

Deakin Research Online

Deakin University's institutional research repository

This is the authors' final peer reviewed version of the item published as:

Wise, Victoria and Fisher, Colleen 2005, Scholarly journal output : a regional perspective, *Asian review of accounting*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 68-83.

Available from Deakin Research Online

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30024490>

Reproduced with the kind permission of the copyright owner. Publisher asks that you include a link to the journal homepage www.emeraldinsight.com

Copyright : 2005, Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Scholarly journal output: A regional Perspective

Victoria Wise *

Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia

Colleen Fisher*

Manukau Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

This paper presents the findings of an investigation designed to reveal the destination of the refereed journal research output of accounting and finance faculty members across their entire academic careers. A geographic approach was adopted with the intention of providing a historical data-set to inform the development of a region centric model of academic research productivity. The study focuses on publication careers of accounting and finance academics from one particular geographic region. New Zealand. The data were collected through a detailed examination of electronic databases of journal holdings and research reports of tertiary institutions. The results of this study provide evidence that, across their careers, New Zealand's academics have published a significant number of papers in journals located in two regions. Australia-New Zealand and the United Kingdom. and that this academic community has attained publication success in international journals generally regarded as high quality

The accounting and finance literature recognises the existence of an interest in the publication records of academics for several reasons including the belief that research productivity dominates decisions about careers, promotion and salary (Beattie and Goodacre 2004; Hasselback and Reinstein 1995) and that research productivity may be affected by matters such as teaching loads and service responsibilities (Cargile and Bublitz 1986). Research output of academics is also an important criterion for accreditation of academic programmes by professional organisations. This interest has been evident in the literature for many decades since Davidson (1957) examined the research and publication activity of accounting faculty, and Coe and Weinstock (1969) and Benjamin and Brenner (1974) conducted their studies of the perceptions of journal quality held by department heads. More recently, the publication record of academics has been considered in the development of government funding models for university research activity.

Performance-based research assessment models exist in a number of countries including the United Kingdom (UK), Hong Kong, Ireland, Germany, the Netherlands and New Zealand. Australia has had a performance-driven research quantum mechanism in place since 1990 (Neumann and Guthrie 2002) and has produced a list of refereed journal destinations that qualify for funding support (Australian Government (AG) 2004). It has recently committed to the implementation of a research quality assessment model (Nelson 2005). Thus, in addition to their impact on decisions about career-related matters, both the destination and the quantum of publication activity can be seen to directly influence the level of funding that universities and other higher educational institutions receive from government. The recent resurgence of interest in research productivity assessment models and publishing patterns of academics can be connected with the introduction of performance-based models for government funding. This is clear in the emergence of a number of studies including those of Harley (2000), who investigated the impact of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) on the academic labour process in the UK; Brinn, Jones and Pendlebury (1996), who investigated UK accountants' perceptions of the quality of research journals; Beattie and Goodacre (2004), who reported on publishing patterns within the UK accounting and finance academic community; and Locke and Lowe (2002), who extended Zeff's (1996) model more comprehensively to the Australasia-Pacific region.

New Zealand has introduced a mixed model for research funding of its tertiary institutions that incorporates elements of both performance indicators and peer review (OECD 2004). Both approaches use metrics to some degree. For example, the count of successful higher degree by research students may be used as a performance indicator; and the number of articles published in particular journals may be used as a measure

of excellence (peer review). The examination of research output and destination is a significant component in any debate on the research funding of universities as it provides a basis for the way in which government resources are directed. It is the intention in this paper to improve the quality of published information about the research output of academics in a manner that will inform the debate on the development of university research funding models. It proceeds by providing historical data on the quantum and destination of the refereed journal output of academics from a particular geographic region, New Zealand, across their careers, and from two related disciplines, accounting and finance. In this regard, the paper falls within the bibliometrics literature.

