

# **AACSB International Accounting Accreditation: Benefits and Challenges**

**Catherine Gaharan**

Nicholls State University

**Michael A. Chiasson**

Nicholls State University

**Karen M. Foust**

Tulane University

**Shawn Mauldin**

Nicholls State University

## **Abstract**

This analysis examines the impact on accounting units from seeking and achieving accounting accreditation. The units tend to experience significant changes during the accreditation process, including increases in intellectual contributions, interactions with the profession, level of advisory board involvement, and curriculum improvements. However, few changes were found in faculty turnover and in promotion and tenure guidelines. These results further indicate little change in faculty teaching loads and compensation. Thus, although the faculty exert considerable effort prior to and during the accreditation process to meet or exceed standards, they receive only few benefits for that effort. Additional results indicate a positive impact on students. Graduates from accredited accounting programs tend to find improved job placement opportunities. Finally, this study analyzes how accounting departments maintain the professional qualification status of its faculty and determines what other problems units face in the accreditation process.

## **Introduction**

The accreditation of a university's programs provides assurance that each accredited program meets standards of excellence and helps publicize the quality of those programs. The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) International is the accrediting body for the business curriculum, and provides separate accreditation for accounting programs. The value of accreditation is becoming increasingly recognized, evidenced by 515 schools attaining general business accreditation and 167 accounting programs receiving separate accounting accreditation as of December 2005 (AACSB.edu/accredited members, March 2006, 1). With more accounting units seeking accreditation, questions arise concerning the benefits and challenges of the process. This study attempts to provide evidence about the benefits and problems accounting units face as a result of the accreditation process.

## **Accreditation**

The purpose of accreditation is to provide assurance of the quality of an educational institution or an educational program. By voluntarily undergoing an independent review, the educational institution seeks an evaluation of the quality of its programs including identification of any deficiencies that need remediation. Accredited educational institutions and programs continuously review and improve their programs to maintain their accreditation. There are two basic forms of accreditation. The regional or institutional form reviews entire colleges and universities.

Regional accreditation serves the public interest by assuring that an institution's educational programs have been intellectually devised (rather than simply fulfilling technical objectives), that the institution's objectives are appropriate and are being accomplished, and that the institution merits confidence by the public (Hardin and Stocks 1995, 82).

The second form of accreditation is specialized in which professional agencies award accreditation to specific programs or academic units in a particular field of study. Specialized accreditation was developed in response to the concerns of professions regarding the quality of the educational programs that prepare practitioners. AACSB International is the agency that grants accreditation for colleges (or schools) of business and for programs (or departments) of accounting (Hardin and Stocks 1995, 82).

### **AACSB International Business Accreditation**

AACSB International, founded in 1916, adopted its first accreditation standards in 1919. It developed a separate set of standards in 1980 for programs in accounting. In 1991, it revised those standards so that achieving accreditation is now based on whether the school can demonstrate that it meets its stated mission. In 2003, AACSB International again revamped its standards to apply to business programs throughout the world. In its efforts to continuously improve those standards, AACSB International revised the standards for each of years 2004, 2005 and 2006 (AACSB International, Jan. 2006, i). In 2004, it also revised its standards for accounting programs, and updated them in 2005 (AACSB International, April 2005, 1).

### **AACSB International Accounting Accreditation**

The accreditation of accounting programs began in 1981 as a result of efforts "by the AACSB International in conjunction with the AICPA, the American Accounting Association (AAA), the National Association of Accountants (NAA), the Financial Executives Institute (FEI), and also advised by the Federated Schools of Accountancy, the Government Accounting Office, and representatives from national public accounting firms" (Pastore, 1989, 20). In 1982, a total of 18 accounting programs were accredited. By 1989, the number of accredited accounting programs rose to 72, and, as of November 2004, accounting programs accredited by AACSB International totaled 165 ([www.AACSB.edu](http://www.AACSB.edu) 2004). The number of accounting programs seeking separate AACSB International accreditation is expected to continue to increase.

