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Abstract

Research quality and productivity are the important dimensions that affect the employability and rewards of university faculty members. Generally, the publication achievement of university faculty members can be measured by the number of papers published in reputable journals as well as the number of citations obtained from their publications. This study examines the publication productivity of accounting faculty members of Asia Pacific universities in the top accounting journals for the period 2000 to 2010. The present study also
measures the publication achievement using the number of citations of the researchers’ publications in these journals for the same period based on the search from Google Scholar, Scopus and Social Science Citation Index. The study found that Hun-Tong Tan is the most productive researcher in the top 18 accounting journals, followed by R. G. Walker and Michael Bradbury. When a sub-set of the top 5 accounting journals is used, the top three researchers are Hun-Tong Tan (NTU), Clive S. Lennox (HKUST) and Robert H. Chenhall (Monash U). Using the citation count, the present study found that T.J. Wong (CUHK), Robert H. Chenhall, and Ferdinand A. Gul (Monash U) obtained the highest total citations from both Google Scholar and Scopus. However, when Social Science Citation Index is used, T.J. Wong, Robert H. Chenhall, and Hun-Tong Tan are the top three. The results of this study provide the evidence of the contributions by the Asia Pacific universities’ faculties towards high quality accounting research and publications over the last decade.
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1. Introduction

“Publish or perish” is a common phrase used to describe the present situation of academic staffs’ performance in institutions of higher learning (Bline, 2007). This is because faculty staff members are expected to secure research grants, to conduct research projects as well as to publish research papers to meet their research productivity assessments (Everett, Nue & Green 2003). Research activities and publication productivity represent one of the major key performance indicators (KPIs) of the faculty members in most of the universities (Kusairi & Fatimah, 2008).

According to Hasselback, Reinstein and Schwan (2000), various parties such as the academic administrators, faculty members and potential doctoral candidates are interested to have information about the research productivity of academics. For example, individual faculty members need such information to justify their hiring, compensation and promotion, tenure decisions, faculty awards and research grants (Pickerd, Stephens, Summers & Wood, 2011). On the other hand, university administrators need such data to provide a fair and objective performance evaluation of their academics (Hasselback, Reinstein & Schwan, 2003). Information on research productivity of faculty members also helps potential doctoral candidates to identify research supervisors to provide suitable and relevant mentorship (Pickerd et al., 2011).

In view of the importance of information on research productivity, extensive research on publication productivity have been conducted in various business disciplines such as accounting (Stammerjohan & Hall, 2002; Chan, Chen, & Cheng, 2005, Chan & Liano, 2009; Chan, Chang, Tong, & Zhang, 2011), finance (Chan, Chen, & Steiner, 2004; Heck & Cooley, 2005), information systems (Clark, Warren, & Au, 2009), knowledge management and intellectual capital (Serenko & Bontis, 2004), and marketing (Cheng, Chan, & Chan, 2003; Seggie & Griffith, 2009). A review of literature in this area shows that most of the studies conducted to examine the research productivity were carried out in the Western countries. Very few studies were done on the research productivity in Asia, despite the fact that researchers from Asian countries have been actively publishing their research findings in reputable and high impact journals. Hence, a research study that examines the research productivity of research in the Asian countries would in turn fill up such a research gap.

To make a contribution to the existing literature in research productivity, the present study aims to (1) examine the publication productivity of accounting faculty members in Asia-Pacific universities in the top accounting journals for the period 2000 to 2010; and (2) measures the publication achievement using the number of citations of the researchers’ publications in these journals for the same period based on the search from Google Scholar, Scopus and Social Science Citation Index. Since the study adopts two different methods (i.e. publication and citation count) in evaluating the publication performance of the accounting faculty members in the Asia Pacific, it should provide a most up-to-date and comprehensive examination to the accounting researchers in the region. Hence, timely, reliable and convincing results could be expected from the present study.
The structure of the latter part of this paper is as follows: Section 2 reviews past empirical studies on accounting publication productivity. Section 3 describes the productivity measures and data selection criteria for the present study. Section 4 presents the results in accordance with the research objectives set forth in the introduction section. Lastly, the paper concludes by discussing the implications and the limitation of the study.