A number of assessment models have been proposed as benchmarks for evaluating the quality of research outcomes of accounting and finance academics. These include citation models, perceptions models, quantity-based models and market-test models. Predominantly, these models have been applied to data from the USA yet the bias towards data from this region may not be appropriate for measurement of the publication output or assessment of the research quality of academics located in the Australasia-Pacific or other regions. Zeff's (1996) market-test model, which was based on a survey of the refereed journal holdings of libraries, has been criticised (Milne, Adler and MacGregor 1999) for its lack of relevance to the Australia-New Zealand region. Zeff's model examined the journal holdings of five major US libraries, five UK libraries, only two Australian libraries, and no New Zealand libraries. It is suggested in this paper that there is a need to explore the development of regional models for the assessment of research publication output and quality. It may be that for certain decisions such as appointment, promotion or government funding an evaluation of the research of academics on a region-centric basis is more appropriate than an evaluation using models that utilise data that are largely from outside the region.

While it is customary to evaluate individual academic performance on the basis of three broad factors - teaching, research and service (Campbell and Morgan 1987) - Gray and Hellier (1994) predicted that in the context of a performance based quality environment, measurable publication output is likely to become the single most important criterion for determining the research rating of academic departments. Cottingham and Hussey (2000) suggested that 'measurable publication' can be regarded as papers appearing in blind refereed journals. Assessing the quality of publication in refereed journals assumes considerable importance as a result.

Studies of research publication records have also been criticised because they tend to focus on a restricted set of journals or publication media. Cottingham and Hussey (2000) identify the main publication outlets open to academics for dissemination of the results of their research activities as books; chapters in books; magazines and newspapers; professional (non-refereed) journals; refereed journals; research monographs; and working/occasional papers. They considered that not all of these media are equal as a measure of either performance or as an effective means of disseminating research to a variety of audiences. In their study, Cottingham and Hussey were concerned with measuring the complete publication output in five UK professional (non-refereed) journals across the period 1987 to 1996. Their objective was to investigate the publication record of British academic institutions in these journals over the ten-year period in which the British RAE was in effect, and to seek evidence of any relationship between the RAE rating and the number of professional articles produced by the faculty of a given institution.

Parker, Guthrie and Gray (1998) asked senior academics about the significance and desirability of seven media. They found that academics ranked these media in descending order as follows: refereed journal articles, research monographs, research books, textbooks, chapters in books, refereed conference papers, and edited books and professional journal articles. This finding encouraged the adoption of a different focus to Cottingham and Hussey's (2000): instead, the objective in this study is to determine the complete publication record of New Zealand's accounting and finance academics in the medium identified by Parker, Guthrie and Gray as the most significant, that is, the refereed journal.

Some studies have shown that most published research is done by a relatively small number of individuals, usually at the professorial rank. Lee and Williams (1999) report that this pattern exists in the finance literature (Chung and Cox 1990), and, in a more limited way in the accounting literature (Chung, Pak and Cox 1992). It may be that the research publication activity of this small number of individuals in refereed journals provides the best indication of the relevance of publication outlets for assessment of particular academic communities. In this study the differences in the quantity of refereed publications between five major academic ranks are presented and discussed.

Beattie and Ryan (1989) noted that some studies of publication output make an adjustment for joint authorship based on the principle of indifference, allowing fractional credit based upon the number of authors. Schinski, Kugler and Wick (1998) report that other studies utilise a weighting approach that is not proportionate. Reinstein and Hasselback (1997) note that most studies do not adjust for joint authorship. Since there does not appear to be an established guideline for measuring the impact of co-authorship, the response in this study is to attribute full credit to each co-author of a jointly authored publication. A weighting of the contribution of individual authors to each paper is inherently subjective and beyond the scope of this paper to attempt. Additionally, by awarding full credit to each author for each publication, it is clear that although this is an examination of historical data, it is beyond the scope of the study to attempt an equally subjective comparative evaluation of recent and older articles that may have been subject to different editorial policies across time.