Recently, the AACSB International and its member schools adopted a new set of standards for accounting accreditation. The opening paragraph of the preamble to the revised accounting accreditation standards states that: "The accreditation process intends to promote the development of accounting education programs of high quality and to encourage innovation and continual improvement" (AACSB International, April 22, 2005, 3). The preamble (3) notes that the determination of a quality accounting program is based on several factors including:

- the qualifications, development, and involvement of the faculty;
- the design and effectiveness of the curriculum;
- the nature and effectiveness and resources needed and used, for instructional and learning purposes;
- the academic preparation and capabilities of entering students;
- the processes in place to plan, assess, and assure quality; and
- the intellectual contributions of the faculty.

The relative importance of each of the above factors depends on the individual accounting program's mission and educational objectives (AACSB International, April 22, 2005, 3). Accounting accreditation is an extension of the accreditation of the business college. For an accounting program to seek separate accreditation, the business program must be accredited. A complete discussion of the business and the accounting standards can be found at the AACSB International website at [www.AACSB.edu](http://www.AACSB.edu) 2006. The initial accreditation process includes a self-evaluation, as well as a peer review. Once accreditation is granted, the accounting programs must demonstrate continued adherence to the standards supported by adequate financial resources. In order to maintain its accreditation, both the business and the accounting programs must enter into a program of periodic review of strategic improvement progress (AACSB International, April 22, 2005, 20).

## Literature Review

While much of the research on accreditation investigates the accreditation of colleges (business, education, etc.) or the university as a whole, the topic of separate accounting accreditation has also been investigated. In fact, long before the process of separate accreditation of accounting programs began in the early 1980s, the need for such accreditation was discussed (MacKenzie 1964; Stettler 1965; Allyn 1966; Pearson 1979).

After the accounting accreditation process was developed, concerns were discussed about the many challenges posed by the separate accreditation of accounting programs. Pastore (1989, 24-25) discussed the need to improve the accreditation process and noted that more departments of accounting must seek separate accounting accreditation for such accreditation to become generally acceptable. His concern was that separate accreditation was not viewed as necessary. He noted that until more departments go through the accreditation process, leading to a better definition of differences between excellent and non-excellent programs, accreditation will not necessarily distinguish an accredited program as excellent and a non-accredited program as not excellent. At the time of Pastore's research, only 72 programs had achieved separate accounting accreditation. Currently only 34% of the accounting programs of AACSB International accredited colleges have achieved separate accounting accreditation, which means that accounting accreditation still may not be viewed as the definitive sign of program excellence.

Bailey and Bentz (1991, 170-171) pointed to the need for improvement in the accreditation process itself. They discussed problems in establishing accreditation standards and in judging whether departments met those standards. Early standards were quite rigid. As a result of complaints about the standards, more flexible standards are now used which are expected to encourage departments to respond to change with innovative programs. A study by Kren et al. (1993, 260-261) also found that previous accounting accreditation standards were perceived to be too rigid. Faculty at non-accredited programs believed that the costs associated with accreditation were not justified by benefits accruing to the accounting unit and to the school. This perception of the lack of cost/benefit justification was also found in an earlier study by Campbell and Williamson (1983, 62).

Graduates of accredited accounting programs, however, appear to realize benefits from accreditation. Studies by both Hardin and Stocks (1995) and by Kim et al. (1996) examined the degree of impact separate accounting accreditation had on job placement for graduates. Both studies found that accounting accreditation does have a positive impact on job placement. Hardin and Stocks (1995, 91-93) found that a hypothetical graduate from an accredited program is more highly regarded than one from a non-accredited program. Kim et al. (1996, 129-131) discovered that starting salary offers by national CPA firms to graduates of accredited programs are higher than those offered to graduates from non-accredited programs. Such a difference in starting salary offers, however, was not found for regional and local CPA firms.