2. Literature Review

Many studies have been conducted to examine the academic institutions’ and faculty members’ research productivity in the Western countries. Dyl and Lilly (1985) conducted a study to examine the accounting publication productivity of academic institutions based on seven high-impact accounting journals from 1978 to 1981. Their findings show that the number of publications per faculty member in accounting has been low. In addition, it is indicated that 45 percent of the articles in the selected accounting journals were accounted for by 25 institutions only. This implies a high level of concentration in publication. A later study conducted by Jones and Roberts (2005) found similar results. They examined 1,867 articles published in six highly-rated UK and six highly-rated US academic journals from 1996 to 2006. They also found that UK journals are dominated by authors from the UK and US universities and 90 percent of the US journals were published by authors from the US institutions only. The results show that very limited numbers of authors from institutions in non-English speaking countries published in the top-rated UK and US based academic journals.

Using 40 reputable accounting journals, Hasselback et al. (2003) conducted a study to examine the most prolific accounting researchers in the US. Forty eight hundred and ninety accounting faculty members graduated from the year 1968-1997 in the US were selected as the sample of the study. The study found that Philip M. J. Reckers, Chee W. Chow, William H. Beaver, Raymond J. Chambers and Wanda A. Wallace were the top five most prolific authors in 40 journals for the period 1967-2001. Not limiting to the accounting researchers in the US, Heck (2009) examined the most prolific authors in the accounting literature from 1959-2008. Heck analyzed 17,462 articles and 10,542 authors from 25 core US accounting journals and found that the top five most frequent appearing authors were Joel S. Demski, William H. Beaver, Chee W. Chow, William R. Kinney, Jr. and Thomas A. Lee. The study also ranks the authors based on the number of papers published in the top five leading accounting journals namely Accounting, Organizations and Society, Accounting Review, Journal of Accounting and Economics, Journal of Accounting Research, and Contemporary Accounting Research. The ranking of authors in these five leading accounting journals are (i) Joel S. Demski, (ii) Robert E. Verrecchia, (iii) William H. Beaver, (iv) Robert Libby and (v) William R. Kinney, Jr.

In terms of research productivity in the Asia Pacific region, the present authors found three research studies on the universities of Australia and New Zealand. They are William and Durden (1998), Chan et al., (2005), and Chan et al. (2011). William and Durden (1998) measured the publication productivity of the Accounting Department of New Zealand University for the period 1992-1997. This study provides a comprehensive evaluation by adopting different measures to assess research productivity. The research performance of the
department was assessed based on such measures as publications in top ten accounting journals, publications in accounting journals using weighted rankings, publications in both Australian and New Zealand accounting journals, publications in unweighted accounting and non-accounting journals, and professional accounting publications. Based on this comprehensive evaluation William and Durden (1998) found that University of Auckland and Massey University performed well when they were measured by aggregate department publications in high-quality accounting journals. On the other hand, the study also found that there is a strong tendency across departments for high reliance on a few main researchers and hence when publication is measured based on a per faculty basis, larger departments in such universities as University of Auckland and Massey University tend to have a poorer performance. The study also found that Victoria University and University of Otago have published widely in professional journals, and University of Waikato has performed well for both professional and academic journals.

Based on articles published in 18 leading accounting journals and a subset of top-five accounting journals, Chan et al. (2005) measured the publication productivity of the academic institutions and their accounting faculty members in the Asia Pacific region. Their performance was measured in a two-time period, from 1991 to 1996 and from 1997 to 2002. The results show that institutions from Australia, Hong Kong and Singapore dominate the top 20 list for both time periods. During the second time period (1997-2002), institutions from Hong Kong and Singapore have gained significant improvement in the publication productivity ranking. The distribution of the publication is highly skewed—the top five, top 10 and top 20 institutions account for 32%, 50% and 70% of all weighted number of articles respectively. Chan et al. (2005) found that for the period of 1991-2002, Michael Firth, R. J. Chambers, Hun-Tong Tan, Ferdinand A. Gul and Ken T. Trotman are the most productive authors in the 18 leading journals. When the top-5 journals were used to rank the productivity of the accounting authors, the top five authors are Hun-Tong Tan, Wai Fong Chua, Suil Pae, Greg B. Clinch and Margaret A. Abernethy.

The latest study in the Asia Pacific region was conducted by Chan et al. (2011). This study examined the research productivity of the institutions of higher education in Australia and New Zealand for the period 1991-2010 using 48 high-quality accounting and finance journals. The study found an upward trend in research output for both Australian and New Zealand accounting and finance departments. The top five universities were found to be University of New South Wales, University Sydney, Monash University, University of Melbourne and University of Queensland. Massey University, the highest ranked university in New Zealand, was found to rank number 8 in the study. The study also found that if a faculty member manages to publish five papers in the 48 journals, such a person would be the top 15 percent among the 1,245 Australian and New Zealand academic staff members. Finally, this study shows that highly research productive academics are able to move to different jobs. This in turn indicates that research productivity gives rise to job mobility.