Wilkinson and Durden (1998) measured the publishing productivity of New Zealand's university accounting departments for the period 1992-97. Their study has been criticised (Milne, Adler and MacGregor 1999) as it used only a restricted set of journals and did not capture the full extent of publication output of either institutions or individuals. Wilkinson and Durden considered only data contained in the Accounting and Tax Index, ABI Inform and data taken directly from Australian and New Zealand journals. The method used in this study overcomes these weaknesses in the Wilkinson and Durden study as it develops a comprehensive list of the institutions that comprise New Zealand's accounting and finance community, the individuals within that community, and the refereed journals which are used as research publication outlets by this community

The population of institutions is defined in this study as those institutions registered as accredited with the relevant professional accreditation organisation in New Zealand which is the Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand (ICANZ). This approach is consistent with other studies of the published research output of accounting faculty. A USA-based study by Benjamin and Brenner (1974) used the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) as the relevant accrediting organisation in their research design, while Milne and Vent (1987) contrasted the research productivity at AACSB accredited and non accredited institutions, and McCullough, Wooten and Ryan (1981) surveyed the deans of AACSB-accredited schools in relation to the merits of faculty research and publication efforts at the time of consideration for promotion.

The social sciences (which include the accounting and finance disciplines) are recognised as low consensus disciplines (Hargens 1988; Harvey 1987). An implication of belonging to a low consensus discipline is that it is difficult to identify the influential publication outlets used by academics in these disciplines to disseminate their research findings. In this study the refereed journal outlets most frequently used by the New Zealand accounting and finance academic community are identified in an attempt to provide a fresh perspective to the meaning of influential publication outlets. Campbell and Morgan (1987) identified publication by 248 US accounting faculty members across a potential range of 250 journals listed in *The accountants index*, while Beattie and Goodacre (2004) identified publication by UK academics in 61 refereed accounting journals and 69 refereed finance journals across a two-year period (1998-99). Accordingly, it was expected that the number of publication outlets utilised by New Zealand's accounting and finance academic community across their entire publication history would be large.

By revealing the destination of the research output of the New Zealand accounting and finance academic community it is hoped that progress will be made towards an assessment model with particular relevance for New Zealand. This geographic approach may serve as the foundation for the development of a region-centric approach to developing models for use in interpreting the quality of published academic research in the accounting and finance disciplines. This particular study outcome will provide a useful perspective for Australian policy-makers to consider as they develop a Research Quality Assessment Framework across 2005-07.

Research design

In this study the details of such publications as books, chapters in books, refereed and non-refereed publications have been collected. However, for the purposes of this paper only refereed journal publications are considered.

The research publication output of New Zealand's accounting and finance academic community was determined and recorded in a detailed Microsoft Access database. The database was designed so that when complete it would support an analysis of research output at the institutional and individual levels and across other demographic aspects of research activity including gender, rank and academic collaboration. As the refereed journal research output of accounting and finance academics in New Zealand's ICANZ accredited institutions was the focus of interest in this study, it was necessary to identify relevant institutions, accounting and finance academics, and refereed journals used as publication outlets. These database development tasks are now discussed.

A list of the institutions that held accreditation with ICANZ at the end of 2004, as approved for providing recognised academic programmes to meet ICANZ's academic requirements for admission, was compiled. New Zealand had fourteen such institutions: eight universities and six institutes of technology (see appendix).

The next task was to compile a list of the accounting and finance academics employed within the institutions. In order to include in the database only academics with a primary interest in accounting and finance certain protocols advanced by Beattie and Goodacre (2004) were adopted. To be included, an individual, in addition to being located in an accounting and finance department, must satisfy one or more of the following criteria: have a primary commitment to teaching and research in accounting and finance; be a teacher who does the bulk of their teaching in accounting and finance degree courses; or be a researcher who publishes primarily in accounting and finance journals. Effectively this approach excludes academics whose primary interests are in law and information systems, as these are regarded as outside the accounting and finance disciplines.

The list of academics was compiled from the staff lists published on the departmental website by each of the fourteen institutions at the end of 2004. In order to be assured of the accuracy of the details on the list, all departmental heads were mailed a copy with a request to confirm whether the academics were employed in the department at the end of 2004 and their rank, title, gender and specialisation.