A major challenge for all programs seeking separate accounting accreditation is meeting the accreditation standards. Sinning and Dykxhoorn (2001, 199), in exploring the processes that are used by accounting units in preparation for meeting the standards, found that the units use many different approaches to prepare for the accreditation process. They also examined the extent of the commitment required of accounting faculty and found that accounting units recognize that an enormous commitment is required of the faculty (Sinning and Dykxhoorn 2001, 183-184) and that methods of maintaining faculty commitment need to be developed faculty (Sinning and Dykxhoorn 2001, 201-202). Further, the assessment requirements included in accounting accreditation are particularly challenging to programs. Finding and using appropriate assessment tools are difficult. Apostolou (1999, 193-194) notes that more research is needed to help develop successful assessment models specifically for accounting programs.

## Research Questions

Prior research has not examined the benefits, if any, that accrue to accredited units nor the challenges presented by the accreditation process. This study attempts to identify benefits and challenges and analyzes whether units with primarily research missions experience different benefits and challenges than those with primarily teaching missions. One of the objectives of this research is to determine whether seeking accounting accreditation results in benefits to the unit and its faculty. Accounting faculty exert considerable effort prior to and during the accreditation process to

meet the standards. As several studies point out (Bailey and Bentz 1991, 170; Kren et al. 1993, 271; Sinning and Dykxhoorn 2001, 183-184), the faculty bears the burden of increased participation and involvement in the process of achieving accounting accreditation. This study questions the extent to which the unit and the faculty are rewarded for their efforts. This study also examines whether these units experience other effects such as increased faculty turnover, changes in faculty performance evaluation methods, and improvements in job placement for students. Finally, this study questions in an open-ended fashion, how accounting units maintain the professionally qualified status of faculty, whether accounting units changed their curriculum, and what other problems units faced during the accreditation process.

## **Research Methods**

To gather information about the benefits and challenges of pursuing separate accounting accreditation, this study surveyed the administrators of accounting departments that had achieved or were in candidacy for accreditation as of July 2003. The survey instrument consisted of a four-page questionnaire (included in the appendix) which focused on the benefits and challenges of accreditation and the accreditation process. A section of the questionnaire asked for demographic data on each accounting program and institution, including the mission of the unit. The instrument also included four open-ended questions dealing with assessment methods, major challenges faced, and maintenance of professional qualifications and practical experience. The development of the survey instrument included a pre-test using several accounting department administrators who had recently been through separate accounting accreditation. Based on their feedback, several revisions were made to the survey instrument.

The final version of the survey was then sent to the administrators of accounting programs that have achieved or were in candidacy for separate accounting accreditation. The first mailing was sent in July 2003 to 168 schools. A second mailing was sent in September 2003. A total of 71 usable responses were received (a 42% response rate). Although candidacy schools were included in the request for information, only two usable responses were received from schools in candidacy. The remaining 69 usable responses were from schools that had achieved separate accounting accreditation.

## **Results**

### ***Demographic Information***

Demographic information from the second section of the survey for the 71 units that responded is presented in Table 1. Thirty-four units indicate that their college's mission is primarily research-based, 32 identify it as primarily teaching-based, and five did not answer. The remaining demographics are presented separately by type of mission for the 66 units that identified mission base.

### ***Motivation***

Both groups report that the motivation for accounting accreditation is university mandated from a small to a moderate extent. State mandates for accounting accreditation were reported to be from not at all to a small extent. There are no significant differences between the groups for these two factors. However, units with teaching missions report that accreditation is both faculty driven and driven by market forces from a considerable to an extreme extent. Research units report these motivating factors from a moderate to considerable extent, and the differences are significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively. Table 2 shows these findings.

### ***Support for the Accreditation Process***

There are no significant differences in the sources of support for accreditation between units with research missions and those with teaching missions. Both report that university administration and the business school deans provide support from a moderate to a considerable extent. Other business units provide support to a small extent. Table 2 reports these results.

### ***Inconsistency in Interpretation of Standards***

The standards relating to academically qualified faculty seem to be the least likely to cause inconsistencies in interpretation. Both research-based and teaching-based units report a small to moderate extent of inconsistency among how deans, accounting department heads, advisors, and team members interpret these standards. Somewhat more inconsistency was reported concerning the standards governing professionally-qualified faculty by both groups.