3. Productivity Measures and Data Selection Criteria

The present study adopts the data selection criteria based on Chan et al. (2005). Eighteen top ranked accounting journals were used in the present study. Chan et al. (2005) provided the
following justifications of adopting these journals. Firstly, these journals are ranked as the most prestigious and influential in the accounting field. Besides, these journals also obtained good quality ratings and have existed for a long period of time (e.g., The Accounting Review was established in 1926). The chosen journals cover both general scope (e.g., The Accounting Review) and specialized accounting topics (e.g., National Tax Journal). In line with Chan et al. (2005), of the 18 journals, a subset of top five journals was also selected for separate analyses. These top five journals are also ranked as the top accounting journals by Hasselback et al. (2003), and Brinn, Jones and Pendleburg (1996). The list of the top 18 accounting journals is presented in Table 1. The impact factors of these journals in SSCI and Scopus as well their ranking in ABDC and ERA are provided.

Table 1. List of the Top Accounting Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>SSCI JIF</th>
<th>SCOPUS SNIP</th>
<th>ABDC ranking</th>
<th>ERA ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Abacus</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Accounting and Business Research</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Accounting, Organizations and Society *</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Behavioral Research in Accounting</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Contemporary Accounting Research *</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Journal of Accounting and Public Policy</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Journal of Accounting Literature</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Journal of Accounting, Auditing, and Finance</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Journal of Management Accounting Research</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Journal of the American Taxation Association</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Journal of Business Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>National Tax Journal</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Review of Accounting Studies</td>
<td>1.972</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Journals are sorted according to alphabetical order;
* denotes the top 5 journals by Chan et al. (2005) and the leading 5 journals by Heck (2009);
JIF – journal impact factor;
SNIP – source normalized impact per paper.

4. Results

The first research objective is to examine the publication productivity of accounting faculty members for the period 2000 to 2010. The name and the affiliation of the Asia-Pacific authors from the 18 accounting journals were collected for the period of 11 years from 2000 to 2010. Unweighted number of article is computed by counting the number of articles
published by an author regardless the number of authors for that paper. When an article is authored by multiple researchers, the weighted number of article published per author is used to adjust for co-authorship and is measured by dividing one by the number of authors for that paper.

Based on the 18 accounting journals, Hun-Tong Tan (NTU) is the most productive author in the 18 accounting journals, followed by R. G. Walker (The U of Sydney) and Michael Bradbury (UNITEC). When a sub-set of the top five journals is used, the top three most productive authors are Hun-Tong Tan (NTU), Clive S. Lennox (HKUST) and Robert H. Chenhall (Monash U). Refer to Tables 2 and 3 for more information about the top 20 authors in terms of weighted number of articles published.
Table 2. The Top 20 Authors based on the 18 Accounting Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Weighted Number of Articles</th>
<th>Unweighted Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hun-Tong Tan *#</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R. G. Walker #</td>
<td>University of New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Michael Bradbury #</td>
<td>UNITEC Institute of Technology, New Zealand</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ken T. Trotman *#</td>
<td>University of New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (tied)</td>
<td>Clive S. Lennox *#</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (tied)</td>
<td>Stewart Jones #</td>
<td>University of Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ferdinand A. Gul *##</td>
<td>Monash University Sunway Campus</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Robert H. Chenhall #</td>
<td>Monash University, Australia</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suil Pae *</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guochang Zhang #</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Firth, Michael *</td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Frank L. Clarke *</td>
<td>University of Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>David Johnstone</td>
<td>University of Wollongong, Australia</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chih-Ying Chen</td>
<td>Singapore Management University</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Robert W. Faff</td>
<td>The University of Queensland, Australia</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Steven F. Cahan</td>
<td>The University of Auckland</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chong M. Lau</td>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Roger Simnett</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (tied)</td>
<td>Terence Bu-Peow Ng</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (tied)</td>
<td>Wai Fong Chua *</td>
<td>University of New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes 8 authors who also appeared in the top 18 journals compiled by Chan et al. (2005) and # denotes 9 authors who also appeared in the 25 core accounting journals compiled by Heck (2009).
### Table 3. The Top 20 Authors based on the Top 5 Accounting Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Weighted Number of Articles</th>
<th>Unweighted Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hun-Tong Tan *</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clive S. Lennox</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robert H. Chenhall *</td>
<td>Monash University, Australia</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suil Pae *</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ken T. Trotman *</td>
<td>University of New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guochang Zhang *</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ferdinand A. Gul *</td>
<td>Monash University Sunway Campus</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wai Fong Chua *</td>
<td>University of New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chul W. Park</td>
<td>Sungkyunkwan University</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peter F. Chen</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rachel F. Baskerville-Morley</td>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T. J. Wong *</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>James R. Frederickson *</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jong-Hag Choi</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Peter M. Clarkson *</td>
<td>The University of Queensland, Australia</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Terence Bu-Peow Ng</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Anne Wyatt</td>
<td>The University of Queensland, Australia</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>John Roberts</td>
<td>University of Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Zoltan P. Matolcsy</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jeong-Bon Kim</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes 10 authors who also appeared in the top 5 journal list compiled by Chan et al. (2005)
The second research objective is to measure the publication achievement for the period 2000 to 2010 using the number of citations. The name of each author who appeared in the 18 journals was searched from three academic citation indexes – SSCI, Scopus, and Google Scholar.

Using the citation analysis method, the study found that Robert H. Chenhall (Monash U), T.J. Wong (CUHK), and Ferdinand A. Gul (Monash U) obtained the highest total citations from both Scopus and Google Scholar. However, when SSCI is used, T.J. Wong (CUHK), Robert H. Chenhall (Monash U), and Hun-Tong Tan (NTU) are the top three most productive authors. Refer to Tables 4, 5 and 6 for more information about the top 20 authors in terms of total citation.

Table 4. The Top 20 Most Cited Asia-Pacific Accounting Authors in SSCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Total Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.J. Wong</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robert H. Chenhall</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hun-Tong Tan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joseph P. H. Fan</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chul W. Park</td>
<td>Sungkyunkwan University</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ferdinand A. Gul</td>
<td>Monash University Sunway Campus</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Donald J. Stokes</td>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wai Fong Chua</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Easton Peter</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peter M. Clarkson</td>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Andrew Ferguson</td>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ken T. Trotman</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Margaret A. Abernethy</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>James R. Frederickson</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jere R. Francis</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Clive S. Lennox</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jeong-Bon Kim</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rachel F. Baskerville</td>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Woody Wu</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jong-Hag Choi</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. The Top 20 Most Cited Asia-Pacific Accounting Authors in Scopus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Total Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robert H. Chenhall</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.J. Wong</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ferdinand A. Gul</td>
<td>Monash University Sunway Campus</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joseph P. H. Fan</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hun-Tong Tan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chul W. Park</td>
<td>Sungkyunkwan University</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wai Fong Chua</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charles J. P. Chen</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Donald J. Stokes</td>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Michael Firth</td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jeong-Bon Kim</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (tied)</td>
<td>Easton Peter</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (tied)</td>
<td>Margaret A. Abernethy</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (tied)</td>
<td>James R. Frederickson</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (tied)</td>
<td>Andrew Ferguson</td>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (tied)</td>
<td>Y. T. Mak</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (tied)</td>
<td>Jere R. Francis</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rachel F. Baskerville</td>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ken T. Trotman</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chi-Wen Jevons Lee</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. The Top 20 Most Cited Asia-Pacific Accounting Authors in Google Scholar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Total Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.J. Wong</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robert H. Chenhall</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ferdinand A. Gul</td>
<td>Monash University Sunway Campus</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joseph P. H. Fan</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chul W. Park</td>
<td>Sungkyunkwan University</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hun-Tong Tan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Easton Peter</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wai Fong Chua</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Donald J. Stokes</td>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Margaret A. Abernethy</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michael Firth</td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Charles J. P. Chen</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jeong-Bon Kim</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Clive S. Lennox</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y. T. Mak</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Woody Wu</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Selto Frank H</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>David C. Hay</td>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (tied)</td>
<td>Hoque Zahirul</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (tied)</td>
<td>James Wendy</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the results of this study are compared with Heck (2009), seven of the top 10 authors in the five leading accounting journals with at least five appearances. It is noteworthy to point out that two Asia-Pacific authors, Hun-Tong Tan (NTU) and Ken. T. Trotman (UNSW), are listed as the top 100 most prolific authors in the five leading accounting journals, ranked 21st and 51st respectively. Nine of the top 10 authors of the 18 accounting journals compiled by the present study also appear in the list of 25 core accounting journals compiled by Heck (2009). (refer to note in table 2)

As this study adopts the data selection criteria from Chan et al. (2005), it will be meaningful to compare the results of these two studies over two periods of time. Based on the weighted number of articles, of the top 20 authors in the 18 journals and the top 5 journals in Chan et al.’s study, eight and ten authors respectively remain in the list of this study, meaning that the current list contain about 50% new authors. (refer to note in table 2 & 3)

In terms of the most cited articles authored by the Asia-Pacific researchers, “the management control system design within its organizational context: findings from contingency-based research and directions for the future” by Robert H. Chenhall (Monash U), and “corporate ownership structure and the informativeness and accounting earnings in East Asia” by Joseph P. H. Fan and T. J. Wong (both CUHK) are consistently ranked as the top 2 articles with highest citations in all three academic citation indexes of SSCI, Scopus, and Google Scholar. Refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9 for the most cited 20 articles in the three indexes respectively.
Table 7. The Top 20 Most Cited Articles in SSCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author, Article Title, Journal Title</th>
<th>Total Cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 8. The Top 20 Most Cited Articles Scopus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author, Article Title, Journal Title</th>
<th>Total Cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chenhall, R. H. (2003). Management control systems design within its organizational context: Findings from contingency-based research and directions for the future. Accounting, Organizations and Society.</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baskerville, R. F. (2003). Hofstede never studied culture. Accounting, Organizations and Society.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
firms in China. *Journal of Accounting Research.*


Table 9. The Top 20 Most Cited Articles in Google Scholar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author, Article Title, Journal Title</th>
<th>Total Cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hoque, Z., &amp; James, W.</td>
<td>Linking Balanced Scorecard measures to size and market factors: Impact on organizational performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fan, J. P. H., &amp; Wong, T. J.</td>
<td>Do external auditors perform a corporate governance role in emerging markets? Evidence from East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chen, C. J. P., &amp; Jaggi, B.</td>
<td>Association between independent non-executive directors, family control and financial disclosures in Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chenhall, R. H.</td>
<td>Integrative strategic performance measurement systems, strategic alignment of manufacturing, learning and strategic outcomes: An exploratory study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Baskerville, R. F.</td>
<td>Hofstede never studied culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hay, D. C., Knechel, W. R., &amp; Wong, N.</td>
<td>Audit fees: A meta-analysis of the effect of supply and demand attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DeFond, M. L., &amp; Park, C. W.</td>
<td>The reversal of abnormal accruals and the market valuation of earnings surprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Briers, M., &amp; Chua, W. F.</td>
<td>The role of actor-networks and boundary objects in management accounting change: A field study of an implementation of activity-based costing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ali, A., Chen, T.-Y., &amp; Radhakrishnan, S.</td>
<td>Corporate disclosures by family firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Baines, A., &amp; Langfield-Smith, K.</td>
<td>Antecedents to management accounting change: A structural equation approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Concluding Remarks

Based on 18 accounting journals, this study examined the accounting publication productivity of Asia-Pacific authors for an eleven-year period from 2000 to 2010 using both count method and citation analysis. The most productive authors have been consistently represented using both methods as well as across three prestigious academic databases – SSCI, Scopus, and Google Scholar. When the results of this study are compared with those of Heck (2009), a substantial gap between Asia-Pacific authors and the USA and the European authors was revealed. Specifically, only two authors from the Asia-Pacific region appeared in the list of the top 100 accounting researchers in the world. This finding implies that the accounting researchers from the Asia-Pacific region have a great challenge ahead in order to be on par if not better than authors from the other parts of the world.

This study suffered from several limitations. First, the comparison made in this study with other relevant studies (e.g., Heck, 2009) may not be valid as different studies selected different number and list of journals. Second, even though the study used count method and citation analysis, the emerging methods, for examples, h-index (simultaneously measure quality and quantity of research output), and g-index (similar to h-index but places more weight to highly cited articles), were not utilized in this study. As different techniques may generate different results, the findings of this study will be interpreted within the scope of the selected journals and the techniques employed. Nevertheless, the study has attempted to analyze research productivity using three widely used academic citation indexes, SSCI, Scopus and Google Scholar, which is relatively new among the research productivity studies.

It is recommended that future researchers compare productivity results using multiple methods to identify similarities and differences. Besides, online accounting journals which are publicly available under the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and Accounting Research Network (ARN) under the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) may be selected as they are freely downloadable by researchers and thus attract a larger readership among researchers. Harzing’s Publish or Perish online tool can be utilized for data collection based on Google Scholar index.
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