornell, Duke, Iowa, Michigan, MIT, NYU, Texas-Dallas, and UCLA) initially placed all graduates at AACSB accredited institutions, and their ALL and ACC scores are identical. Only one degree granting institution (MIT) initially placed every graduate at accounting doctoral granting institutions, thus MIT's score is the same in all three categories (ALL, ACC, DOC). Three degree granting institutions (Cincinnati, Cleveland State and St. Louis) initially placed no graduates at doctoral accounting degree granting institutions, receiving a DOC rating of 10.00. These are relatively small doctoral programs. Cleveland State and St. Louis are currently inactive doctoral programs (Hasselback 2009 – weblisting).

Relative Rankings

The relative rankings of the doctoral programs using are reported in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 provides an alphabetical listing by doctoral institution. Table 4 provides an ordered listing. Higher relative rankings indicate initial placements at more research productive accounting departments on average using Chan et al. (2007) global accounting research rankings adjusted for the percentage of graduates who are placed in AACSB schools (ACC) or doctoral granting schools (DOC).

A comparison of these rankings with similar rankings in Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) shows that two or three schools listed in the top ten in the prior study are not listed in the corresponding top ten in this study (see

⁷ The math used to calculate the adjusted Acc mean and adjusted Doc mean is relatively simple. For example, the mean decile rank of all initial placements for the University of Alabama is 5.31 (1 is the highest decile and 10 is the lowest decile, representing unranked schools). For placements at AACSB accredited schools, Alabama's mean decile rank is 4.46. However, since only 24 of 32 graduates were initially placed in AACSB schools, that rank is adjusted to reflect 8 of 32 graduates' non-AACSB placements, thusly:

$$ACC = 4.46 \times (24/32) + 10.00 \times (8/32) = 5.85$$

Similarly, Alabama's mean decile rank for doctoral placements was 1.92. however, only 12 of 32 graduates were placed in doctoral granting schools, so the mean decile rank is adjusted to reflect the other 20 graduates' non-doctoral placements, thusly:

$$DOC = 1.92 \times (12/32) + 10.00 \times (20/32) = 6.97$$

Alabama's scores can be compared to Virginia Tech's scores. Virginia Tech's mean decile rank of all initial placements is quite similar at 5.12. Virginia Tech, however, placed a smaller percentage of graduates in AACSB schools than Alabama, so its mean decile rank for AACSB placements of 4.03 is adjusted downward like this:

$$ACC = 4.03 \times (39/59) + 10.00 \times (20/59) = 6.05$$

Similarly, Virginia Tech's doctoral placement mean decile rank of 2.00 is adjusted downward:

$$DOC = 2.00 \times (11/50) + 10.00 \times (48/59) = 8.51$$

So, although these two doctoral programs have a very similar mean decile rank for all placements (they are ranked consecutively in the ALL ranking), relative to Virginia Tech, Alabama moves higher in ACC ranking and even higher in DOC ranking as shown in Table 4 because, during the period of this study, a higher percentage of Alabama's graduates have been placed in AACSB and doctoral schools.

Stammerjohan and Hall (2002), Table 3: HT95a Mean⁸, ACC Mean⁹, DOC Mean¹⁰). In Stammerjohan and Hall's study, Carnegie Mellon, Columbia and Washington are listed in the HR95 top ten but do not appear in the ALL top ten here. Similarly, Chicago, Columbia and Rochester fail to show in the ACC top ten in the current study and Northwestern and Michigan do not appear in the DOC top ten.

Furthermore, Table 4 shows three schools who appear in at least one of the top ten lists in the current study (see Table 4) that do not appear in the top ten in similar rankings in the earlier study by Stammerjohan and Hall (2002). These four schools are Iowa, MIT and NYU. Iowa, in fact, makes the top ten in all three current rankings in Table 4, whereas in the earlier study Iowa's highest ranking was 15th.

At the other end of the relative ranking, an examination of the schools ranking 70 and below on each list shows a number of schools who have moved up out of the bottom reaches of one or more lists in the current study, including South Florida, Washington State, Connecticut, Union, Rutgers, and George Washington. Similarly, several schools have fallen to ranks lower than 70 in at least one list in the current study who did not appear below 70 in Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) similar ranks including: Memphis, Central Florida, North Texas, Kent State, Cincinnati, Texas-Arlington, Mississippi, Kentucky, Temple, Rutgers, and Kent State.

Comparing this study's ALL ranking to overall ranking (HR95a) in Stammerjohan and Hall (2002), 12 schools have increased at least 10 places in the ALL ranking, 12 schools have increased at least 10 places in the ACC ranking, and seven schools are at least 10 places higher in the current DOC ranking. At the other extreme, 20 schools have dropped ten or more places in the ALL ranking. In the ACC ranking, 14 schools have dropped ten or more places. In the DOC ranking, nine schools have dropped ten or more places.

If changes in ranking are averaged across the three rank lists in this study (ALL, ACC, DOC), the schools with greatest increases (moving up ten places or more on average) are NYU, Geo. Washington, South Florida, UCLA, Iowa, Washington State, and Connecticut. Those schools with the largest decreases (moving down ten places or more on average) are Cincinnati, Central Florida, Oklahoma, Ohio State, Washington, Maryland, North Texas, SUNY-Buffalo, Columbia, Michigan State, and Kent State.

Three schools that were not rated by Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) (Duke, Texas-Dallas, and Cleveland State) were rated in the current study. These ranked 28, 40 and 83 in the ALL rating, respectively. Presumably, these schools did not yet have enough graduates to be included in the earlier study.

Rankings by Cohorts

The previously reported mean rank scores are averaged over a two decade period. Since older placements may be less useful in predicting future placements, the study data have been divided into first decade (1987-1996) and second decade (1997-2006) cohorts to compare how the rankings change over time. Unfortunately, one problem in doing this is that the smaller schools and newer schools may not have five placements in each decade. Table 5 indicates the numbers of graduates from each program for each decade. These programs have been newly ranked by decade. Programs with less than five graduates in a decade are not ranked in this analysis, resulting in seven institutions¹¹ removed in the first decade and nine institutions¹² removed in the second decade. Table 6 provides an alphabetical listing by doctoral institution.

⁸ HT95a Mean Top 10 from Stammerjohan and Hall (2002): Carnegie Mellon, Stanford, Rochester, Chicago, Pennsylvania, Columbia, Berkeley, Cornell, Washington, Michigan.

⁹ ACC Mean Top 10 from Stammerjohan and Hall (2002): Stanford, Berkeley, Chicago, Carnegie Mellon, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Rochester, Northwestern, Cornell, Michigan.

¹⁰ Doc Mean Top 10 from Stammerjohan and Hall (2002): Stanford, Berkeley, Carnegie Mellon, Chicago, Cornell, Rochester, Northwestern, Michigan, Harvard, Pennsylvania.

¹¹ These seven institutions are Cleveland State, Duke, George Washington, South Florida, SUNY-Buffalo, Syracuse and Texas-Dallas.

Table 7 provides a listing by ranking. These results show that the rankings of programs by initial placement can change dramatically from one decade to another. This information helps identify programs whose more recent placements are better than their first decade placements and, therefore, their average placements over the entire twenty year period. The more recent placements may be more relevant to future doctoral applicants.

Changes in the Top 10 rankings show that Harvard had a dramatic improvement in its ranking as it moved from being out of the top 10 in all measures for the first decade to the number one spot in all three measures in the most recent decade. Equally dramatic are the changes for Carnegie Mellon, as they drop out of the top 10 in every measure from the first decade to the second decade.

Further analysis of the top 10 rankings shows that, for the ALL ranking, no other program drops out of the top 10. Northwestern and Rochester drop out of the top 10 in the ACC ranking and are replaced by Stanford and Indiana. While in the DOC ranking Rochester and UCLA also drop out and are replaced by Northwestern and Michigan. If changes in ranking from one decade to another are averaged across the three rank lists in this study (ALL, ACC, DOC), thirteen schools moved up ten places or more on average. They are (with average number of places moved up in parentheses) Kansas (22), Penn State (21), Oregon (20), Washington University (17), Georgia (16), Harvard (14), Temple (13), Columbia (12), Pittsburgh (11), Southern California (10), Nebraska (10), Massachusetts (10) and Wisconsin (10).

Twelve schools dropped ten or more places from one decade to the next (moving down ten places or more on average). These include (with average number of places moved in parentheses) CUNY-Baruch (-24), Purdue (-23), Case Western (-19), Boston (-16), Arizona State (-14), Florida State (-13), Alabama (-12), Carnegie Mellon (-12), Texas Tech (-11), Drexel (-10), North Texas (-10), and Maryland (-10).