The standards concerning assessment methods apparently cause the most inconsistencies for both groups, reported as moderate to considerable. Teaching-based units report the most inconsistencies in interpretation of the relevant practical experience standards. Research-based units report a lack of consistency in interpretation of these standards to a slightly less than moderate extent, while teaching-based units reported slightly less than considerable extent. This difference is statistically significant at the .01 level. Results of these questions are reported in Table 2.

### ***Effects of Accreditation or Candidacy***

The results indicate that the accreditation process has a major impact on accounting programs, requiring several adjustments, such as in the need for increased funding, in expectations of faculty performance, in improvements to the curriculum, and in focus on the mission. While accounting programs are challenged to make the necessary changes to meet accreditation standards, the adjustments result in some benefits to the program as well. The following analysis of results is done by type of mission of the unit—research or teaching.

#### **Impact on Funding**

The analysis of benefits from accreditation indicates mixed results. Respondents report only limited increases in funding to meet the demands of an accredited program. Increased funding for existing faculty salaries average between “not at all” and “to a small extent” for both research and teaching mission units (1.56 vs. 1.62). However, new faculty salaries increased between “to a moderate extent” and “to a considerable extent” for both (3.18 vs. 3.81). Although teaching units reported a larger increase, the difference is not statistically significant.

Both types of units report a small to moderate increase in funding for professional travel (for example, to AICPA meetings and for continuing professional education) (2.38 vs. 2.78). Units with research missions report a small to moderate increase in funding for academic travel (for example, to present results of research), while those with teaching missions report a moderate to considerable increase (2.71 vs. 3.41). This difference is statistically significant at the .05 level. Research units report very little increase in funding for dues to professional organizations, but teaching units report a small to moderate increase in funding for this purpose (1.50 vs. 2.22). The difference between the two is statistically significant at the .01 level.

While very little increase in funding for supplies is reported (1.06 vs. 1.09), both groups report small to moderate increases in funding for technology in classrooms (2.09 vs. 2.17) and computer labs (2.03 vs. 2.34). Research units report a small increase in technology in faculty offices, while teaching units report small to moderate increases, although this difference is not significant (1.88 vs. 2.44). Little increase in funding for library resources is reported for both groups (1.91 vs. 1.50). Table 3 lists the means and the results of one-way analysis of variance testing for reported increased funding benefits of accreditation for units with research versus teaching mission.

#### **Impact on Program Activities**

While both groups report a moderate to considerable increase in intellectual contributions (3.48 vs. 3.81) and in interactions with the profession (3.36 vs. 3.38) as a result of accreditation or candidacy, the examination found little increase in faculty turnover (1.39 vs. 1.31). Both groups report only small to moderate increases in outside funding (2.52 vs. 2.75). Advisory board involvement increased to a moderate extent for research mission units and from a moderate to a considerable extent for teaching mission units (2.97 vs. 3.63). The difference between accounting units based on mission type is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Accounting accreditation or candidacy results in small to moderate changes in promotion and tenure guidelines (2.12 vs. 2.66) as well as in annual evaluations for units with both missions (2.82 vs. 2.59). Teaching-based units report changes in promotion and tenure guidelines to a slightly higher extent and research-based departments report

more extensive changes in annual evaluations. The differences, however, are not significant. Both research-based and teaching-based units report moderate to considerable improvements in curriculum resulting from the accreditation process (3.24 vs. 3.88). Teaching-based units report more improvement than research-based. The difference is significant at the .05 level. The units report, however, that teaching loads were reduced either not at all or to a small extent. There is no significant difference in reduction of teaching loads as a result of accreditation (1.91 vs. 1.78). Only a small increase in the number of graduate assistants was found. Research-based units report a larger increase than do the teaching-based units (1.81 vs. 1.16). This difference is significant at the .01 level.