The academics were categorised according to rank as: 1) professor; 2) associate professor; 3) senior lecturer; 4) lecturer; and 5) other. The descriptions used by the departments were unambiguous for the ranks of professor, senior lecturer and lecturer. However the categorisation of academics into the second rank (associate professor) and fifth rank (other) was less clear. Thus, consistent with Beattie and Goodacre (2004) the title of 'associate professor' has been taken as including: associate professor; head of department (where not otherwise identified as professor), and reader. The title of 'other' includes academics described as: assistant lecturer; associate lecturer; dean; doctoral fellow; emeritus professor; fellow; other; professional tutor; research assistant; research associate; research fellow; senior academic; senior fellow; senior research fellow; senior tutor; teaching assistant; tutorial fellow; visiting professor; and visitor.

A further important task undertaken in the development of the database was the categorisation of journals as refereed or non-refereed. The journals were classified in accordance with the Australian Research Quantum (ARQ) list of refereed journals (AG 2004). Content analysis was adopted as a useful way to classify journals that did not appear in the ARQ list. An internet search was conducted to gather details of the nature and editorial policy of each of the journals. Classification was straightforward where the editorial policy indicated that a double blind refereeing process was used. Where the editorial policy was less clear a list of words, terms, themes, discussions or explanations about particular processes, developed from the espoused editorial policies of the refereed journals, was used to identify journals that could be classified as refereed. All journals not identified as refereed were captured in a second category, 'non-refereed' journal publications.

As in any content analysis study, there was the potential for methodological problems in gathering the data. In particular, the methodology is subject to a subjectivity constraint that means the reliability of the method as a suitable means of analysing information may be affected by the consistency of the researcher's coding. In anticipation of such problems, and in order to enhance the validity and reliability of the classification process, a procedure was used in which the first researcher scanned the details of each journal, established a hardcopy record of the details, and produced a preliminary classification. A second researcher undertook a similar process of classification of the journals and then both records were compared. In cases where insufficient journal details were available for classification of a journal as refereed, the second classification of non-refereed was applied.

The publication data were collected from a variety of different sources. Initially, a sweep was made of the relevant departmental website of each institution. It was anticipated that although this data source may not be comprehensive, it would provide an initial guide as to the outlets in which New Zealand's accounting and finance academics are publishing their research. Some of the departmental websites are not especially user-friendly and in order to improve the soundness of the application of the methodology a second researcher conducted a subsequent search of the departmental websites and validated the initial dataset.

Author citations were sought using the following EBSCO host research databases: Academic Search Elite; Business Source Premier; and Econlit. Although this resource was useful for extending the dataset it did not provide a comprehensive coverage of all journals in which New Zealand's accounting and finance academics have published. Given the substantial number of academics and potential journal outlets, a full search of all research databases was not considered to be an efficient research technique at this point. Milne, Adler and MacGregor (1999) pointed out that contacting individuals and asking them to validate their records was a critical step in ensuring that a full record would be compiled. It was also a method employed in a study by Cargile and Bublitz (1986) who asked respondents to identify their published research and used the results 'as a measure of a respondent's research performance' (160). Accordingly, individual publication profiles were compiled and mailed to the academics with a request to verify the data and to respond with missing data. Various response mechanisms were suggested including email, postal and fax and appropriate addresses were supplied. The advantage of this methodological approach is that a complete historical record is likely to be compiled.

As an objective of the study is the compilation of a complete historical record for all academics in the population of interest, managing the non-response rate is important. It may be that some academics chose not to respond because they have no publication record. The next stage of the research plan included a strategy to improve the response rate by distributing a second publications profile for each non-respondent, distributed by email with an accompanying request to verify and return the data together with details of any missing publications. Each non-respondent was also contacted directly by telephone. Responses from these academics confirmed that the broad search of electronic journal databases and the annual research reports of departments undertaken by the researchers was an effective strategy for accumulating an accurate record of publications.

Analysis and discussion

The paper reports on the distribution of publication output by accounting and finance faculty, across their entire academic careers, in refereed journal outlets. The analysis is restricted to one key subgroup: academics categorised by rank.