The cohort rankings across deciles are valuable to current and future Ph.D. candidates because they provide information regarding the stability of the programs. Stability in a program's ranking is a testament to their commitment to hiring research active faculty that publish in high-quality journals, their ability to attract and accurately evaluate the research potential of the applicants to their program, and their ability to develop their candidates' into faculty members that are committed to being research active during their career.

Conclusion

This study provides an evaluation and ranking of U.S. accounting doctoral programs based on graduates' initial placement in U.S. academic institutions. The rankings focus on the accounting research productivity of the employer institutions as measured by Chan et al. (2007). These rankings may help prospective graduate students, prospective faculty, and, perhaps, hiring institutions, assess the placement ability of the doctoral programs measured by initial placement of graduates at research productive accounting departments. This study extends and potentially improves upon Stammerjohan and Hall (2002) by evaluating more recent graduates using a more contemporary ranking of hiring institutions that is based on a larger pool of journals and an complete group of hiring schools. Unlike many prior studies other than Stammerjohan and Hall (2002), this study investigates the entire set of doctoral programs, not just a subset. Also, in the current study, the sample is split into decade long cohorts that show how the rankings change over time within the sample. Together, these differences are significant enough to show that the current study provides an updated and somewhat different ranking from that found in the prior literature.

The rankings differ from prior research and they differ across decade long cohort groups within the current study's sample. The changes in the programs' rankings show that the rankings of the US doctoral programs are dynamic and change rapidly. Maintaining a stable ranking over time is a challenge that requires consistent effectiveness in the given university's hiring of faculty and in the evaluation and education of Ph.D. candidates.

¹² These nine institutions are Central Florida, Cincinnati, Cleveland State, Duke, Minnesota, St Louis, Syracuse, UCLA and Union.

Limitations and Future Research

One of the limitations of this study is that it does not consider other factors that may influence doctoral graduates in choosing their initial placement, such as geography, weather, quality of life, cost of living, proximity to family, pressure from doctoral committee, etc. As these may differ widely among graduates, they are difficult to model well. This study focused on the research ranking of the hiring institutions. Clearly this is not the only variable of interest to an academic on the job market.

Further, this study only addressed U.S. placements. An extension that considers all academic placements, including those outside of the U.S. might provide further useful information in this age of globalization but will also require solving some problems of language, cultural, and accreditation differences. In addition, to some extent this study or any study of placement may actually measure more than just graduates' desired placement and the prestige of the alma mater. It may also be driven by the degree to which the graduates are influenced, even pressured by chairs and advisors to choose prestigious placements.

Another limitation is the impermanence of initial placements. A large percentage of graduates do not remain at their initial placement for a variety of reasons. For example, for those 1987-2006 graduates whose initial placements (within 2 years of degree year) were used in this study and whose employment in 2007 was known, 46% had already moved on to a different university employer. An extension of this study should consider placement of graduates some years after the degree is earned, perhaps post-tenure or at least more than six years post matriculation, that is, after the traditional tenure period. Furthermore, a longitudinal study could provide a better measure of the lasting research impact of doctoral programs since many of these graduates have not, most likely, heavily influenced their initial placement employers' rankings until they've been employed for some time.

Another further limitation is the nature of the source used to rank the hiring institutions. Chan et al. (2007) provided rankings based on authorship by faculty in twenty-four accounting journals over a 15 year period. While this is one of the most contemporary studies of this type and it covers a period (1990-2005) that is concurrent with the study period (1987-2006), clearly many other accounting journals and publishing outlets exist for accounting researchers and many accounting researchers are active in publishing over longer periods of time. Future research should consider total research output, without limiting measurement to a subset of accounting journals.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, W. T., & P. B. McKenzie. 1978. Leading Accounting Departments Revisited. *The Accounting Review* **53**, 135–138.
- Baldwin, A. A., C. E. Brown and B. S. Trinkle. 2010. Accounting Doctoral Programs: A Multidimensional Description. *Advances in Accounting Education* **11**, 101-128.
- Baldwin, A. A. and C. E. Brown. 2010. An Analysis of the Accounting Doctoral Industry: Observations and Unanswered Questions. *Advances in Business Research* **1** (1) 114-132
- Bazley, J. D. and L. A. Nikolai. 1975. A Comparison of Published Accounting Research and Qualities of Accounting Faculty and Doctoral Programs. *The Accounting Review* **50**, 605–610.
- Beard, D. F. and J. A. Elfrink. 1990. A Profile of Recent Doctoral Graduates in Accounting: Some Guidance in What to Expect. *Journal of Accounting Education* **8**, 285–298.
- Brown, L. D. 1996. Influential Accounting Articles, Individuals, Ph.D. Granting Institutions and Faculties: A Citational Analysis. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* **21** (7/8) 723-754.
- Brown, L. D. and J. C. Gardner. 1985. Applying Citation Analysis to the Research Contributions of Accounting Faculty and Doctoral Programs. *The Accounting Review* **60**, 262–277.
- Brown, L. D. and I. Laksmana. 2004. Ranking Accounting Ph.D. Programs and Faculties Using Social Science Research Network Downloads. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* **22**: 249–266.
- Bublitz, B. and R. Kee. 1984. Measures of Research Productivity. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 39–60.
- Carcello, J. V., D. R. Hermanson, R. H. Hermanson, and D. H. Turner. 1994. Doctoral Study in Accounting: Cost and Financial Support. *Issues in Accounting Education* **9**, 219–230.
- Carpenter, C. G., D. L. Crumbley and R. H. Strawser. 1974. A New Ranking of Accounting Faculties and Doctoral Programs. *Journal of Accountancy* **137**, 90–94.
- Chan, K. C., C. R. Chen and L. T. W. Cheng. 2007. Global Ranking of Accounting Programmes and the Elite Effect in Accounting Research. *Accounting and Finance* **47** (2:June) 187–220.
- Chang, J. and H. Sun. 2008. Where are the accounting professors? *Journal of College Teaching and Learning* **5** (1) 47-51.
- Chewing, E. and C. L. DeBerg. 1991. A Survey of Current Doctoral Students in Accounting: Demographics and Experiences. *Advances in Accounting* **9**, 183–201.
- Collins, D. L., A. Reitenga, A. B. Collins and S. Lane. 2000. “Glass Walls” in Academic Accounting? The Role of Gender in Initial Employment Position. *Issues in Accounting Education* **15** (3) 371-391.
- Coyne, J. G., S. L. Summers, B. Williams and D. A. Wood. 2010. Accounting Program Research Rankings by Topical Area and Methodology. *Issues in Accounting Education* **25** (4) 631–654.
- Estes, R. W. 1970. A Ranking of Accounting Programs. *Journal of Accountancy* **130**, 86–90.