The results indicate that accounting accreditation does result in benefits to students. Both groups report improvement in the placement of graduating students (3.00 vs. 3.25). Both groups also indicate that recruitment of better qualified students to the program (3.39 vs. 3.38) as well as recruitment of better qualified faculty (3.61 vs. 3.50) is positively affected by a moderate to considerable extent. There are no significant differences between research-based and teaching-based departments for these three benefits. Additionally, both groups report a moderate to considerable increase in focus on the units' missions (2.48 vs. 3.69) and identification of their programs' stakeholders (3.79 vs. 3.31). Neither group experienced more than a small amount of animosity from other business departments or faculty (1.52 vs. 1.44). Complete listings of the means and the results of one-way analysis of variance testing are available in Table 4.

### **Required Intellectual Activities**

The average number (from a range of one to five) of peer-reviewed articles during a five-year period recommended for faculty to remain academically qualified is 3.59 for research units and 4.04 for teaching units. The number of recommended presentations is 3.36 for research-based and 3.0 for teaching-based units. The average number of proceedings recommended for faculty of research-based units is 2.36 and for teaching-based units, 4.06. Only the proceedings category show a statistically significant difference (at the .01 level). Table 5 gives complete results for required intellectual activities.

### **Exploratory Inquiry**

The final section of the survey asked respondents to complete four open-ended questions. Responses to these questions provide insight as to the major challenges faced by accounting programs seeking accreditation and the methods used by those programs to meet accreditation standards. The first question asks how faculty maintain their professional qualifications. The most common methods are consulting activities, continuing professional education (CPE) credits, seminars and conferences, involvement with professional organizations such as state societies, the AICPA, and the Institute of Management Accountants (IMA), developmental leaves and internships, interaction with practitioners, and the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program. The second question asks respondents to enumerate the major challenges presented by accreditation or candidacy. The seven most common challenges, with the number of respondents denoted parenthetically, are time commitment (19), intellectual contributions (17), paperwork and planning (15), financial resources (13), the relevant practical experience standard (7), assessment (7), and shifting of resources away from the accounting program after accreditation (5). When responding to the third question asking what primary assessment tools are used for the program, respondents listed alumni and employer surveys (24), exit exams and interviews (23), placement data (18), internal evaluation of courses and curriculum objectives (11), student evaluations (11), performance in selected courses (9), and pre- and post-testing (7). Responses to the fourth question of the methods faculty use to obtain relevant practical experience include faculty internships, continuing professional education, consulting activities, interaction with professional societies and practitioners, and part-time accounting practices.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this paper is to examine the benefits and challenges presented by accounting accreditation. Accounting units that are contemplating seeking separate accounting accreditation can examine these results to determine whether seeking accreditation is worthwhile. The results indicate that achieving separate accounting accreditation has a positive influence on the program in several areas. Often advisory boards become more involved,

promotion and tenure guidelines and annual faculty evaluation methods are examined, the curriculum is improved, and better qualified students and faculty are attracted to the program. Faculty teaching loads, however, do not decrease significantly, and the availability of graduate assistants does not increase significantly.

Students also benefit from accreditation. Students in the program are better qualified, and graduates find better placement opportunities. The findings of improved placement opportunities are consistent with results of prior research indicating that because of the positive signaling effect of accreditation, graduates have improved job placement opportunities [Hardin and Stocks (1995, 91-93) and Kim et al. (1996, 128)]. A further benefit of accreditation is that the accounting units receive better guidance and sense of direction. Often the unit's mission is reviewed and updated, and stakeholders are identified more extensively.

On the other hand, units seeking accounting accreditation face many challenges. Accounting units experience only limited increases in funding, benefiting existing faculty mostly through increases in funds for travel and technology while benefiting new faculty with increases in salaries as well as for travel and technology. The existing faculty, therefore, receives very little benefit from increased funding although they must bear most of the burden of achieving accreditation through increased intellectual contributions and involvement in other activities to improve the program as well as continued or increased service efforts. The endeavor, therefore, may be demotivating to existing faculty without a commitment of financial and other support. The small increase found in faculty turnover may be due, in part, to units that are seeking to improve faculty resumes. These units may seek new hires with significant research histories. Additionally, existing faculty may leave either because they are persuaded to leave due to low achievement or because high-achieving faculty members become more aware of their value and seek higher-paying positions elsewhere.