Individuals

Responses validating academic staff lists were received from thirteen of the fourteen department heads. One department head declined to participate in the research project (although individuals within that department responded directly with publications data). This provided an effective response rate of 100 per cent (13/[14 1]). Validation of the initial staff list of the non-participating department was sought by accessing and comparing the 2004 and 2005 faculty handbooks as published at the overall institution level.

It was found that the New Zealand accounting and finance academic community had 280 members at the end of 2004. Of these, 53 were appointed at the professorial level as professor (28) and associate professor (25); 81 were senior lecturers; 105 were appointed at the rank of lecturer; and 41 were classified as other academics. It is inappropriate to describe all 'other' academics as junior academics as this rank has also been used to capture details of senior academics such as visiting professors, emeritus professors and certain others who are deemed to be predominantly engaged in service activities. Of this community of 280 academics, 132 (47.1%) have published research in refereed journals.

Journals and publications

A response rate from academics of 35.4 per cent (99/280) was achieved. This compares favourably with the response rate of 23.6 per cent achieved by Brinn, Jones and Pendlebury (2001) in their survey of UK academics, and by Cargile and Bublitz (1986) (24.8%) in a survey of USA academics. Some respondents voluntarily provided either their complete, or relevant portions, of their curriculum vitae to the researchers for data validation purposes and a number expressed positive support for the study. Knowledge that colleagues and peers would use the data in relevant research appeared to provide a strong incentive for individuals to ensure completeness and accuracy of their records. A non-response rate does not suggest that data in relation to non-respondents has not been included. Instead, data on the publication records of non-respondents is data that has not been validated by the individual academic. Given the extensive data collection methods employed in this study, the level of unreported publications is likely to be low.

The content analysis resulted in the identification of 321 refereed journals in which New Zealand's accounting and finance academics had published 1000 articles (an average of 3.1 articles per journal) across a 35-year period (1969-2004). Beattie and Goodacre (2004) found a similarly large range of publication outlets in their study (1141 articles were distributed across 442 different outlets, averaging 2.6 articles per journal). Frequency statistics of the publication activity in refereed journals according to academic rank are presented in table 1.

Analysis of the data presented in table 1 shows that most published research (59.6%) is done by a relatively small number of individuals (45; 16.1% (45/280) who hold appointments at a rank (the professoriate) that is generally regarded as elite in the academic community. Although this phenomenon is not novel in the academic productivity literature, it is of interest to note that 8 (15.1%) of the academics holding this post have no refereed journal publication record. Campbell and Morgan (1987) identified a similar phenomenon when they found that over 17 per cent of subjects in their study had no publications at the time of promotion to full professor. The rank of 'other' includes some very productive senior academics such as deans who are unable to be classified in this study as either 'professor' or 'associate professor'. It is reasonable to assume that the research productivity of early career-stage academics in each of the ranks will be systemically lower than academics in the mature stages of their careers.

Table 1 Number of refereed journal publications by academic rank

Accounting and finance academics Rank	Refereed journal publications		Academics who have published in refereed journals across their career		
	(Col. 1) Number	%	(Col. 2) Number	%	Mean no. of publs (col. 2/col. 3)
Professor	28	10.0	434	43.4	16.1
Assoc. prof.	25	8.9	162	16.2	9.0
Subtotal	53	18.9	596	59.6	84.9
Snr. lecturer	81	28.9	193	19.3	4.3
Lecturer	105	37.5	54	5.4	1.8
Subtotal	239	85.3	843	84.3	49.8
Other	41	14.7	157	15.7	12.1
Totals	280		1000		7.6

The data in table 1 also provides career averages of the refereed publication success of academics in each of the five ranks. It may be useful as a guideline for those involved in making decisions about their own or others' academic careers. The population of interest was the community of academics at December 2004 as this approach yields data that reflects the current composition of the community. Academics move to different ranks within their employing institutions for many reasons including promotion and retirement. It is the historical profile of the current community rather than the composition of the community at different points in time that is the focus in this paper. Accordingly, conversion of the outputs reported in table 1, per unit of time to determine the expected output for a given staffing profile, may be a fruitful area for future research.