- Everett, J. O., B. Klamm and R. Stoltzfus. 2004. Developing Benchmarks for Evaluating Publication Records at Doctoral Programs in Accounting. *Journal of Accounting Education* **22**, 229–252.
- Fellows, J. and J. Spence. 1985. Efficiency in academe: Comparative advantage vs. “publish or perish.” *Journal of Accounting Education* **3**(2) 53-60.
- Fogarty, T. 1995. A Ranking to End All Rankings: A Meta-Analysis and Critique of Studies Ranking Academic Accounting Departments. *Accounting Perspectives* **1**: 1–22.
- Fogarty, T. J. and G. Markarian. 2007. An Empirical Assessment of the Rise and Fall of Accounting as an Academic Discipline. *Issues in Accounting Education* **22** (2:May) 137–161.
- Fogarty, T. J. and Ruhl, J. M. 1997. Institutional Antecedents of Accounting Faculty Research Productivity: A LISREL Study of the “Best and Brightest.” *Issues in Accounting Education* **12**, 27–48.
- Fogarty, T. J. and Saftner, D. V. 1993. Academic Department Prestige: A New Measure Based on the Doctoral Labor Market. *Research in Higher Education* **34**, 427–449.
- Fogarty, T. J. and W. Yu. 2010. The Sustainability of Success: Distinguishing the Lucky from the Good in the Stacked Deck of Academic Accounting. *Accounting Educators’ Journal* **20**, 63-89.
- Fogarty, T. J., D. V. Saftner, and J. R. Hasselback. 2011. Knowing one’s place: The distribution of new accounting academics into a segmented labor market. *Journal of Accounting Education* **29** (2/3) 89-99.
- Hasselback, J. R. 2007. Listing of Doctoral Graduates by School.
<http://www.jrhasselback.com/AtgDoct/XSchDoct.pdf>
- Hasselback, J. R. 2009. Weblisting of Accounting Doctoral Programs.
<http://www.jrhasselback.com/AtgDoct/XDocChrt.pdf>
- Hasselback, J. R. 1988-2008. *Accounting Faculty Directory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hasselback, J. R., and A. Reinstein. 1995a. A Proposal for Measuring Scholarly Productivity of Accounting Faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* **10**, 269–306.
- Hasselback, J. R. and A. Reinstein. 1995b. Assessing Accounting Doctoral Programs by Their Graduates’ Research Productivity. *Advances in Accounting* **13**, 61–86.
- Hunt, S. C., T. V. Eaton and A. Reinstein. 2009. Accounting Faculty Job Search in a Seller’s Market. *Issues in Accounting Education* **24**(2:May) 157–185.
- Jacobs, F. A., A. L. Hartgraves and L. H. Beard. 1986. Publication Productivity of Doctoral Alumni: A Time-Adjusted Model. *The Accounting Review* **61**, 179–186.
- Maranto, C. L. and C. A. Streuly. 1994. The Determinants of Accounting Professors’ Publishing Productivity: The Early Career. *Contemporary Accounting Research* **10**, 387–407.
- Mathews, M. R. 2007. Publish or Perish: Is this Really a Viable Set of Options? *Accounting Education* **16** (3:September) 225-240.
- May, G. S., F. W. Windal and J. Sylvestre. 1995. The need for change in accounting education: An educator survey. *Journal of Accounting Education* **13** (1:Winter) 21-43.

- Meyer, M. J. and P. L. Titard. 2000. Those Who Can... Teach. *Journal of Accountancy* (July) 49–58.
- Miller, H. E. 1966. Textbooks or Research. *Accounting Review* **41** (1) 1-7.
- Mittermaier, L. J. 1991. Representation on Editorial Boards of Academic Accounting Journals: An Analysis of Accounting Faculties and Doctoral Programs. *Issues in Accounting Education* **6**, 221–238.
- Noland, T. G., B. Francisco and D. Sinclair. 2007. Pursuing a PhD in Accounting: What to Expect. *CPA Journal* (March) 66-68.
- Plumlee, R. D., S. J. Kachelmeier, S. A. Madeo, J. H. Pratt and G. Krull. 2006. Assessing the Shortage of Accounting Faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* **21** (2:May) 113-125.
- Sriram, R. S. and V. Gopalakrishan. 1994. Ranking of Doctoral Programs in Accounting: Productivity and Citational Analyses. *Accounting Educators' Journal* **6**(1), 32–53.
- Stammerjohan, W. W., D. L. Seifert, and R. P. Guidry. 2009. Factors Affecting Initial Placement of Accounting Ph.Ds. *Advances in Accounting Education* **10**, 103–118.
- Stammerjohan, W. W. and S. C. Hall. 2002. Evaluation of Doctoral Programs in Accounting: An Examination of Placement. *Journal of Accounting Education* **20**(1), 1–27.
- Stephens, N. M., S. L. Summers, B. Williams and D. A. Wood. 2011. Accounting Doctoral Program Rankings Based on Research Productivity of Program Graduates. *Accounting Horizons* **25**(1), 149-181.
- Stevens, K. T. and W. P. Stevens. 1996. Ranking Accounting Doctoral Programs by the Research Productivity of Graduates: 1974–1992. *Accounting Educators' Journal* **8**(1), 51–79.
- Urbancic, F. R. 2008. A Multiattributes Approach for Ranking PhD programs. *Journal of Education for Business* **83**(6), 339–346.

Table 1. Summary of Placement Information

Year	Number of Graduates reported by Hasselback	Number of graduates in current sample	Number of placements in current sample	Number of placements at AACSB-accredited institutions	Number of placements at doctoral granting institutions
1987	201	198	142	123	76
1988	205	205	163	126	68
1989	210	214	162	130	77
1990	175	176	130	95	60
1991	198	196	145	108	53
1992	201	197	142	98	46
1993	204	203	144	84	29
1994	197	202	149	104	58
1995	170	164	120	90	46
1996	163	161	112	73	43
1997	159	156	122	96	46
1998	152	153	119	90	51
1999	129	126	95	75	40
2000	208	106	79	65	30
2001	125	125	100	84	40
2002	114	111	80	64	39
2003	105	102	78	69	28
2004	142	141	102	91	46
2005	137	134	116	106	57
2006	148	136	103	95	47
Totals	3,343	3,206	2,403	1,866	980

Table 2. Degree granting institution – Placement information

<i>Alma Mater</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>1987-2006</i>	<i>Placed in</i>			<i>Percent</i>		<i>Placement Measure</i>		
	<i>Degree</i>	<i>Grads</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Acc.</i>	<i>Doc.</i>	<i>Acc.</i>	<i>Doc.</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Acc.</i>	<i>Doc.</i>
Alabama	1963	41	32	24	12	75%	38%	5.31	5.85	6.97
Arizona	1970	64	59	55	34	93%	58%	2.71	3.00	5.19
Arizona State	1968	60	53	45	25	85%	47%	3.49	4.13	6.17
Arkansas	1961	46	35	22	7	63%	20%	6.26	6.97	8.51
Berkeley	1929	35	23	23	22	100%	96%	1.48	1.48	1.65
Boston	1986	35	21	17	5	81%	24%	3.38	4.14	8.00
Carnegie Mellon	1959	23	12	12	10	100%	83%	1.75	1.75	2.67
Case Western	1966	19	10	10	7	100%	70%	2.50	2.50	4.30
Central Florida	1991	14	12	8	3	67%	25%	6.50	6.67	8.08
Chicago	1922	35	27	23	25	85%	93%	1.30	2.59	1.85
Cincinnati	1970	14	11	7	0	64%	0%	6.27	7.37	10.00
Cleveland State	1994	14	7	2	0	29%	0%	9.00	9.29	10.00
Colorado	1966	41	32	22	9	69%	28%	4.56	5.50	7.72
Columbia	1952	31	20	17	13	85%	65%	2.30	2.70	4.25
Connecticut	1992	24	18	13	2	72%	11%	4.22	5.33	9.00
Cornell	1968	30	24	24	22	100%	92%	1.25	1.25	1.88
CUNY-Baruch	1975	25	16	9	2	56%	13%	5.69	7.50	8.94
Drexel	1985	31	22	14	3	64%	14%	4.77	6.14	8.86
Duke	1986	6	5	5	4	100%	80%	3.00	3.00	4.00
Florida	1956	47	38	30	26	79%	68%	3.32	3.84	4.53
Florida State	1970	45	40	34	17	85%	43%	4.10	4.37	6.65
Geo. Washington	1969	23	12	9	3	75%	25%	4.75	5.08	8.17
Georgia	1970	64	54	41	18	76%	33%	4.78	5.26	7.24
Georgia State	1965	43	34	27	15	79%	44%	5.03	5.20	6.59
Harvard	2004	19	14	13	13	93%	93%	1.64	1.93	1.93
Houston	1973	60	41	29	7	71%	17%	5.78	6.46	8.78
Illinois	1939	72	45	41	27	91%	60%	2.44	2.87	4.85
Indiana	1950	45	39	38	28	97%	72%	2.51	2.57	4.11
Iowa	1951	34	25	25	22	100%	88%	1.40	1.40	2.24
Kansas	1970	22	15	10	5	67%	33%	5.13	5.60	7.20
Kent State	1970	49	35	16	1	46%	3%	6.71	8.06	9.80
Kentucky	1973	69	49	31	4	63%	8%	6.29	6.92	9.37
Louisiana Tech	1973	51	37	16	2	43%	5%	8.41	8.98	9.76
LSU	1943	49	46	34	17	74%	37%	4.91	5.48	7.11
Maryland	1969	35	27	17	8	63%	30%	5.11	6.44	7.93
Massachusetts	1971	17	16	13	6	81%	38%	3.38	4.00	6.94
Memphis	1982	38	31	15	4	48%	13%	6.48	7.84	9.03
Michigan	1939	51	49	49	40	100%	82%	1.47	1.47	2.84
Michigan State	1959	60	52	42	21	81%	40%	3.19	3.96	6.62
Minnesota	1936	28	19	17	14	89%	74%	2.00	2.58	3.69
Mississippi	1964	70	49	26	3	53%	6%	7.49	8.16	9.61
Mississippi State	1968	47	34	20	1	59%	3%	7.94	8.65	9.94

Table 2. Continued.