The quite candid responses to the open-ended question of major challenges provide further insight into the considerable challenges faced. The extensive time requirement is most often cited with the difficulty of improving faculty intellectual contribution output as the second most-cited challenge. The large amount of paperwork and planning and the lack of sufficient increases in financial support are also frequently cited. As one respondent questioned, "Is it really worth it?"

Accounting accreditation signals excellence to program stakeholders. As more units achieve accounting accreditation, more pressure may be applied to units that are not accredited. However, each program will have to determine whether the benefits outweigh the challenges in deciding whether to seek separate accounting accreditation. Table 6 is a snapshot summary of the benefits and challenges found in this study.

### **Limitations**

While the results of this study provide information about accounting units that are separately accredited as well as those seeking separate accreditation, these results are limited to the experiences of the respondent units. Accounting units not responding to the survey may have different experiences. Additionally, accounting units not involved with separate accreditation are excluded from the survey, so there is no control for experiences that may have affected units in general rather than being caused by the accreditation process. Other factors such as changes in administration, changes in funds available to the institution, or changes in the demand for accounting graduates that may have had an influence on the results are not included in the survey instrument. Further, the study does not analyze possible influences of some surveyed factors including differences in size of institution, public versus private institutions, and highest degree offered. A further limitation is apparent in the responses to the question of the number of required articles/conference papers. The results indicating that research schools require fewer than teaching schools seem contrary to expectations. Since the survey does not ask about research quality, a probable explanation for these seemingly paradoxical results is that research schools require a smaller level of output but that the quality of the research is expected to be higher.

## REFERENCES

- AACSB International. 2006. Accreditation. Retrieved from [www.aacsb.edu/accreditation](http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation), March 7.
- AACSB International. 2004. Accredited Members. Retrieved from [WWW.aacsb.edu/accredited](http://WWW.aacsb.edu/accredited) members. December.
- AACSB International. 2006. Accredited Members. Retrieved from [WWW.aacsb.edu/accredited](http://WWW.aacsb.edu/accredited) members. March 10.
- AACSB International. 2005. Eligibility procedures and standards for accounting accreditation. April 22.
- AACSB International. 2006. Eligibility procedures and standards for business accreditation. January 1.
- Allyn, R. G. 1966. Accreditation of accounting curriculums. *The Accounting Review* (April): 303-311.
- Apostolou, B. 1999. Outcomes assessment. *Issues in Accounting Education* (February): 177-197.
- Bailey, A. R., and W. R. Bentz. 1991. Accounting accreditation: Change and transition. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Fall): 168-177.
- Campbell, D. R., and R. W. Williamson. 1983. Accreditation of accounting programs: Administrators' perceptions of proposed AACSB standards. *Issues in Accounting Education*: 60-70.
- Hardin, J., and M. H. Stocks. 1995. The effect of AACSB accreditation on the recruitment of entry-level accountants. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Spring): 83-95.
- Kim, K., J. C. Rhim, W. C. Henderson, N. F. Bizal, and G. A. Pitman. 1996. AACSB accreditation: A positive signal in accounting job markets. *Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business* (June): 123-135.
- Kren, L., K. W. Tatum, and L. C. Phillips. 1993. Separate accreditation of accounting programs: An empirical investigation. *Issues in Accounting Education* (Fall): 135-141.
- MacKenzie, O. 1964. Accreditation of accounting curricula. *The Accounting Review* (April): 363-370
- Pastore, Jr., J. M. 1989. Developing an academic accreditation process relevant to the accounting profession. *The CPA Journal* (May): 18-26.
- Pearson, D. B. 1979. Will accreditation improve the quality of education? *The Journal of Accountancy* (April): 53-58.
- Sinning, K. E., and H. J. Dykxhoorn. 2001. Processes implemented for AACSB accounting accreditation and the degree of faculty involvement. *Issues in Accounting Education* (May): 181-204.
- Stettler, H. F. 1965. Accreditation of collegiate accounting programs. *The Accounting Review* (October): 723-730.