The data in table 1 also show that on a per capita basis and giving full credit for co-authored publications the mean number of publications is 3.57 (1000/280). This score more than doubles to 7.67 when assessed on the

basis of academics who have actually published in refereed journals (1000/132). Using a time period of just two years, Beattie and Goodacre (2004) showed the mean publications record of the UK's accounting and finance academics was 1.76.

An analysis of the incidence of the refereed journal publication output of New Zealand's accounting and finance academics across the most frequently used outlets was undertaken. The nineteen most frequently used refereed journal destinations of New Zealand's accounting and finance academic community are compared with the twenty most frequently used refereed journal destinations of UK accounting academics identified by Beattie and Goodacre (2004). The analysis has been curtailed at nineteen for presentation and discussion purposes. The results of the comparative analysis are presented in table 2.

A review of the data presented in table 2 highlights the distinct regional outcomes of refereed journal publication of academics in New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Of the 30 journals included in table 2, the New Zealand accounting and finance academics demonstrated an inclination towards journals located in Australia and New Zealand with 42.1 per cent (8/19 journals) of their most frequently used publication outlets having this regional base. Over 20 per cent of their total publications are located in these eight journals. They also demonstrated a strong trend towards publication in UK journals with 31.6 per cent (6/19) of their most frequently used outlets located in the UK. This represents over 11 per cent of total publications by New Zealand accounting and finance academics in just six UK refereed journals. Five USA journals were represented among the nineteen most frequently used journal outlets for New Zealand's accounting and finance academics representing 8.0 per cent of total output.

Table 2 Destination of refereed journal output of NZ and UK academics

Journal	NZ (this study, 2004)	UK (B&G, 2004)	Journal location
<i>Pacific Accounting Review</i>	1		NZ
<i>Accounting Education: An International Journal</i>	2	5	UK
<i>Accounting Forum</i>	3	20=	Aust
<i>Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal</i> ¹	4	9=	Aust
<i>Accounting and Finance</i>	5		Aust
<i>Critical Perspectives on Accounting</i>	7=	2	USA
<i>Pacific-Basin Finance Journal</i> ²	7=		USA
<i>Financial Accountability and Management</i>	8	11=	UK
<i>Journal of Business Finance and Accounting</i>	11=	1	UK
<i>New Zealand Journal of Applied Business Research</i>	11=		NZ
<i>New Zealand Journal of Taxation Law and Policy</i>	11=		NZ
<i>Journal of Accounting Research</i>	14=		USA
<i>Journal of Futures Markets</i>	14=		USA
<i>Management Accounting Research</i>	14=	9=	UK
<i>Accounting Review (The)</i>	15		USA
<i>British Accounting Review</i>	16	4	UK
<i>Abacus</i>	19=		Aust
<i>Accounting and Business Research</i>	19=	6	UK
<i>Australian Accounting Review</i>	19=		Aust
<i>European Accounting Review</i> ³		3	UK
<i>European Journal of Finance</i>		9=	UK
<i>Accounting, Organisations and Society</i>		11=	UK
<i>Journal of Applied Accounting Research</i>		12	UK
<i>Accounting Business and Financial History</i>		14=	UK
<i>Managerial Auditing Journal</i>		14=	UK
<i>Applied Financial Economics</i>		17=	UK
<i>International Journal of Auditing</i>		17=	UK
<i>Irish Accounting Review</i>		17=	UK
<i>British Tax Review</i>		18	UK
<i>Accounting History</i>		20=	Aust

¹ Journal is edited in Australia and published in UK

² Journal has co-editors based in Hawaii and Hong Kong

³ Editor is based in Finland; journal is published in UK

The output of UK academics showed a similar pattern favouring journals in their local region (16/20,80%). This was followed by journals located in the Australasia-New Zealand region (3/20, 15%) while journals located in the USA represented only 5 per cent (1/20) of their most frequently used destinations.