Alma Mater	First Degree	1987-2006 Grads	Placed in			Percent		Placement Measure		
			All	Acc.	Doc.	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc.	Doc.
Missouri	1941	36	26	21	10	81%	38%	4.62	5.07	7.04
MIT	1960	13	13	13	13	100%	100%	1.69	1.69	1.69
Nebraska	1943	61	40	26	2	65%	5%	5.55	6.50	9.63
North Carolina	1957	36	31	29	18	94%	58%	2.29	2.65	5.03
North Texas	1969	65	44	21	7	48%	16%	6.70	7.64	8.82
Northwestern	1956	31	22	21	18	95%	82%	1.50	1.91	2.87
NYU	1944	42	25	25	18	100%	72%	1.84	1.84	3.72
Ohio State	1950	48	38	30	24	79%	63%	2.71	3.50	4.68
Oklahoma	1967	28	22	14	4	64%	18%	5.59	6.37	8.82
Oklahoma State	1971	42	33	23	10	70%	30%	5.82	5.97	7.79
Oregon	1964	27	19	17	10	89%	53%	3.26	3.37	5.63
Penn State	1967	63	50	44	25	88%	50%	3.22	3.66	5.80
Pennsylvania	1973	27	22	21	20	95%	91%	1.36	1.69	2.09
Pittsburgh	1932	35	25	22	15	88%	60%	2.64	3.08	4.80
Purdue	1969	29	21	18	10	86%	48%	3.57	3.67	6.00
Rochester	1972	28	24	22	21	92%	88%	1.42	2.13	2.34
Rutgers	1992	42	28	19	2	68%	7%	6.39	6.89	9.43
South Carolina	1976	54	53	42	20	79%	38%	4.77	5.11	7.00
South Florida	1992	19	15	13	2	87%	13%	4.80	5.13	8.87
Southern Cal	1963	36	29	25	16	86%	55%	2.52	3.41	5.24
Southern Illinois	1988	28	16	7	3	44%	19%	6.63	7.87	8.81
St Louis	1966	21	10	1	0	10%	0%	8.40	9.50	10.00
Stanford	1939	37	30	28	29	93%	97%	1.17	1.70	1.44
SUNY-Buffalo	1957	21	13	12	8	92%	62%	3.69	4.30	5.62
Syracuse	1970	16	7	6	4	86%	57%	2.71	3.29	5.14
Temple	1981	34	23	14	2	61%	9%	5.39	6.61	9.39
Tennessee	1976	44	41	37	13	90%	32%	4.00	4.22	7.46
Texas A&M	1972	87	70	61	18	87%	26%	4.87	5.09	7.86
Texas Tech	1969	44	38	29	7	76%	18%	4.89	5.50	8.50
Texas-Arlington	1980	27	20	13	2	65%	10%	7.25	7.45	9.30
Texas-Austin	1934	78	63	52	42	83%	67%	2.32	3.22	4.25
Texas-Dallas	2002	9	7	7	3	100%	43%	3.86	3.86	6.14
UCLA	1962	12	6	6	5	100%	83%	2.17	2.17	2.83
Union	1989	10	8	4	1	50%	13%	5.75	6.88	9.13
Utah	1976	27	24	21	8	88%	33%	4.21	4.50	7.21
Virginia Comm	1987	40	30	20	2	67%	7%	6.43	7.07	9.73
Virginia Tech	1976	70	59	39	11	66%	19%	5.27	6.09	8.51
Wash U - St Louis	1964	15	11	8	8	73%	73%	3.00	4.82	4.18
Washington	1956	55	37	35	21	95%	57%	2.57	2.90	5.16
Washington State	1989	23	20	15	3	75%	15%	5.95	6.40	9.00
Wisconsin	1953	69	50	40	18	80%	36%	3.28	4.06	6.98

Table 3. Initial placement rankings of 85 doctoral granting institutions († indicates ties)

Alma Mater	All	Acc.	Doc.	Alma Mater	All	Acc.	Doc.
Alabama	59	56	41	North Carolina	16	18	26
Arizona	25 †	22 †	29	North Texas	76	75	62 †
Arizona State	37	37	36	Northwestern	9	10	13
Arkansas	68	70	59	NYU	13	9	15
Berkeley	8	4	2	Ohio State	25 †	29	23
Boston	35 †	38	54	Oklahoma	62	60	62 †
Carnegie Mellon	12	8	10	Oklahoma State	66	57	51
Case Western	20	14	21	Oregon	32	27	32
Central Florida	74	66	55	Penn State	31	30	33
Chicago	3	17	4	Pennsylvania	4	5 †	7
Cincinnati	69	72	81 †	Pittsburgh	24	24	24
Cleveland State	83	82	81 †	Purdue	38	31	34
Colorado	45	53 †	50	Rochester	6	12	9
Columbia	17	19	19 †	Rutgers	71	68	74
Connecticut	44	51	67 †	South Carolina	48 †	47	43
Cornell	2	1	5	South Florida	51	48	65
CUNY-Baruch	63	74	66	Southern Cal	22	28	30
Drexel	48 †	59	64	Southern Illinois	75	77	61
Duke	28 †	22 †	16	St Louis	81	83	81 †
Florida	34	32	22	Stanford	1	7	1
Florida State	42	41	39	SUNY-Buffalo	39	40	31
Geo. Washington	47	45	56	Syracuse	25 †	26	27
Georgia	50	50	48	Temple	60	65	73
Georgia State	55	49	37	Tennessee	41	39	49
Harvard	10	11	6	Texas A&M	52	46	52
Houston	65	63	60	Texas Tech	53	53 †	57 †
Illinois	19	20	25	Texas-Arlington	78	73	71
Indiana	21	15	17	Texas-Austin	18	25	19 †
Iowa	5	2	8	Texas-Dallas	40	33	35
Kansas	57	55	46	UCLA	15	13	11
Kent State	77	78	79	Union	64	67	70
Kentucky	70	69	72	Utah	43	42	47
Louisiana Tech	82	81	78	Virginia Comm	72	71	77
LSU	54	52	45	Virginia Tech	58	58	57 †
Maryland	56	62	53	Wash U - St Louis	28 †	43	18
Massachusetts	35 †	35	40	Washington	23	21	28
Memphis	73	76	69	Washington State	67	61	67 †
Michigan	7	3	12	Wisconsin	33	36	42
Michigan State	30	34	38				
Minnesota	14	16	14				
Mississippi	79	79	75				
Mississippi State	80	80	80				
Missouri	46	44	44				
MIT	11	5 †	3				
Nebraska	61	64	76				

Table 4. Rank order based on initial placement research productivity measures († indicates ties)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>All Mean</u>	<u>Acc. Adj. Mean</u>	<u>Doc. Adj. Mean</u>
1	Stanford	Cornell	Stanford
2	Cornell	Iowa	Berkeley
3	Chicago	Michigan	MIT
4	Pennsylvania	Berkeley	Chicago
5	Iowa	Pennsylvania†	Cornell
6	Rochester	MIT†	Harvard
7	Michigan	Stanford	Pennsylvania
8	Berkeley	Carnegie Mellon	Iowa
9	Northwestern	NYU	Rochester
10	Harvard	Northwestern	Carnegie Mellon
11	MIT	Harvard	UCLA
12	Carnegie Mellon	Rochester	Michigan
13	NYU	UCLA	Northwestern
14	Minnesota	Case Western	Minnesota
15	UCLA	Indiana	NYU
16	North Carolina	Minnesota	Duke
17	Columbia	Chicago	Indiana
18	Texas-Austin	North Carolina	Wash U - St Louis
19	Illinois	Columbia	Columbia†
20	Case Western	Illinois	Texas-Austin†
21	Indiana	Washington	Case Western
22	Southern Cal	Arizona†	Florida
23	Washington	Duke†	Ohio State
24	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
25	Arizona†	Texas-Austin	Illinois
26	Ohio State†	Syracuse	North Carolina
27	Syracuse†	Oregon	Syracuse
28	Duke‡	Southern Cal	Washington
29	Wash U - St Louis‡	Ohio State	Arizona
30	Michigan State	Penn State	Southern Cal
31	Penn State	Purdue	SUNY-Buffalo
32	Oregon	Florida	Oregon
33	Wisconsin	Texas-Dallas	Penn State
34	Florida	Michigan State	Purdue
35	Boston†	Massachusetts	Texas-Dallas
36	Massachusetts†	Wisconsin	Arizona State
37	Arizona State	Arizona State	Georgia State
38	Purdue	Boston	Michigan State
39	SUNY-Buffalo	Tennessee	Florida State
40	Texas-Dallas	SUNY-Buffalo	Massachusetts
41	Tennessee	Florida State	Alabama
42	Florida State	Utah	Wisconsin
43	Utah	Wash U - St Louis	South Carolina
44	Connecticut	Missouri	Missouri
45	Colorado	Geo. Washington	LSU