Table 1 – Demographics of Respondents				
	Research	Teaching	Total No.	Percent
<b>Type of mission</b>				
Primarily research-based	34		34	47.9
Primarily teaching-based		32	32	45.1
No response			5	7.0
Total	34	32	71	100.0
<b>Type of institution</b>				
Public	26	20	46	69.7
Private	8	12	20	30.3
Total	34	32	66	100.0
<b>Highest program offered</b>				
Undergraduate	9	10	19	28.8
MBA with concentration in accounting	1	2	3	4.5
Master of Accounting/Tax	12	16	28	42.4
Doctoral	12	4	16	24.3
Total	34	32	66	100.0
<b>Student organizations</b>				
Beta Alpha Psi	33	29	62	93.9
Student Institute of Management Accountants (IMA)	12	9	21	31.8
Accounting Club	17	18	35	53.0
	<b>Research</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>Number of accounting majors</b> (median number)	190	225	200	45 – 1,500
<b>Institution's enrollment</b> (median number)	16,000	10,950	11,500	1,500- 45,000

Scale: 1 – 5 (1 denotes “not at all” and 5 denotes “to an extreme extent”)

Table 2 – Motivation, Support, and Interpretation of Standards				
Research Based v. Teaching Based Missions				
Motivation	Means		F	Prob > F
	Research	Teaching		
University mandated	2.27	2.45	.421	.519
State mandated	1.42	1.21	1.07	.305
Faculty mandated	3.48	4.17	5.28	.025
Market forces	3.41	4.27	8.59	.005
Provided Support				
University administration	3.24	3.28	.019	.89
Business school dean	3.62	3.91	1.67	.201
Other business departments	1.82	1.53	1.70	.197
Interpretation of Standards				
Academically qualified	2.25	2.69	1.88	.175
Professionally qualified	2.94	3.28	.731	.396
Assessment methods	3.72	3.63	.074	.787
Relevant practical experience	2.81	3.94	8.67	.005

Scale: 1 – 5 (1 denotes “not at all” and 5 denotes “to an extreme extent”)

Table 3 – Impact on Funding Research Based v. Teaching Based Missions				
	Means		F	Prob > F
	Research	Teaching		
Existing salaries	1.56	1.62	.105	.747
New salaries	3.18	3.81	4.45	.037
Travel – academic	2.71	3.41	4.43	.039
Travel – professional	2.38	2.78	1.28	.263
Dues	1.50	2.22	7.37	.009
Supplies	1.06	1.09	.858	.358
Technology in classrooms	2.09	2.17	.060	.807
Technology in computer labs	2.03	2.34	1.21	.276
Technology in faculty offices	1.88	2.44	2.77	.101
Library resources	1.91	1.50	3.37	.071

Scale: 1 – 5 (1 denotes “not at all” and 5 denotes “to an extreme extent”)

	Means		F	Prob > F
	Research	Teaching		
Increased intellectual contributions	3.48	3.81	1.15	.287
Increased interaction with the profession	3.36	3.38	.001	.973
Increased faculty turnover	1.39	1.31	.298	.587
Increased outside funding	2.52	2.75	.440	.509
Increased advisory board involvement	2.97	3.63	4.97	.029
Changes in promotion and tenure guidelines	2.12	2.66	2.31	.133
Changes in annual evaluations	2.82	2.59	.557	.458
Improvements in curriculum	3.24	3.88	4.03	.049
Reduced teaching loads	1.91	1.78	.214	.645
More graduate assistants	1.81	1.16	11.58	.001
More clerical support	1.85	1.13	8.68	.005
Easier placement of students	3.00	3.25	.533	.468
Recruitment of better qualified students	3.39	3.38	.003	.957
Recruitment of better qualified faculty	3.61	3.50	.113	.738
Review/focus on mission	3.48	3.69	.378	.541
Identification of program's stakeholders	3.79	3.31	2.02	.160
Animosity from other business faculty/dept.	1.52	1.44	.091	.764