The appearance of nine journals in both lists suggests that UK data for the evaluation of research quality may have considerable relevance to the assessment of the research output of the New Zealand accounting and finance academic community. Further investigation of this phenomenon may yield useful results in the research productivity literature.

Summary and conclusions

This paper reports on the career publishing history of New Zealand's accounting and finance academics in ICANZ accredited institutions at the end of 2004. By presenting historical data, this quantitative study informs future research into the relevance of models that adopt a citations, perceptions or market-test approach for the assessment of research quality and performance by providing data to investigate another, regional-orientated, dimension. This research can be extended in a number of directions to investigate issues that require longitudinal data. For instance it is possible to analyse where academics residing within each of the five ranks have published (journal and location). The findings of this study will be of assistance to policy-makers by raising awareness of the way in which the accounting and finance disciplines have disseminated the results of their research in refereed journal outlets.

The results of this study confirm prior research findings that the refereed journal output of an academic community tends to be dominated by academics appointed at the elite professorial rank, and that not all academics at this rank may have accumulated a record of refereed journal publication. These findings imply that research publication in refereed journals may be only part of the appointment/promotion process, with other factors such as teaching load, service responsibilities and political considerations likely to be receiving some consideration. It is also found that the accounting and finance disciplines are indeed 'low consensus' disciplines as evidenced by the spread of 1000 publications

Refereed journals located in the Australia-New Zealand region were used frequently by the New Zealand accounting and finance academics as publication outlets with over 20 per cent of their total publication output found in eight regionally located journals. It was found that the publication destination was strongly influenced by journals located in the UK with over 11 per cent of total publication found in just six UK journals. Overall, the results of this study provide evidence that New Zealand academics display a tendency to publish in journals located in the Australia-New Zealand region and in journals located in the UK. These findings are of importance to policy-makers considering an appropriate journal set against which to evaluate the refereed journal publication output of New Zealand's accounting and finance academics for the purpose of determining university research funding, across 321 refereed journals.

The data present the career publication output of academics over an extended period of time to the end of 2004. It is beyond the intention of this study to gather data on academics who might have contributed to the literature but are no longer employed within ICANZ accredited institutions; or, to weight the data for the impact of co-authorship or age of publication. Further, as the data focus is on individual publication records, it cannot be considered a longitudinal study of an employing institution's record.

Appendix:

New Zealand institutions accredited by ICANZ at the end of 2004

Name of institution

1. Auckland University of Technology
- 2 Eastern Institute of Technology
- 3 Lincoln University
- 4 Manukau Institute of Technology
- 5 Massey University
- 6 Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology
- 7 The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand
- 8 The University of Auckland
- 9 The University of Waikato

- 10 Unitec New Zealand
- 11 University of Canterbury
- 12 University of Otago
- 13 Victoria University of Wellington
- 14 Waikato Institute of Technology

References

- Australian Government (AO), Department of Education, Science and Training. 2004. Register of refereed journals. <http://www.dest.gov.au> (accessed 28 January 2005).
- Beattie, V.A., and A. Goodacre. 2004. Publishing patterns within the UK accounting and finance academic community. *British Accounting Review* 36: 7-44.
- Beattie, V.A., and R.J. Ryan. 1989. Performance indices and related measures of journal reputation in accounting. *British Accounting Review* 21(3): 267-78.
- Benjamin, J.J., and V.C. Brenner. 1974. Perceptions of journal quality. *Accounting Review* 49(2) (April): 360-2.
- Brinn, T., M.J. Jones, and M. Pendlebury. 1996. UK accountants' perceptions of research journal quality. *Accounting and Business Research* 26(3): 265-78.
- Campbell, D.R., and R.O. Morgan. 1987. Publication activity of promoted accounting faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* 2(1): 28-43.
- Cargile, B.R., and B. Bublitz. 1986. Factors contributing to published research by accounting faculties. *Accounting Review* 61(1): 158-78.
- Chan, K.C., R.C.W. Fok, and M. Pan. 2000. Citation-based finance journal rankings: an update. *Financial Practice & Education* 10(1) (Spring/ Summer): 132-41.
- Chung, K.H., and R.A.K. Cox. 1990. Patterns of productivity in the finance literature: A study of the bibliometric distribution. *Journal of Finance* XLV(I) (March): 301-9.
- Chung, K.H., H.S. Pak, Cox, R.A.K. 1992. Patterns of research output in the accounting literature: A study of bibliometric distributions. *Abacus* 28(2): 168-85.
- Coe, R.K., and I. Weinstock. 1969. Evaluating journal publication: Perceptions versus reality. Paper presented at the Western Division, Academy of Management Annual Meeting California, March.
- Cottingham, J., and R. Hussey. 2000. Publishing in professional accounting journals: Academic institutional performance 1987-96. *British Accounting Review* 32: 101-14.
- Davidson, S. 1957. Research and publication by the accounting faculty. *Accounting Review* 32(1): 114-18.
- Gray, R.H., and C. Hellier. 1994. UK accounting academics and publication: an exploration of observable variables associated with publication output. *British Accounting Review* 26(3): 235-54.
- Hargens, L.L. 1988. Scholarly consensus and journal rejection rates. *American Sociological Review* 53(1): 139-51.
- Harley, S. 2000. Accountants divided: research selectivity and academic accounting labour in UK universities. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting II*: 549-82.
- Harvey, L. 1987. The nature of schools in the sociology of knowledge: The case of the Chicago school. *Sociological Review* 35(2) (May): 245-78. Hasselback, IR., and Reinstein, A. 1995. A proposal for measuring scholarly productivity of accounting faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* 10(2): 269-306.

- Howard, T.P., and L.A. Nikolai. 1983. Attitude measurement and perceptions of accounting faculty publication outlets. *Accounting Review* LVIII(4) (October): 765-76.
- Lee, T.A., and P.F. Williams. 1999. Accounting from the inside: Legitimizing the accounting academic elite. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 10: 867-95.
- Locke, J., and A. Lowe. 2002. Problematizing the construction of journal quality: An engagement with the mainstream. *Accounting* FOI/111126(1): 45-71.
- McCullough, C.D., R.E. Wooten, J.A. Ryan. 1981. Research and publication programs in collegiate schools of business: A faculty development approach. *Journal of Business Education* 57 (November): 46-9.
- Milne, M.J., R. W. Adler, A.C. MacGregor. 1999. A critical commentary on Wilkinson and Durden's (1998) measures of accounting publishing productivity. *Pacific Accounting Review* 11(1): 29-44.
- Milne, R.A., and G.A. Vent. 1987. Publication productivity: A comparison of accounting faculty members promoted in 1981 and 1984. *Issues in Accounting Education* 2(1): 94-102.
- Nelson, B. 2005. A research quality framework. Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. <http://dest.gov.au/resqallissuesyaper.htm> (accessed 8 April 2005).
- Neumann, R., and J. Guthrie. 2002. The corporatization of research in Australian higher education. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 13: 721-41.
- OECD. 2004. *A performance-based research funding for tertiary education institutes: The New Zealand experience*. Paris: OECD.
- Parker, L., J. Guthrie, and R. Gray. 1998. Accounting and management research: Passwords from the gatekeepers. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 1(4): 371-402.
- Reinstein, A., and J.R. Hasselback. 1997. A literature review of articles assessing the productivity of accounting faculty members. *Journal of Accounting Education* 15: 425-55.
- Schinski, M., A. Kugler, W. Wick. 1998. Perceptions of the academic finance profession regarding publishing and the allocation of credit in coauthorship situations. *Financial Practice and Education* 8(1): 60-7.
- Wilkinson, B.R., and C.H. Durden. 1998. A study of accounting faculty publishing productivity in New Zealand. *Pacific Accounting Review* 10(2) (December): 75-95.
- Zeff, S. 1996. A study of academic research journals in accounting. *Accounting Horizons* 10(3): 158-77.