Table 4. Continued († indicates ties)

Rank	All Mean	Acc. Mean	Doc. Mean
46	Missouri	Texas A&M	Kansas
47	Geo. Washington	South Carolina	Utah
48	Drexel†	South Florida	Georgia
49	South Carolina†	Georgia State	Tennessee
50	Georgia	Georgia	Colorado
51	South Florida	Connecticut	Oklahoma State
52	Texas A&M	LSU	Texas A&M
53	Texas Tech	Colorado†	Maryland
54	LSU	Texas Tech†	Boston
55	Georgia State	Kansas	Central Florida
56	Maryland	Alabama	Geo. Washington
57	Kansas	Oklahoma State	Texas Tech†
58	Virginia Tech	Virginia Tech	Virginia Tech†
59	Alabama	Drexel	Arkansas
60	Temple	Oklahoma	Houston
61	Nebraska	Washington State	Southern Illinois
62	Oklahoma	Maryland	North Texas†
63	CUNY-Baruch	Houston	Oklahoma†
64	Union	Nebraska	Drexel
65	Houston	Temple	South Florida
66	Oklahoma State	Central Florida	CUNY-Baruch
67	Washington State	Union	Washington State†
68	Arkansas	Rutgers	Connecticut†
69	Cincinnati	Kentucky	Memphis
70	Kentucky	Arkansas	Union
71	Rutgers	Virginia Comm	Texas-Arlington
72	Virginia Comm	Cincinnati	Kentucky
73	Memphis	Texas-Arlington	Temple
74	Central Florida	CUNY-Baruch	Rutgers
75	Southern Illinois	North Texas	Mississippi
76	North Texas	Memphis	Nebraska
77	Kent State	Southern Illinois	Virginia Comm
78	Texas-Arlington	Kent State	Louisiana Tech
79	Mississippi	Mississippi	Kent State
80	Mississippi State	Mississippi State	Mississippi State
81	St Louis	Louisiana Tech	Cincinnati†
82	Louisiana Tech	Cleveland State	Cleveland State†
83	Cleveland State	St Louis	St Louis†

Table 5. Degree granting institution – Placement information by decade.

Alma Mater	<i>First Decade (1987-1996)</i>									<i>Second Decade (1997-2006)</i>								
	<i>Placed in</i>			<i>Percent</i>			<i>Placement</i>			<i>Placed in</i>			<i>Percent</i>			<i>Placement Measure</i>		
	All	Acc	Doc	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc	Doc	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc.	Doc.		
Alabama	21	17	8	81%	38%	5.14	5.43	6.91	11	7	4	64%	36%	5.64	6.63	7.09		
Arizona	33	31	18	94%	55%	2.76	3.06	5.27	26	24	16	92%	62%	2.65	2.92	5.08		
Arizona State	33	27	19	82%	58%	3.06	3.91	5.30	20	18	6	90%	30%	4.20	4.50	7.60		
Arkansas	19	12	3	63%	16%	6.32	7.16	8.84	16	10	4	63%	25%	6.19	6.75	8.13		
Berkeley	16	16	15	100%	94%	1.50	1.50	1.75	7	7	7	100%	100%	1.43	1.43	1.43		
Boston	12	10	3	83%	25%	2.58	3.58	7.83	9	7	2	78%	22%	4.44	4.89	8.22		
Carnegie Mellon	7	7	6	100%	86%	1.29	1.29	2.43	5	5	4	100%	80%	2.40	2.40	3.00		
Case Western	7	7	6	100%	86%	2.14	2.14	3.14	3	3	1	100%	33%	3.33	3.33	7.00		
Central Florida	8	5	2	63%	25%	6.25	6.50	8.13	4	3	1							
Chicago	14	12	13	86%	93%	1.29	2.50	1.86	13	11	12	85%	92%	1.31	2.69	1.85		
Cincinnati	10	6	0	60%	0%	6.10	7.30	10.00	1	1	0							
Cleveland State	3	1	0						4	1	0							
Colorado	17	10	4	59%	24%	4.71	6.24	8.12	15	12	5	80%	33%	4.40	4.66	7.27		
Columbia	7	5	3	71%	43%	2.71	3.86	6.14	13	12	10	92%	77%	2.08	2.08	3.23		
Connecticut	6	3	1	50%	17%	4.00	6.17	8.50	12	10	1	83%	8%	4.33	4.92	9.25		
Cornell	12	12	11	100%	92%	1.17	1.17	1.75	12	12	11	100%	92%	1.33	1.33	2.00		
CUNY-Baruch	7	5	2	71%	29%	4.43	6.14	7.57	9	4	0	44%	0%	6.67	8.56	10.00		
Drexel	15	8	3	53%	20%	4.40	6.40	8.33	7	6	0	86%	0%	5.57	5.57	10.00		
Duke	2	2	1						3	3	3							
Florida	27	22	19	81%	70%	3.11	3.67	4.37	11	8	7	73%	64%	3.82	4.28	4.91		
Florida State	27	23	13	85%	48%	3.85	4.18	6.26	13	11	4	85%	31%	4.62	4.77	7.46		
G. Washington	4	1	0						8	8	3	100%	38%	3.13	3.13	7.25		
Georgia	36	24	10	67%	28%	5.42	5.95	7.72	18	17	8	94%	44%	3.50	3.89	6.28		
Georgia State	20	14	9	70%	45%	5.10	5.30	6.60	14	13	6	93%	43%	4.93	5.07	6.57		
Harvard	7	6	6	86%	86%	2.29	2.86	2.86	7	7	7	100%	100%	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Houston	29	18	7	62%	24%	5.72	6.69	8.28	12	11	0	92%	0%	5.92	5.92	10.00		
Illinois	29	26	16	90%	55%	2.72	3.07	5.31	16	15	11	94%	69%	1.94	2.50	4.00		
Indiana	25	24	18	96%	72%	2.80	2.88	4.28	14	14	10	100%	71%	2.00	2.00	3.79		
Iowa	12	12	11	100%	92%	1.42	1.42	2.00	13	13	11	100%	85%	1.38	1.38	2.46		
Kansas	10	5	2	50%	20%	5.70	6.40	8.20	5	5	3	100%	60%	4.00	4.00	5.20		
Kent State	21	11	1	52%	5%	6.19	7.72	9.67	14	5	0	36%	0%	7.50	8.57	10.00		
Kentucky	29	15	2	52%	7%	6.55	7.48	9.45	20	16	2	80%	10%	5.90	6.10	9.25		
Louisiana Tech	23	10	1	43%	4%	7.96	8.83	9.70	14	6	1	43%	7%	9.14	9.22	9.86		
LSU	33	22	11	67%	33%	5.18	5.97	7.36	13	12	6	92%	46%	4.23	4.23	6.46		
Maryland	13	7	5	54%	38%	5.00	6.69	7.23	14	10	3	71%	21%	5.21	6.21	8.57		
Massachusetts	8	5	2	63%	25%	3.38	4.63	7.88	8	8	4	100%	50%	3.38	3.38	6.00		
Memphis	22	9	2	41%	9%	6.41	8.00	9.27	9	6	2	67%	22%	6.67	7.45	8.44		
Michigan	24	24	19	100%	79%	1.50	1.50	3.00	25	25	21	100%	84%	1.44	1.44	2.68		
Michigan State	32	23	13	72%	41%	3.28	4.53	6.60	20	19	8	95%	40%	3.05	3.05	6.65		
Minnesota	15	13	11	87%	73%	2.07	2.80	3.73	4	4	3							
Mississippi	30	15	3	50%	10%	7.17	8.00	9.37	19	11	0	58%	0%	8.00	8.42	10.00		

Table 5. Continued.

	<i>First Decade (1987-1996)</i>						<i>Second Decade (1997-2006)</i>									
	<i>Placed in</i>			<i>Percent</i>		<i>Placement</i>			<i>Placed in</i>			<i>Percent</i>		<i>Placement Measure</i>		
Alma Mater	All	Acc	Doc	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc	Doc	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc.	Doc.
Mississippi State	21	10	0	48%	0%	7.71	8.71	10.00	13	10	1	77%	8%	8.31	8.54	9.85
Missouri	14	10	5	71%	36%	4.71	5.50	7.36	12	11	5	92%	42%	4.50	4.58	6.67
MIT	2	2	2	100%	100%	1.50	1.50	1.50	11	11	11	100%	100%	1.73	1.73	1.73
Nebraska	24	12	0	50%	0%	5.83	7.38	10.00	16	14	2	88%	13%	5.13	5.19	9.06
North Carolina	13	13	8	100%	62%	2.38	2.38	4.77	18	16	10	89%	56%	2.22	2.84	5.22
North Texas	31	17	7	55%	23%	6.32	7.23	8.32	13	4	0	31%	0%	7.62	8.62	10.00
Northwestern	13	13	10	100%	77%	1.46	1.46	3.31	9	8	8	89%	89%	1.56	2.56	2.22
NYU	11	11	7	100%	64%	1.91	1.91	4.46	14	14	11	100%	79%	1.79	1.79	3.14
Ohio State	27	22	17	81%	63%	2.30	3.29	4.67	11	8	7	73%	64%	3.73	4.00	4.72
Oklahoma	12	6	3	50%	25%	6.17	7.42	8.42	10	8	1	80%	10%	4.90	5.10	9.30
Oklahoma State	19	13	6	68%	32%	5.63	5.89	7.63	14	10	4	71%	29%	6.07	6.07	8.00
Oregon	10	8	4	80%	40%	4.30	4.50	6.70	9	9	6	100%	67%	2.11	2.11	4.45
Penn State	32	27	10	84%	31%	3.78	4.41	7.41	18	17	15	94%	83%	2.22	2.33	2.94
Pennsylvania	11	11	10	100%	91%	1.36	1.36	2.09	11	10	10	91%	91%	1.36	2.00	2.09
Pittsburgh	13	11	8	85%	62%	3.38	3.85	4.77	12	11	7	92%	58%	1.83	2.25	4.83
Purdue	15	13	8	87%	53%	3.00	3.14	5.33	6	5	2	83%	33%	5.00	5.00	7.67
Rochester	11	10	10	91%	91%	1.18	1.91	1.91	13	12	11	92%	85%	1.62	2.31	2.69
Rutgers	8	3	1	38%	13%	6.50	7.63	8.88	20	16	1	80%	5%	6.35	6.60	9.65
South Carolina	35	25	13	71%	37%	5.14	5.63	6.97	18	17	7	94%	39%	4.06	4.11	7.06
South Florida	4	3	0						11	10	2	91%	18%	4.00	4.36	8.45
Southern Cal	18	15	8	83%	44%	2.83	3.78	6.17	11	10	8	91%	73%	2.00	2.82	3.73
Southern Illinois	9	3	2	33%	22%	6.33	8.56	8.78	7	4	1	57%	14%	7.00	7.00	8.86
St Louis	8	1	0	13%	0%	8.13	9.38	10.00	2	0	0					
Stanford	15	13	15	87%	100%	1.13	2.20	1.13	15	15	14	100%	93%	1.20	1.20	1.73
SUNY-Buffalo	3	2	3						10	10	5	100%	50%	4.20	4.20	6.70
Syracuse	4	3	2						3	3	2					
Temple	11	4	0	36%	0%	5.82	7.82	10.00	12	10	2	83%	17%	5.00	5.50	8.83
Tennessee	26	23	7	88%	27%	4.00	4.31	7.77	15	14	6	93%	40%	4.00	4.06	6.93
Texas A&M	39	34	10	87%	26%	4.87	5.02	7.90	31	27	8	87%	26%	4.87	5.16	7.81
Texas Tech	23	19	5	83%	22%	4.70	5.08	8.22	15	10	2	67%	13%	5.20	6.13	8.93
Texas-Arlington	13	8	2	62%	15%	7.77	7.93	8.92	7	5	0	71%	0%	6.29	6.57	10.00
Texas-Austin	38	30	26	79%	68%	2.34	3.31	4.10	25	22	16	88%	64%	2.28	3.08	4.48
Texas-Dallas									7	7	3	100%	43%	3.86	3.86	6.14
UCLA	6	6	5	100%	83%	2.17	2.17	2.83								
Union	7	4	1	57%	14%	5.71	6.43	9.00	1	0	0					
Utah	14	13	5	93%	36%	4.29	4.35	6.86	10	8	3	80%	30%	4.10	4.70	7.70
VCU	14	8	0	57%	0%	6.14	6.79	10.00	16	12	2	75%	13%	6.69	7.32	9.50
Virginia Tech	35	21	8	60%	23%	5.29	6.37	8.14	24	18	3	75%	13%	5.25	5.67	9.04
Wash U-St Louis	5	2	3	40%	60%	3.20	7.20	4.80	6	6	5	100%	83%	2.83	2.83	3.67
Washington	24	24	14	100%	58%	2.50	2.50	5.04	13	11	7	85%	54%	2.69	3.61	5.39
Washington St	11	6	2	55%	18%	6.45	7.27	8.82	9	9	1	100%	11%	5.33	5.33	9.22
Wisconsin	35	27	10	77%	29%	3.46	4.43	7.54	15	13	8	87%	53%	2.87	3.20	5.67

Table 6. Initial placement rankings of doctoral granting institutions, by decade († indicates ties)

Alma Mater	<i>First Decade</i>			<i>Second Decade</i>		
	All	Acc	Doc	All	Acc	Doc
Alabama	49 †	42	36	59	64	41
Arizona	24	20	25	23	23	25
Arizona State	28	30	26	40 †	41	45
Arkansas	65 †	59	62	63	65	50
Berkeley	9 †	6 †	3 †	7	5	2
Boston	21	25	47	45	46	51
Carnegie Mellon	4 †	2	9	22	16	13
Case Western	14	11	13	29	28	39
Central Florida	64	55	51			
Chicago	4 †	15 †	5	3	19	5
Cincinnati	60	63	71 †			
Colorado	44 †	50	50	44	43	43
Columbia	22	29	29	17	11	15
Connecticut	37 †	49	59	43	47	61 †
Cornell	2	1	3 †	4	3	6
CUNY-Baruch	42	48	43	66 †	71	68 †
Drexel	41	52 †	57	58	55	68 †
Florida	29	26	18	33	39	24
Florida State	36	31	31	47	45	44
G. Washington				28	26	42
Georgia	53	46	45	31	32	32
Georgia State	48	41	32 †	50	49	34
Harvard	16	18	11	1	1	1
Houston	57	56 †	55	61	57	68 †
Illinois	23	21	27	14	17	19
Indiana	25	19	17	15 †	9	18
Iowa	7	4	7	6	4	9
Kansas	55	52 †	53	35 †	33 †	26
Kent State	63	68	69	70	72	68 †
Kentucky	71	66	68	60	59	61 †
Louisiana Tech	75	75	70	74	74	67
LSU	51	47	39 †	42	38	33
Maryland	47	56 †	38	55	61	54
Massachusetts	32 †	38	48	30	29	30
Memphis	68	71 †	66	66 †	68	52
Michigan	9 †	6 †	12	8	6	10
Michigan State	31	37	32 †	27	24	35
Minnesota	13	17	15			
Mississippi	72	71 †	67	72	69	68 †
Mississippi State	73	74	71 †	73	70	66

Table 6. Continued.

Alma Mater	<i>First Decade</i>			<i>Second Decade</i>		
	All	Acc	Doc	All	Acc	Doc
Missouri	44 †	43	39 †	46	42	36
MIT	9 †	6 †	2	11	7	3 †
Nebraska	59	64	71 †	53	52	59
North Carolina	19	14	21 †	19 †	22	27
North Texas	65 †	61	56	71	73	68 †
Northwestern	8	5	14	9	18	8
NYU	12	9 ‡	19	12	8	14
Ohio State	17	23	20	32	33 †	22
Oklahoma	62	65	58	49	50	63
Oklahoma State	54	45	44	62	58	49
Oregon	40	36	34	18	12	20
Penn State	35	34	41	19 †	15	12
Pennsylvania	6	3	8	5	10	7
Pittsburgh	32 †	28	21 †	13	13	23
Purdue	27	22	28	51 †	48	46
Rochester	3	9 ‡	6	10	14	11
Rutgers	70	67	63	65	63	65
South Carolina	49 †	44	37	38	36	40
South Florida				35 †	40	53
Southern Cal	26	27	30	15 †	20	17
Southern Illinois	67	73	60	69	66	56
St Louis	76	76	71 †			
Stanford	1	13	1	2	2	3 †
SUNY-Buffalo				40 †	37	37
Temple	58	69	71 †	51 †	54	55
Tennessee	37 †	32	46	35 †	35	38
Texas A&M	46	39	49	48	51	48
Texas Tech	43	40	54	54	60	57
Texas-Arlington	74	70	64	64	62	68 †
Texas-Austin	18	24	16	21	25	21
Texas-Dallas				34	31	31
UCLA	15	12	10			
Union	56	54	65			
Utah	39	33	35	39	44	47
VCU	61	58	71 †	68	67	64
Virginia Tech	52	51	52	56	56	58
Wash U-St Louis	30	60	23	25	21	16
Washington	20	15 †	24	24	30	28
Washington St	69	62	61	57	53	60
Wisconsin	34	35	42	26	27	29

Table 7. Rank order based on initial placement research productivity measures by decade
(† indicates ties)

#	<i>First Decade (1987-1996)</i>			<i>Second Decade (1997-2006)</i>		
	All	Acc.	Doc.	All	Acc.	Doc.
1	Stanford	Cornell	Stanford	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard
2	Cornell	Carnegie Mellon	MIT	Stanford	Stanford	Berkeley
3	Rochester	Pennsylvania	Berkeley†	Chicago	Cornell	MIT†
4	Carnegie Mellon†	Iowa	Cornell†	Cornell	Iowa	Stanford†
5	Chicago†	Northwestern	Chicago	Pennsylvania	Berkeley	Chicago
6	Pennsylvania	Berkeley†	Rochester	Iowa	Michigan	Cornell
7	Iowa	Michigan†	Iowa	Berkeley	MIT	Pennsylvania
8	Northwestern	MIT†	Pennsylvania	Michigan	NYU	Northwestern
9	Berkeley†	Rochester‡	Carnegie Mellon	Northwestern	Indiana	Iowa
10	Michigan†	NYU‡	UCLA	Rochester	Pennsylvania	Michigan
11	MIT†	Case Western	Harvard	MIT	Columbia	Rochester
12	NYU	UCLA	Michigan	NYU	Oregon	Penn State
13	Minnesota	Stanford	Case Western	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Mellon
14	Case Western	North Carolina	Northwestern	Illinois	Rochester	NYU
15	UCLA	Washington†	Minnesota	Indiana†	Penn State	Columbia
16	Harvard	Chicago†	Texas-Austin	Southern Cal†	Carnegie Mellon	WashU-St Louis
17	Ohio State	Minnesota	Indiana	Columbia	Illinois	Southern Cal
18	Texas-Austin	Harvard	Florida	Oregon	Northwestern	Indiana
19	North Carolina	Indiana	NYU	North Carolina†	Chicago	Illinois
20	Washington	Arizona	Ohio State	Penn State†	Southern Cal	Oregon
21	Boston	Illinois	North Carolina†	Texas-Austin	WashU-St Louis	Texas-Austin
22	Columbia	Purdue	Pittsburgh†	Carnegie Mellon	North Carolina	Ohio State
23	Illinois	Ohio State	WashU-St Louis	Arizona	Arizona	Pittsburgh
24	Arizona	Texas-Austin	Washington	Washington	Michigan State	Florida
25	Indiana	Boston	Arizona	WashU-St Louis	Texas-Austin	Arizona
26	Southern Cal	Florida	Arizona State	Wisconsin	G. Washington	Kansas
27	Purdue	Southern Cal	Illinois	Michigan State	Wisconsin	North Carolina
28	Arizona State	Pittsburgh	Purdue	G. Washington	Case Western	Washington
29	Florida	Columbia	Columbia	Case Western	Massachusetts	Wisconsin
30	WashU-St Louis	Arizona State	Southern Cal	Massachusetts	Washington	Massachusetts
31	Michigan State	Florida State	Florida State	Georgia	Texas-Dallas	Texas-Dallas
32	Massachusetts†	Tennessee	Michigan State†	Ohio State	Georgia	Georgia
33	Pittsburgh†	Utah	Georgia State†	Florida	Kansas†	LSU
34	Wisconsin	Penn State	Oregon	Texas-Dallas	Ohio State†	Georgia State
35	Penn State	Wisconsin	Utah	Kansas†	Tennessee	Michigan State
36	Florida State	Oregon	Alabama	South Florida†	South Carolina	Missouri
37	Connecticut†	Michigan State	South Carolina	Tennessee†	SUNY-Buffalo	SUNY-Buffalo
38	Tennessee†	Massachusetts	Maryland	South Carolina	LSU	Tennessee
39	Utah	Texas A&M	Missouri†	Utah	Florida	Case Western
40	Oregon	Texas Tech	LSU†	Arizona State†	South Florida	South Carolina
41	Drexel	Georgia State	Penn State	SUNY-Buffalo†	Arizona State	Alabama

Table 7. Continued. († indicates ties)

<i>First Decade (1987-1996)</i>			<i>Second Decade (1997-2006)</i>			
#	All	Acc.	All	Acc.	Doc.	
42	CUNY-Baruch	Alabama	Wisconsin	LSU	Missouri	G. Washington
43	Texas Tech	Missouri	CUNY-Baruch	Connecticut	Colorado	Colorado
44	Colorado†	South Carolina	Oklahoma State	Colorado	Utah	Florida State
45	Missouri†	Oklahoma State	Georgia	Boston	Florida State	Arizona State
46	Texas A&M	Georgia	Tennessee	Missouri	Boston	Purdue
47	Maryland	LSU	Boston	Florida State	Connecticut	Utah
48	Georgia State	CUNY-Baruch	Massachusetts	Texas A&M	Purdue	Texas A&M
49	Alabama†	Connecticut	Texas A&M	Oklahoma	Georgia State	Oklahoma State
50	South Carolina†	Colorado	Colorado	Georgia State	Oklahoma	Arkansas
51	LSU	Virginia Tech	Central Florida	Purdue†	Texas A&M	Boston
52	Virginia Tech	Drexel†	Virginia Tech	Temple†	Nebraska	Memphis
53	Georgia	Kansas†	Kansas	Nebraska	Washington St	South Florida
54	Oklahoma State	Union	Texas Tech	Texas Tech	Temple	Maryland
55	Kansas	Central Florida	Houston	Maryland	Drexel	Temple
56	Union	Houston†	North Texas	Virginia Tech	Virginia Tech	Southern Illinois
57	Houston	Maryland†	Drexel	Washington St	Houston	Texas Tech
58	Temple	VCU	Oklahoma	Drexel	Oklahoma State	Virginia Tech
59	Nebraska	Arkansas	Connecticut	Alabama	Kentucky	Nebraska
60	Cincinnati	WashU-St Louis	Southern Illinois	Kentucky	Texas Tech	Washington St
61	VCU	North Texas	Washington St	Houston	Maryland	Connecticut†
62	Oklahoma	Washington St	Arkansas	Oklahoma State	Texas-Arlington	Kentucky†
63	Kent State	Cincinnati	Rutgers	Arkansas	Rutgers	Oklahoma
64	Central Florida	Nebraska	Texas-Arlington	Texas-Arlington	Alabama	VCU
65	Arkansas†	Oklahoma	Union	Rutgers	Arkansas	Rutgers
66	North Texas†	Kentucky	Memphis	CUNY-Baruch†	Southern Illinois	Mississippi St
67	Southern Illinois	Rutgers	Mississippi	Memphis†	VCU	Louisiana Tech
68	Memphis	Kent State	Kentucky	VCU	Memphis	CUNY-Baruch†
69	Washington St	Temple	Kent State	Southern Illinois	Mississippi	Drexel†
70	Rutgers	Texas-Arlington	Louisiana Tech	Kent State	Mississippi St	Houston†
71	Kentucky	Memphis†	Cincinnati†	North Texas	CUNY-Baruch	Kent State†
72	Mississippi	Mississippi†	Mississippi St†	Mississippi	Kent State	Mississippi†
73	Mississippi St	Southern Illinois	Nebraska†	Mississippi St	North Texas	North Texas†
74	Texas-Arlington	Mississippi St	St Louis†	Louisiana Tech	Louisiana Tech	Texas-Arlington†
75	Louisiana Tech	Louisiana Tech	Temple†			
76	St Louis	St Louis	VCU†			

Appendix. Expanded Table 2. Degree granting institution – Placement information (including unadjusted and adjusted mean decile ranks.

<u>Alma Mater</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>Doc.</u>	<u>Acc. %</u>	<u>Doc. %</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Unadjusted</u>		<u>Adjusted</u>	
							<u>Acc.</u>	<u>Doc.</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>Doc.</u>
Alabama	32	24	12	75%	38%	5.31	4.46	1.92	5.85	6.97
Arizona	59	55	34	93%	58%	2.71	2.49	1.65	3.00	5.19
Arkansas	35	22	7	63%	20%	6.26	5.18	2.57	6.97	8.51
Arizona State	53	45	25	85%	47%	3.49	3.09	1.88	4.13	6.17
CUNY-Baruch	16	9	2	56%	13%	5.69	5.56	1.50	7.50	8.94
Berkeley	23	23	22	100%	96%	1.48	1.48	1.27	1.48	1.65
Boston	21	17	5	81%	24%	3.38	2.76	1.60	4.14	8.00
Carnegie Mellon	12	12	10	100%	83%	1.75	1.75	1.20	1.75	2.67
Case Western	10	10	7	100%	70%	2.50	2.50	1.86	2.50	4.30
Central Florida	12	8	3	67%	25%	6.50	5.00	2.33	6.67	8.08
Chicago	27	23	25	85%	93%	1.30	1.30	1.20	2.59	1.85
Cincinnati	11	7	0	64%	0%	6.27	5.86	-	7.37	10.00
Cleveland St	7	2	0	29%	0%	9.00	7.50	-	9.29	10.00
Colorado	32	22	9	69%	28%	4.56	3.45	1.89	5.50	7.72
Columbia	20	17	13	85%	65%	2.30	1.41	1.15	2.70	4.25
Connecticut	18	13	2	72%	11%	4.22	3.54	1.00	5.33	9.00
Cornell	24	24	22	100%	92%	1.25	1.25	1.14	1.25	1.88
Drexel	22	14	3	64%	14%	4.77	3.93	1.67	6.14	8.86
Duke	5	5	4	100%	80%	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	4.00
Florida St	40	34	17	85%	43%	4.10	3.38	2.12	4.37	6.65
Florida	38	30	26	79%	68%	3.32	2.20	2.00	3.84	4.53
Geo. Washington	12	9	3	75%	25%	4.75	3.44	2.67	5.08	8.17
Georgia State	34	27	15	79%	44%	5.03	3.96	2.27	5.20	6.59
Georgia	54	41	18	76%	33%	4.78	3.76	1.72	5.26	7.24
Harvard	14	13	13	93%	93%	1.64	1.31	1.31	1.93	1.93
Houston	41	29	7	71%	17%	5.78	5.00	2.86	6.46	8.78
Illinois	45	41	27	91%	60%	2.44	2.17	1.41	2.87	4.85
Indiana	39	38	28	97%	72%	2.51	2.37	1.79	2.57	4.11
Iowa	25	25	22	100%	88%	1.40	1.40	1.18	1.40	2.24
Kansas	15	10	5	67%	33%	5.13	3.40	1.60	5.60	7.20
Kent State	35	16	1	46%	3%	6.71	5.75	3.00	8.06	9.80
Kentucky	49	31	4	63%	8%	6.29	5.13	2.25	6.92	9.37
LSU	46	34	17	74%	37%	4.91	3.88	2.18	5.48	7.11
La Tech	37	16	2	43%	5%	8.41	7.63	5.50	8.98	9.76
MIT	13	13	13	100%	100%	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69
Massachusetts	16	13	6	81%	38%	3.38	2.62	1.83	4.00	6.94
Maryland	27	17	8	63%	30%	5.11	4.35	3.00	6.44	7.93
Memphis	31	15	4	48%	13%	6.48	5.53	2.50	7.84	9.03
Michigan St	52	42	21	81%	40%	3.19	2.52	1.62	3.96	6.62
Michigan	49	49	40	100%	82%	1.47	1.47	1.23	1.47	2.84
Minnesota	19	17	14	89%	74%	2.00	1.71	1.43	2.58	3.69

Appendix. Expanded Table 2. Degree granting institution – Placement information (including unadjusted and adjusted mean decile ranks) – *continued*.

<u>Alma Mater</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>Doc.</u>	<u>Acc. %</u>	<u>Doc. %</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Unadjusted</u>		<u>Adjusted</u>	
							<u>Acc.</u>	<u>Doc.</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>Doc.</u>
Mississippi	49	26	3	53%	6%	7.49	6.54	3.67	8.16	9.61
Mississippi St	34	20	1	59%	3%	7.94	7.70	8.00	8.65	9.94
Missouri	26	21	10	81%	38%	4.62	3.90	2.30	5.07	7.04
North Texas	44	21	7	48%	16%	6.70	5.05	2.57	7.64	8.82
North Carolina	31	29	18	94%	58%	2.29	2.14	1.44	2.65	5.03
NYU	25	25	18	100%	72%	1.84	1.84	1.28	1.84	3.72
Nebraska	40	26	2	65%	5%	5.55	4.62	2.50	6.50	9.63
Northwestern	22	21	18	95%	82%	1.50	1.52	1.28	1.91	2.87
Ohio St	38	30	24	79%	63%	2.71	1.77	1.58	3.50	4.68
Oklahoma St	33	23	10	70%	30%	5.82	4.22	2.70	5.97	7.79
Oklahoma	22	14	4	64%	18%	5.59	4.29	3.50	6.37	8.82
Oregon	19	17	10	89%	53%	3.26	2.59	1.70	3.37	5.63
Penn State	50	44	25	88%	50%	3.22	2.80	1.60	3.66	5.80
Pennsylvania	22	21	20	95%	91%	1.36	1.29	1.30	1.69	2.09
Pittsburgh	25	22	15	88%	60%	2.64	2.14	1.33	3.08	4.80
Purdue	21	18	10	86%	48%	3.57	2.61	1.60	3.67	6.00
Rochester	24	22	21	92%	88%	1.42	1.41	1.24	2.13	2.34
Rutgers	28	19	2	68%	7%	6.39	5.42	2.00	6.89	9.43
Southern Cal	29	25	16	86%	55%	2.52	2.36	1.38	3.41	5.24
South Florida	15	13	2	87%	13%	4.80	4.38	1.50	5.13	8.87
Southern Illinois	16	7	3	44%	19%	6.63	5.14	3.67	7.87	8.81
South Carolina	53	42	20	79%	38%	4.77	3.83	2.05	5.11	7.00
SUNY-Buffalo	13	12	8	92%	62%	3.69	3.83	2.88	4.30	5.62
St Louis	10	1	0	10%	0%	8.40	5.00	-	9.50	10.00
Stanford	30	28	29	93%	97%	1.17	1.11	1.14	1.70	1.44
Syracuse	7	6	4	86%	57%	2.71	2.17	1.50	3.29	5.14
Temple	23	14	2	61%	9%	5.39	4.43	3.00	6.61	9.39
Tenn	41	37	13	90%	32%	4.00	3.59	2.00	4.22	7.46
Texas A&M	70	61	18	87%	26%	4.87	4.36	1.67	5.09	7.86
Texas Tech	38	29	7	76%	18%	4.89	4.10	1.86	5.50	8.50
Texas-Arlington	20	13	2	65%	10%	7.25	6.08	3.00	7.45	9.30
Texas-Austin	63	52	42	83%	67%	2.32	1.79	1.38	3.22	4.25
Texas-Dallas	7	7	3	100%	43%	3.86	3.86	1.00	3.86	6.14
UCLA	6	6	5	100%	83%	2.17	2.17	1.40	2.17	2.83
UnionNY	8	4	1	50%	13%	5.75	3.75	3.00	6.88	9.13
Utah	24	21	8	88%	33%	4.21	3.71	1.63	4.50	7.21
VCU	30	20	2	67%	7%	6.43	5.60	6.00	7.07	9.73
Virginia Tech	59	39	11	66%	19%	5.27	4.08	2.00	6.09	8.51
Washington	37	35	21	95%	57%	2.57	2.49	1.48	2.90	5.16
Wash U -St Louis	11	8	8	73%	73%	3.00	2.88	2.00	4.82	4.18
Washington St	20	15	3	75%	15%	5.95	5.20	3.33	6.40	9.00
Wisconsin	50	40	18	80%	36%	3.28	2.58	1.61	4.06	6.98