Scale: 1 – 5 (1 denotes “not at all” and 5 denotes “to an extreme extent”)

Table 5 - Required Intellectual Activities Research Based v. Teaching Based Missions				
Intellectual Activity	Means		F	Prob > F
	Research	Teaching		
Peer-reviewed articles	3.59	4.04	2.18	.146
Proceedings	2.36	4.06	14.9	.001
Presentations	3.36	3.00	.510	.481

Scale: 1 – 5 (1 denotes “not at all” and 5 denotes “to an extreme extent”)

Table 6
Benefits
Better qualified faculty are attracted to the program.
Academically better students are attracted to the program.
Graduates experience better placement opportunities.
Program curriculum is improved.
Technology is improved.
Promotion and tenure guidelines are improved
Annual evaluation methods are improved
Mission statements are improved.
Stakeholders are identified more fully.
The advisory board becomes more involved.
Faculty members are more involved in interacting with the profession.
Funding for travel is increased.
Challenges
Extensive commitment of time is required.
Little or no increases in financial resources (except for travel) are forthcoming.
The increases in financial resources that are received are often decreased after accreditation.
Extensive amounts of paperwork and planning are required.
Salaries to existing faculty are not increased.
Teaching loads are not reduced.
The availability of graduate assistants is not increased.
Faculty intellectual contributions must be maintained/increased.
Other activities required of faculty must be increased.
The relevant practical experience standard is difficult to meet.
Professional qualification of faculty is difficult to maintain.
Assessment methods are difficult to develop and time-consuming to implement.

## APPENDIX

### ACCOUNTING ACCREDITATION SURVEY

#### Section 1

Instructions: Using the following response scale, please place the most appropriate number in the blank space to the left of each statement.

1 = Not at all

2 = To a small extent

3 = To a moderate extent

4 = To a considerable extent

5 = To an extreme extent

1. Accounting accreditation or candidacy has increased funding for:

- Existing faculty salaries
- New faculty salaries
- Travel to academic conferences
- Travel to professional meetings
- Dues to professional organizations
- Supplies
- Technical/Library resources
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

2. Accounting accreditation or candidacy has resulted in improvement in technology and/or resources in:

- Classrooms
- Computer labs
- Faculty offices
- Libraries
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

3. Motivation for accounting accreditation or candidacy:

- University mandated
- State mandated
- Faculty mandated
- Market forces/Competing schools
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. To what extent have the following provided support during your accreditation or candidacy process:

- University administration
- Business school dean
- Other business departments
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

5. To what extent has your accounting accreditation or candidacy resulted in:

- Increased intellectual contributions
- Increased interaction with the profession

- Increased faculty turnover
- Increased outside funding
- Increased advisory board involvement
- Changes in promotion and tenure guidelines
- Changes in annual evaluations
- Improvements in curriculum
- Reduced teaching loads
- More graduate assistants
- More clerical support
- Easier placement of students
- Recruitment of better qualified students
- Recruitment of better qualified faculty
- Review/focus on mission
- Identification of program=s stakeholders
- Animosity from other business faculty/departments
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

6. To what extent have you experienced a lack of consistency among how deans, accounting department heads, advisors, and team members interpret the following:

- Academically qualified
- Professionally qualified
- Assessment methods
- Relevant practical experience
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

### Section II

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by filling in the blank or checking the appropriate box.

1. Year accounting program was:

- Accredited       Entered candidacy

2. Was the accounting program accredited (or will be accredited) at the same time as the College of Business?

- Yes       No

3. What academic disciplines are included in your department?

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

4. Type of institution?       Public  Private

5. Institution=s total enrollment: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Number of accounting majors: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Highest level of accounting program offered:

- Undergraduate
- MBA with a concentration in Accounting
- Master of Accounting/Tax
- Doctoral

8. Your college=s mission statement is primarily:

