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**Abstract**

Bibliometrics is a fundamental field of information science that studies quantitatively the bibliographic material. It is very useful for organizing the available knowledge of a scientific discipline. The study presents a bibliometric overview of accounting research according to the information found in the Web of Science. A fundamental result provided by this approach is the identification of an important part of the most relevant research in this field classified by papers, authors, journals, institutions and countries. In general, the findings are close, to our common knowledge, to being the most significant research of highly ranked papers. The results show that the most influential journals are: *The Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *Journal of Accounting Research*, *The Accounting Review* and *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. Results also show that US institutions are the most influential worldwide. However, it is important to mention that some very good research in this area, including a small number of papers and citations, may not show up in this study due to the specific characteristics of different subtopics.
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**1. Introduction**

Accounting is a very old discipline. Several centuries ago, merchants were already using accounting techniques to deal with their businesses. The first record of its use is by Pacioli from Northern Italy in the 14th Century although; it actually emerged in Arabia and was later brought to Venice by Arabian traders. It started to grow tremendously during the twentieth century, especially motivated by multi-national enterprises that required a careful analysis of their business information. Today, it is the main tool for representing the information of a business, with many professional associations around the world dedicated to it. It can be divided in many sub disciplines including financial accounting, auditing and management accounting. An important consolidation process of the field occurred in 1916 when the American Association of University Instructors in Accounting was created. Later, in 1936 it received its current name well-known worldwide, the American Accounting Association (AAA). The AAA is a voluntary association dedicated to the promotion and development of accounting education and research. It is comprised of several thousand professionals and academic accountants.

Over the last few decades, many other associations have been created throughout the world. Some of them put priority on the professional sector while others focus on the academic community. The expansion of accounting research over the last century has reached maturity with the creation of other general associations such as the European Accounting Association in 1977 and others in Asia, including the Asian Academic Accounting Association in 1998 and the Asia-Pacific Management Accounting Association in 2004. Moreover, many countries also have their own accounting associations that are usually linked to international ones such as the British Accounting Association.

The field of accounting has been disseminated through many information channels, in particularly journals. In this context, the AAA played a fundamental role during the first half of the twentieth century with the creation of *The Accounting Review* (TAR) in 1926. For many years, it was the main outlet for accounting researchers to publish their new advancements in the field. Many other journals were available in the literature but they did not impact the academic community as much. Later, in 1963, the *Journal of Accounting Research* (JAR) was created by the University of Chicago, *Accounting and Finance* (AF) in 1961 and the *Abacus Journal* in 1965. Some others appeared in the following decades including *Accounting and Business Research* (ABR) in 1971, *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* (JBFA) (1974), *Accounting, Organizations and Society* (AOS) (1976), *Journal of Accounting & Economics* (JAE) (1979) and *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory* in 1981. Thus, the academic community began to find many alternatives to present the newest developments. More recently, a lot of other journals have appeared including the *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy* (JAPP), *Contemporary Accounting Research* (CAR), *European Accounting Review* (EAR) and *Review of Accounting Studies* (RAS).

Over the years, many authors have provided a wide range of overviews concerning the field of accounting. Some of them used bibliometric indicators to assess the general state of the art in the area (Brown and Gardner 1985a; Brown 1996). Many others have also studied different fundamental aspects including journal rankings (Bonner et al. 2006; Chan et al. 2009) and regional analysis (Chan et al. 2012b; Qu et al. 2009). Moreover, several papers have developed a cross-disciplinary analysis comparing accounting with other related disciplines including marketing and finance (Bernardi et al. 2008; Swanson 2004). However, none of them have provided a complete picture of the current state of the art, considering all the modern tools available for representing a field with bibliometric indicators (Hirsch 2005; Podsakoff et al. 2008).

The aim of this paper is to present a general bibliometric analysis of accounting research. Thus, it is possible to obtain a complete overview of the main results and trends in the field. The information is collected from the Web of Science (WoS) database. It is usually regarded as the most influential database in academic research because it only includes those journals recognized with high quality standards. Most of the results are in accordance with our common knowledge where JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS are the most influential journals and North American authors and institutions are the main leaders of the discipline. The new approach of this paper is based on the combination of several tools for representing the importance of the bibliographic material found in the WoS. Thus, it assesses the information from different perspectives. This is important because some authors, journals or institutions may have a high result under one scope but get a different result under another. Basically, the focus is on citation analysis, number of publications and the *h*-index (Hirsch 2005) which is a modern measure for representing the quality of a set of papers. Note that it is assumed from a general context that the number of papers indicates the productivity while the number of citations indicates the influence in a research area. The *h*-index is a combination of both of these.

This study analyzes the 300 most influential papers in accounting research of all time. The ranking is classified by journals so all the papers from the same journal appear together. The main reason for this is that it is easier to see the influence of a journal and the type of papers published there that become more relevant. Secondly, the paper presents a list of the most influential authors in accounting. In order to focus on only the highest quality, the ranking is established considering the number of citations in the top 4 journals (JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS). In order to be more general in the evaluation of these authors, many other factors are considered, among them the number of papers published and the *h*-index. Moreover, all the publications, citations and *h*-index obtained are also taken into account when considering all twenty accounting journals currently indexed in the WoS. The focus is then placed on the most influential institutions. They are assessed with similar criteria to those used for assessing authors. It is found that almost all of the top 100 institutions are from English speaking countries. Finally, the study ends with a country analysis of the most productive and influential research in accounting.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the literature review; Section 3 the methodology. Section 4 presents the results including the 300 most cited papers in accounting research of all time and the most influential authors, institutions and countries. Section 5 summarizes the main conclusions and limitations.

**2. Literature review**

Bibliometric analysis studies and classifies bibliographic material quantitatively. In recent years it has become very popular to assess the state of the art of a scientific discipline, chiefly motivated by the development of computers and internet. In the literature, there are many discussions regarding its definition. Broadus (1987) provided a definition that considered its use in the eighties and left the concept open for further development by adding “… and surrogates of either”. More recently, Bar-Ilan (2008) provided a complete overview of the concept from the general perspective of informetrics. Its main advantage is that it provides a general picture of a research area, which is very useful in identifying the most influential research and identifying the main trends throughout time.

Bibliometric studies have been developed in many disciplines such as the paper by Podsakoff et al. (2008) in management. They developed a complete state of the art that permitted the identification of the most influential authors and institutions in thirty selected management journals from 1981 to 2004. This study displayed awareness concerning the use of citation analysis and number of publications. Moreover, they analyzed the results in five-year periods in order to see its evolution throughout time. Similar studies in management developed by other authors are available, including Gómez-Mejia and Balkin (1992), Kirkpatrick and Locke (1992) and Trieschmann et al. (2000).

Wagstaff and Culyer (2012) developed a modern bibliometric analysis in health economics that provided a complete picture of the field for the last forty years. They considered many fundamental issues including a list of the 300 most cited papers and the most influential authors and institutions ranked according to the *h*-index. This study showed that modern bibliometric techniques can provide a lot of information regarding a research discipline. A previous paper had already addressed these issues (Rubin & Chang, 2003) although their results were less ambitious and general.

Econometrics is another field that has attracted attention by bibliometric researchers. Among others, the papers by Baltagi (1998, 2007) are worth mentioning. He studied the most productive authors, institutions and countries in econometrics taking into account the most influential journals in the area. Observe that his 2007 paper was an update of the previous research published in 1998 but of great interest because it provided a broader picture of the field. A similar paper was written before by Hall (1990) although his analysis was restricted to studies developed in the eighties. Some other papers worth mentioning in this area are Cribari-Neto et al. (1999) and Phillips et al. (1988) that studied similar issues.

More generally, economics has received a lot of attention for its development of bibliometric analysis in a wide range of perspectives. For example, Laband and Piette (1994) studied the influence of economic journals for the period 1970–1990. The results found were consistent with common knowledge, the most influential journals that appeared in the first positions included the *American Economic Review*, *Econometrica* and the *Journal of Political Economy*. Recently, several studies have been developed in this same direction (Card and DellaVigna 2013; Laband 2013; Stern 2013). Some other studies have analyzed the influence of authors and institutions (Autor 2012; Kocher and Sutter 2001; Süssmuth et al. 2006). Other researchers have developed a regional approach, the European region in particular (Coupé 2003; Lubrano et al. 2003). This is due to the fact that there is very relevant research in the region which rarely appears in the top positions as they are usually occupied by the USA. Some other specific regions that have received important attention are China (Du and Teixeira 2012), Germany (Sternberg and Litzenberger 2005), Spain (Rodríguez 2006) and Canada (Davies et al. 2008).

Entrepreneurship has also been of interest in bibliometrics. Ratnatunga and Romano (1997) studied the most influential research in contemporary small enterprise research which encompassed the main topics related to entrepreneurial activities. Dos Santos et al. (2011) studied the influence that the journals of the field were showing in the scientific community. Recently, Landström et al. (2013) has provided a complete bibliometric overview of the discipline. Some other authors have developed similar studies but with a more specific focus on family business research (Benavides-Velasco et al. 2013; Casillas and Acedo 2007).

Production and operations management has been studied by several bibliometric papers. Hsieh and Chang (2009) provided a general state of the art of the discipline considering the most productive and influential authors, institutions and countries. Pilkington and Meredith (2009) analyzed the most influential papers by using a citation analysis approach. Some other papers have presented several journal rankings in the field, including Barman et al. (2001), Holsapple and Lee-Post (2010), Petersen et al. (2011), Stonebraker et al. (2012) and Theoharakis et al. (2007). Many discussions have gone in the direction of determining the significance of production and operations management as an independent research field (Linderman and Chandrasekaran 2010; Pilkington and Liston-Hayes 1999).

Several studies have also focused on marketing. Seggie and Griffith (2009) studied the importance of publishing in top journals in order to be promoted. Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) analyzed the influence of marketing journals by using a citation analysis approach. Tellis et al. (1999) compared the publications found in the major journals in order to establish a ranking between them. Other authors have drawn attention to the influence of marketing scholars, institutions and countries (Chan et al. 2012a; Stremersch and Verhoef 2005). Specific topics of marketing have also been considered by many papers; including advertising research (Kim and McMillan 2008), public policy (Sprott and Miyazaki 2002) and pricing research (Leone et al. 2012).

Bibliometric studies are also present in financial research. Alexander and Mabry (1994) presented some rankings regarding the most influential authors and institutions in finance. Borokhovich et al. (1995) analyzed the most influential institutions in finance while Kim, Morse and Zingales (2009) considered the competitive advantage of the top institutions and the trends for the future. Some other papers have focused on the quality and influence of financial journals (Borokhovich et al. 2000; Currie and Pandher 2011; Oltheten et al. 2005). Regional analyses are very common in this discipline; including the work of Chan et al. (2011b) in Europe and in the Asia-Pacific region (Chan et al. 2011a).

Focusing on accounting research, several authors have provided a wide range of overviews over the years by using bibliometric indicators to assess the general state of the art. For example, Brown and Gardner (1985a) and Brown (1996) analyzed the most influential articles, authors and institutions by using a citation analysis. As expected they found that US authors and institutions were the most influential. Coyne et al. (2010) and Pickerd et al. (2011) developed several rankings classifying accounting by topics and methodology. Other studies were also developed to analyze a specific journal by citation count including the work of Brown and Gardner (1985b) focused on CAR, Brown et al. (1987) on AOS and Smith and Krogstad (1984) on AUD. Some other authors analyzed the information by publication count such as the paper by Heck and Bremser (1986) focusing on TAR and Watts (1998) on JAE. Other papers have analyzed the quality of accounting journals in order to establish a ranking that permits the classification of journals from very high quality to lower quality (Bonner et al. 2006). Under this framework, Lowe and Locke (2005) developed a survey of British accounting academics in order to establish the quality of the journals. Chan et al. (2009) developed a similar approach by using a dissertation citation analysis and by using an author affiliation index that indicates the percentage of publications in the journal from authors affiliated to institutions in the top 100 (Chan et al. 2012b).

Another interesting issue is the regional classification of accounting research. Qu et al. (2009) studied the North American region to analyze the influence of US elites in disseminating Canadian accounting research. Chan et al. (2012b) provided an overview of research in accounting and finance in Australia and New Zealand during 1991 – 2010. Some other research has been more specific analyzing a particular feature including author analysis (Danielson and Heck 2010), institutions (Reinstein and Calderon 2006) and journals (Jones and Roberts 2005). Moreover, accounting research has also been compared with other related disciplines including marketing, finance and management (Bernardi et al. 2008; Swanson 2004).

**3. Methodology**

This paper analyzes information through a combination process that considers total number of papers, total citations and the *h*-index. The main reason for doing so is that there is no fixed methodology for establishing the value of a set of papers that may include authors, institutions or countries. Therefore, in order to develop a complete analysis it is necessary to consider the main factors that influence the results. In this paper, it is assumed that the three most practical factors that determine the value of a group of papers are the number of works published, citations and the *h*-index (Merigó et al. 2015). A lot of criticism and discussion is found in the literature regarding the search of an optimal approach for classifying the value of research (Podsakoff et al. 2008). Traditionally, the publication count has received much attention because it can be considered as a measure that determines the productivity of an author, institution or country (Borokhovich et al. 1995). However, many limitations have been found due to the specific nature of each paper as some may have a higher number of pages, others a different number of authors or the size of one page in one journal is not equivalent to another. Furthermore, the type of paper may also influence the impact since literature reviews usually receive more citations than regular papers.

Some studies have partially considered these issues and some solutions have been found; including adjusting for the number of papers by dividing each paper by the number of authors (Heck and Bremser 1986) and adjusting for the number of pages by considering the number of pages that each article has (Baltagi 2007). However, several other limitations appeared because sometimes it is not easy to compare the publications of two different journals. For example, one paper in a top journal has a higher value than a paper in a medium quality journal. Therefore, if one author publishes five papers in a top journal, the value is higher than another one that publishes five papers in a medium quality journal. Unfortunately, it is not easy to classify this issue because generally, one unit is given to each publication and citation. A possible solution for this problem is that each journal has a different counting process depending on a pre-established value using, for example, the impact factor provided by WoK. Thus, if a journal has an impact factor of 3, each paper published there should be considered as 3 units while a journal with an impact factor of 1 should only be given 1 unit. Therefore, publishing one paper in the first top journal would be equivalent to publishing 3 papers in the medium journal. Although this could be a solution for overcoming the limitations mentioned before, there would still be problems in the evaluation process as it is also difficult to establish the value of a journal.

The impact factor provided by the WoK is commonly accepted as a relevant indicator that could be used in publications and citations count, but there is a lot of criticism regarding its calculation process. Currently, it considers the citations given by papers published inyear *n* to papers published in years *n* – 1 and *n* – 2. From this, it makes the ratio citations in year *n* – 1 and *n* – 2 divided by the number of papers published in year *n* – 1 and *n* – 2. However, due to criticism received, especially because it seems very easy to manipulate the impact factor of a journal by using a self-citation policy and related techniques, it is now becoming more relevant to use a five year impact factor. That is, instead of considering the last two years, citations over the last five years are considered. Although it is still possible to manipulate the impact factor under this framework at least it is possible to reduce this limitation by more than 50%. As seen in many fields, the five year impact factor seems to provide a more accurate result that seems to be in accordance with reality, where the most popular journals tend to obtain the highest results.

Similar limitations are also found in the citation count. However, in this case the disequilibrium found at high levels seems to be lower because the number of citations is higher than the number of publications and the most popular papers tend to be the most cited ones. Usually, the number of citations is used as a measure for identifying the influence of a paper, author, institution or country. Although the limitations are less relevant in this case, it is still necessary to consider them. Moreover, other types of limitations may occur in this context. A very common one is that some topics may receive more citations than others because more journals are involved in this field or because of the interdisciplinary nature of a field that may involve more researchers. Therefore, some very good but rather specific research may receive fewer citations than another one that is more general and encompasses more researchers. As it will be shown in Section 4, this may be one reason why JAE has received more citations than JAR and TAR even though it is a younger journal. This is because JAE encompasses accounting and economics under its central scope.

The *h*-index (Hirsch 2005) is a modern technique that aims to combine publications and citations under the same framework. Thus, if a set of papers has an *h*-index of 30, it means that at least 30 papers have each received 30 citations or more. This measure combines the number of papers with citations, which seems to be very useful. However, for some particular cases it may not correctly represent the information. For example, if a researcher has published one hundred papers with three of them having more than 1000 citations but the rest having fewer than four citations, his *h*-index will be three. However, it is clear that the value of this researcher is much higher. In order to solve this problem, other indexes have been suggested such as the *g*-index and the *hg*-index (Alonso et al. 2009; Egghe 2006). Most of these techniques are focused on more specific issues that may affect some exceptional researchers but from a general perspective, the *h*-index seems to be an adequate measure for representing the value of a researcher considering both publications and citations at the same time.

Regarding the selection of database, in this paper WoS, currently owned by Thomson & Reuters, is used. WoS includes papers published in almost all the known scientific disciplines and covers more than 15,000 journals and 50,000,000 papers. The research published there is classified into 251 subject categories and 151 more general research areas. It is assumed that WoS includes only those journals that are recognized as high quality by several criteria including: on time review and publication of papers, a rigorous peer review process and a wide dissemination through internet and related channels. Some other popular databases commonly used are SCOPUS, GoogleScholar and EconLit. However, for the purposes of this paper, only WoS will be used since it provides objective results that can be considered to be sufficiently neutral and representative of the information.

Focusing on authorship and institutions, one unit is given to each author or institution that takes part in the paper. Although this could be seen as a limitation, it is assumed that this will not substantially affect the results of the paper. The main reasons are as follows. For authorship, this research aims to identify both productivity and influence. Therefore, with the publication count we aim to detect those authors that publish the highest number of papers independently, whether these papers are single authored or not. Thus, the results will show the involvement of researchers in the publication of papers. Although sometimes this is unfair because this may not strictly reflect the productivity of one author, it gives a general view of his total production that usually includes his own single authored papers, those coauthored with junior researchers and his collaborations with other senior researchers. Similar problems occur with the total number of citations and the *h*-index, although in this case the differences are less relevant because the involvement of a researcher is closer to the influence than the productivity.

Concerning institutions, these limitations are less significant because here the concept of involvement becomes more relevant. The main reason is that a productive and influential institution is found by not only the publications of its own researchers but also the collaboration with researchers from other institutions. Several explanations are available for this. First, an institution is a dynamic entity made up of many researchers that may enter and leave it at any time because the career of a researcher has several stages and each of them may be developed at a different place. Second, external researchers collaborating with people from the institution may also be partly considered as its members due to the exchange of knowledge between researchers. Note that a similar situation occurs when analyzing the productivity and influence of a country where it is acceptable to give one unit to each country involved in one paper.

Currently, WoS does not include a specific section for accounting. It has a subject category of business finance that mainly includes financial and accounting journals. Honing in on this category, twenty journals are found to be mainly dedicated to different topics of accounting. Note that there are journals that were previously included in the database such as the *Journal of Accountancy*. Since this journal has a more professional orientation and its current issues are not included in WoS, it has not been considered in the analysis. Moreover, some other journals with close connection to accounting have also been excluded in order to specify the area of accounting as much as possible. This issue has affected some journals that are sometimes considered to be accounting journals (Bonner et al. 2006; Chan et al. 2009) including the *National Tax Journal* and the *Journal of American Taxation Association*. Table 1 presents the twenty journals included in the analysis. In order to evaluate each journal, several variables are studied in order to rank them based on their value and significance.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 1 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS are clearly the most influential journals in the field as assessed by all the different variables considered in this study. A next group of influential journals are AUD, CAR and RAS. The rest of the journals, ranked with the *h*-index, seem to obtain a position more or less in accordance with their influence. Note that in this ranking no significant anomalies are found because more than half of the journals have been included in WoS during the last six years. Therefore, they do not have many papers collected in WoS at this time. In order to consider the most influential papers published in these journals, three columns focusing on the number of papers with more than 200, 100 and 50 citations are considered. Since many journals have been included in WoS for fewer than ten years but are much older, a manual search by using the option “cited reference search” has been developed in order to find any highly cited paper in the journal above the 50 citation threshold.

As shown in Table 1, JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS have published most of the highly cited papers. It is worth noting that JAE obtains higher results than the other three although it is the youngest journal. A key reason for this is that it has strong connections with economics. Therefore, it has broader influence because many researchers from economics may also consider this journal as an outlet for their research. Another interesting issue is that TAR is much older than the other three and this is the reason why it has published the highest number of papers. However, this issue should not be taken into account when evaluating the ratio of citations/papers because old papers did not receive many citations due to the fact that there were not many journals at that time and the number of papers and citations in accounting was very low.

As to February 2013, there were 17,444 papers published in the twenty accounting journals listed in WoS. However, in order to exclude short communications, editorial material and book reviews, the analysis is mainly focused on “full articles” and “reviews”. Considering only these two types of publications, the number of papers is reduced to 11,423. Furthermore, since it has been defined that four journals clearly dominate this discipline, most of the different analyses developed in the paper take as point of departure the results found only in these top four journals. The main reason for doing this is to focus on papers with the highest quality, leaving the rest of papers only considered at a second level.

Accounting is a research field that currently does not have a significant position in WoS as only twenty journals are included. Before 2004 only eight journals were included. This is a very small number for such a large discipline; accounting comprises many thousands of researchers worldwide. Figure 1 shows the number of papers published in accounting during the last 50 years.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Figure 1 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

As shown in Figure 1, the number was as low as around 100 per year until the last decade when it started to grow quickly. Currently the number is close to 700 papers per year and it seems that the number will continue to increase in the future. Note that the main reason for this is the expansion developed by WoS during the last few years, it has included many more journals. Moreover, regional expansion has also given non-English speaking countries the opportunity to have more journals included in the database.

The number of citations received in this area is also very low compared to sister disciplines such as finance and economics mainly because of the low number of accounting journals that have been included in the database. In Table 2 the citation structure is presented in this area for the 11,423 papers considered. Note that some additional adjustments made in order to find the most cited papers in section 4.1 are also included here. Thus, the total number of papers is increased to 11,454.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 2 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The number of citations is very low compared to other disciplines where several papers receive more than 1,000 citations. Furthermore, it is clear that most of the papers currently receive less than 50 citations. However, it is worth mentioning that in the future these numbers are expected to increase significantly due to the increase in the number of accounting journals included in WoS. Observe that the global *h*-index in accounting is 131. That is, from the total of 11,454 papers, 131 have received at least 131 citations.

Next, let us look into the global impact factor in this field as shown in Table 3. Recall that it considers all the citations of papers published in accounting in year *n* to papers published in years *n* – 1 and *n* – 2. From this it calculates the ratio citations in these two years divided by the number of papers in the same period.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 3 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

During the last ten years, the global impact factor has been quite stable; between 1 and 1.5. The main reason for this is the selection process that accounting journals have had to go through to enter WoS. Before, there were not many journals indexed, allowing the top journals to have a higher influence in the impact factor. Now, with more journals in WoS their influence is lower so the impact factor is lower than should be. However, the increase of journals has also influenced an increase in the impact factor. Due to this, the variations have been compensated so that the final result is stable.

**4. Results**

This Section presents the main results found in WoS concerning the most cited papers in accounting research, the most prolific authors, institutions and countries.

**4.1. The most influential articles in accounting research of all time**

Over the last few decades, many influential papers have been published in accounting research. In order to identify them, this section analyzes the most cited papers in accounting journals. Since many journals have only been included in WoS since last decade, a manual search process has also been developed. Thus, all the papers that could be considered mainstream accounting are considered. Table 4 presents a list with the 300 most cited papers in accounting of all time. Observe that the ranking has been developed by grouping all the papers from the same journal in order to find them directly in the list. The appearance of journals in the ranking is presented from the journal with the highest number of papers in the list to the journal with the lowest number.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 4 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

JAE has 102 papers on the list, being the journal with the highest number. JAR comes next with 74 and it has the two most cited papers of all time. TAR is found in the third position with 60 and AOS in the fourth position with 34. Far away from the previous four journals comes CAR in the fifth position with 9 papers and AH is in the sixth position with 8 papers. Note that most of the papers of CAR and AH did not appear in the automatic search because most of these papers had been published before the journals entered WoS. Thus, a manual search through the “cited reference search” has been developed in order to find these highly cited articles.

The most cited paper of all time in accounting was published in 1968 by Ball and Brown, it currently has 651 citations. Three other papers have also received more than 500 citations. The second one was written by Ohlson, the third by Healy and the fourth by Jones. Note that the key reason that JAE has received more citations than JAR, TAR and AOS is because it has a broader scope that includes researchers from both accounting and economics. Therefore, many other researchers cite the journal while in the other three journals this happens in a much lower degree.

**4.2. The most prolific and influential authors**

Many researchers have made fundamental contributions to accounting research. In order to identify the most influential ones, Table 5 presents the 40 authors that have received the highest number of citations in the top 4 journals (JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS). Observe that through this measure it is possible to consider the most influential researchers and focus only on the highest quality journals. However, the disadvantage of this is that some very influential papers published in other journals such as CAR, RAS and AH are not included in the first list. In order to balance this problem, an additional column with the total citations received in all the twenty accounting journals is included. Furthermore, the total number of papers and the *h*-index are also considered to obtain a picture that takes into account both the influence and the productivity of each author.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 5 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Richard G. Sloan is the author with the highest number of citations in the top 4 journals and in all the sets of journals. Not far behind him appears David F. Larcker in the second position. Moreover, Larcker is the author with the highest number of papers and *h*-index. S.P. Kothari and Robert Verrecchia are found in the third and fourth positions with almost 2,000 citations in the top 4 each. Note that 18 authors have received at least 1000 citations from 22 of all the journals considered. Regarding the differences found between the top 4 and the rest of the journals, they are not significant except for James A. Ohlson and Paul M. Healy. Ohlson published a highly cited paper with 460 citations in CAR and Healy a paper with 329 citations in AH. Therefore, their total number of citations increases a lot when considering these papers. Another interesting issue is that almost all the authors come from the USA.

In order to obtain a more complete picture of the most productive authors in the top 4 journals, Table 6 presents the 30 authors with the highest number of papers in each of the journals. Note that an additional column with the corresponding citations of each author is also included. Moreover, TAR is studied from two different perspectives: a specific one from 1963–2012 in order to be equivalent to JAR and a second perspective that considers all time since 1926.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 6 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

JAE, JAR and TAR (1963–2012) have similar results with many of these authors included in the top 40 list. TAR (all time) has different results because it is an older journal and many authors have published a lot of papers there since 1926. However, as mentioned in Table 1, at that time the number of citations was very low so these authors have a lot of papers but not many citations. AOS also obtains significant differences mainly because it is a non-US journal with a higher influence by other schools including the European, Canadian and Australian schools.

**4.3. The most productive and influential institutions**

Institutions from all over the world have made fundamental contributions in accounting research. However, a great majority are established in the USA. In order to identify and classify the most influential and productive institutions, Table 7 presents a list with the top 100 most productive institutions ranked according to the number of papers in the top 4 journals. Some other additional variables are considered including total citations, the *h*-index, total number in the twenty accounting journals and the number of papers with more than 200, 100 and 50 citations. Thus, it is possible to find the most productive institutions in the top 4 journals, which reflects high quality publications and also considers each institution’s influence and key contributions in the field.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 7 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The University of Chicago is the most productive and influential institution worldwide. It has the highest number of papers, citations and *h*-index. Note that a reason that may explain the huge differences between the University of Chicago and the second ranked institution is that, apart from having some of the most famous accounting researchers, the University of Chicago publishes JAR. According to the number of papers published in the top 4 journals, the rest of the institutions in the top 5 are Stanford University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Texas Austin and University of Michigan. If the total number of citations and the *h*-index are considered, the top 5 remains very similar with the only difference that Harvard University would appear in the fifth position instead of Austin.

Note that until the thirty-third position all the universities are from the USA and 78 of the top 100 universities are from this country. The first non-US institution is the University of Manchester which appears in the thirty-fourth position. In total, seven UK institutions are included in the top 100, five Canadian and Australian universities, two from Israel, and one each from China, Singapore and the Netherlands. By looking at these results, it is clear that the USA has an extremely strong position in this discipline.

In order to see the most relevant institutions in each of the top 4 journals, Table 8 presents the 30 institutions with the highest number of papers in these journals. An additional column with their total citations is also included so it is also possible to observe their influence.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 8 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The University of Chicago leads the list in JAE and JAR and obtains the seventh position in TAR. Stanford University also obtains very remarkable results being the second one in JAR and TAR and the fifth one in JAE. Most of the well-known US institutions appear in the list in JAE, JAR or TAR. Concerning AOS, there is more dispersion worldwide with less US influence. The University of Manchester gets the first position and London School of Economics the second one.

**4.4. Country analysis**

In order to create a worldwide picture of accounting research, in this section the country origin of the publications is studied. Note that a country concerns the institution that publishes a paper but it does not consider the nationality of the researchers who publish the paper. This may create a substantial gap as many good researchers have moved to other countries, especially the US and the UK. Thus, their publications only count for the institution where they were working at the time of publication and not to their citizenship. Although this does not reflect the nationality of researchers, it seems more reasonable to develop the analysis in this way because the focus is on finding key places around the world where high quality accounting research is published. Table 9 presents a ranking of the 30 most productive countries in the top 4 journals. Here again the objective is to see the volume of publications in the most influential journals because this reflects the importance of a country in the field. In order to give a complete picture, the total number of citations and the *h*-index are also considered.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 9 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It is clear that the USA is the most productive and influential country in this area obtaining the best results in all the variables and with huge differences from the second ranked country. The second place goes to the UK, the third to Canada and the fourth to Australia. At a lower level China is found in the fifth position and the Netherlands in sixth. Although being small countries, Israel and Singapore obtain remarkable results being in the seventh and eighth position respectively. The rest of the countries do not seem to have a strong influence in this field having published only few papers in the top 4 journals.

Next, in order to see the specific influence and productivity that each country has, Table 10 shows the number of papers that each country has published in each of the twenty journals indexed in WoS. Note that the same ranking is used as in Table 9.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Table 10 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The USA is the most influential country in almost all the accounting journals. The only exceptions are JBFA, EAR, MAR, ABR and AAAJ that are led by the UK, AAR by Australia and SJFA by Spain. Concerning the top 4, the differences are very significant between the USA and the rest of countries for JAE, JAR and TAR while in AOS it seems to be more dispersion regarding the country of origin of the publications.

**5. Conclusions**

This paper presented a general updated picture of accounting research in the last decades by using bibliometric indicators. The results were generated by using WoS which is a general database widely regarded as the most influential in scientific research. The main findings are in accordance with previous research in this direction and with the common knowledge in the field where the most popular journals, institutions and authors appear in the most relevant positions. The main contribution of this paper was the use of modern bibliometric tools for producing the results and taking into account the different indicators that are currently used in the literature. JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS are the most influential journals in the field, where the majority of the most cited papers are published. CAR, AH and more recently RAS, are also very influential journals but far away from the top 4. Inside this selective group, JAE gets the best results. It has the advantage of being more interdisciplinary with a strong connection between accounting and economics. Another important issue found when analyzing the journals is that WoS does not include many accounting journals. An advantage of this in the search process is that it is very selective focusing only on the highest quality research. This issue leads to other implications such as the very low citation level of accounting papers compared to other fields. Only four papers have received more than 500 citations while in other sister disciplines usually several papers have more than 1000 citations and many are above the 500 citation threshold.

The USA is the most dominant country in the field with a very strong position in all the top journals. It has a long tradition of accounting research especially since the creation of the AAA in 1916. More than 75% of the institutions in the top 100 worldwide come from the USA and they control JAE, JAR, TAR and many other influential journals. Almost all the top 40 authors shown in Table 5 are from this country and they have published most of the highly cited papers in accounting. All these authors represent an important part of the main leaders in this field and they currently hold relevant editorial positions in the most important journals. By looking at the results, the conclusion is that the USA almost has some kind of monopoly in this area with the exception of the UK, Canada and Australia that also have significant positions in this field.

The British School has shown a strong position in accounting according to its size. It is the most influential country in AOS and several of its institutions are found in the top 100 although none of them entered the top 20. It has published many highly cited papers and also holds a long tradition of accounting research. Furthermore, it controls other influential journals including JBFA, MAR and ABR. Currently, it is ranked as the second most productive and influential country in the world.

The Canadian School, ranked in the third position, is also very influential in accounting research. It controls CAR and has five institutions in the top 100, although the first one appears in the thirty-sixth position. Many highly cited papers come from this country. The Australian School has also shown remarkable results, given to its size. Currently, it is the fourth most influential country, very close to Canada. It controls Abacus, AF, AAR and AAAJ.

Other countries are far away from the first four countries. The Chinese School starts to get some remarkable results and is currently ranked in the fifth position. However, it still needs to grow a lot, especially when compared to other fields in which it has already obtained relevant positions. From the sixth until the eleventh position, small developed countries appear with results that could be considered appropriate according to their sizes, including the Netherlands, Israel, Singapore, Sweden, New Zealand and Denmark. Large non-English speaking countries including France, South Korea, Germany, Spain, Japan and Italy, have only published a small number of papers in the best accounting journals, probably due to their different languages. Many developing countries have only published a few papers in JAE, JAR, TAR and AOS. For example, Egypt, India and Indonesia have each published four papers in the top 4, and only ten developing countries have published at least one paper in the top 4.

The main findings of this paper are useful for obtaining a general overview of the state of the art in accounting research according to bibliometric information. Thus, it is possible to find the most remarkable research in this area according to some key indicators including number of papers, citations and the *h*-index. However, it is worth noting that there are several limitations that should be considered. First, the analysis presented in the paper aims to be informative so that it is possible to identify some very relevant research in the field. However, since this study is based on WoS, other influential research that is not collected in WoS is not included in this study. For instance, some influential authors do not publish many papers or they do not receive many citations due to their specific topics. Another example of this could be non-English speaking countries that have shown very weak results but have perhaps published excellent research results in their own languages.

Secondly, it was necessary to classify the information, so several rankings were presented. However, they are not an official result. They are simply aimed at being informative based on the bibliometric data found in WoS. Furthermore, many important issues in the evaluation of research are very difficult to quantify, including involvement in journals, conferences, promotion of research worldwide and many other related issues. Therefore, this paper only provides general information that may be useful to help understand the field of accounting, but many other issues should be taken into account in order to get a complete picture of the state of the art.
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**Figure 1.** Number of annual publications in accounting in WoS , articles + reviews) since 1963.

**Table 1.** Most influential accounting research journals according to the WoS\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R | Name | H | TC | TP | >200 | >100 | >50 | Y | Vol. | IF | 5-IF | T300 |
| 1 | JAE | 86 | 28970 | 752 | 25 | 71 | 165 | 1982 | 4 | 3.912 | 4.023 | 102 |
| 2 | JAR | 77 | 31161 | 1397 | 13 | 51 | 170 | 1963 | 1 | 2.192 | 3.368 | 74 |
| 3 | TAR | 71 | 30256 | 4416 | 10 | 37 | 129 | 1926 | 1 | 2.319 | 3.204 | 60 |
| 4 | AOS | 61 | 20718 | 1096 | 2 | 20 | 95 | 1981 | 6 | 1.867 | 3.143 | 34 |
| 5 | AUD | 33 | 5029 | 566 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1985 | 5 | 1.015 | 1.408 | 2 |
| 6 | CAR | 26 | 3094 | 365 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 2002 | 19 | 1.564 | 2.154 | 9 |
| 7 | RAS | 24 | 1958 | 210 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 2004 | 9 | 1.364 | 1.899 | 5 |
| 8 | JBFA | 17 | 1747 | 441 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2005 | 32 | 1.010 | 1.061 | 0 |
| 9 | JAPP\*\* | 17 | 1366 | 340 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2008 | 27 | 0.770 | - | 2 |
| 10 | EAR | 13 | 668 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2006 | 15 | 0.654 | 1.465 | 0 |
| 11 | ABA | 12 | 727 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1974 | 10 | 0.850 | 1.010 | 0 |
| 12 | MAR | 8 | 340 | 98 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2008 | 19 | 1.366 | - | 2 |
| 13 | AF | 7 | 346 | 259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 47 | 0.875 | 0.794 | 0 |
| 14 | ABR | 7 | 295 | 132 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2007 | 37 | 0.533 | 0.792 | 1 |
| 15 | AH | 7 | 206 | 113 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 2008 | 22 | 1.288 | - | 8 |
| 16 | AAR | 5 | 128 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2008 | 18 | 0.833 | - | 0 |
| 17 | AAAJ | 5 | 125 | 123 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2010 | 23 | 0.922 | - | 1 |
| 18 | JIFMA | 3 | 25 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2008 | 19 | 0.333 | - | 0 |
| 19 | APJAE | 2 | 22 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2008 | 15 | 0.206 | - | 0 |
| 20 | SJFA | 1 | 15 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2008 | 37 | 0.106 | - | 0 |

\*Note that four other accounting journals have entered WoS during the last three years although they still have not received an impact factor: *British Accounting Review*; *Comptabilité – Control – Audit*; *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*; *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*.

\*\*JAPP was included in 2008 but it also appeared between 1982 – 1995 (Vol. 1 – 14).

Abbreviations: R = Rank; H = *h*-index; TC and TP = Total citations and papers; >200, >100, >50 = number of papers with more than 200, 100 and 50 citations; Y = Year when the journal was included in WoS; Vol. = First volume included in the WoS; IF = Impact Factor 2012; 5-IF = 5 year Impact Factor 2012; T300 = Number of papers in the Top 300 list shown in Table 4; JAE = *Journal of Accounting and Economics*; JAR = *Journal of Accounting Research*; TAR = *The Accounting Review*; AOS = *Accounting, Organizations and Society*; AUD = *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*; CAR = *Contemporary Accounting Research*; RAS = *Review of Accounting Studies*; JBFA = *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*; JAPP = Journal of Accounting and Public Policy; EAR = *European Accounting Review*; ABA = *Abacus: A Journal of Accounting and Business Studies*; MAR = *Management Accounting Research*; AF = *Accounting and Finance*; ABR = *Accounting and Business Research*; AH = *Accounting Horizons*; AAR = *Australian Accounting Review*; AAAJ = *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*; JIFMA = *Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting*; APJAE = *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics*; SFJA = *Revista Española de Financiación y Contabilidad – Spanish Journal of Finance and Accounting*.

**Table 2**. General citation structure in accounting research in WoS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | All time | | 2003 – 2012 | |
| Citations | Number of papers | % Papers | Number of papers | % Papers |
| ≥ 500 citations | 4 papers | 0.035% | 0 papers | 0% |
| ≥ 200 citations | 55 papers | 0.480% | 4 papers | 0.090% |
| ≥ 100 citations | 201 papers | 1.754% | 25 papers | 0.563% |
| ≥ 50 citations | 616 papers | 5.378% | 140 papers | 3.155% |
| ≤ 50 citations | 10,838 papers | 94.621% | 4,296 papers | 96.844% |
| Total | 11,454 papers |  | 4,436 papers |  |

**Table 3.** Global impact factor in accounting research

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| TP | 212 | 191 | 272 | 307 | 374 | 560 | 573 | 612 | 644 | 688 |
| TC | 6202 | 5583 | 5736 | 4559 | 3887 | 4173 | 2827 | 1975 | 807 | 175 |
| TC2 | 444 | 511 | 534 | 655 | 765 | 914 | 1090 | 1546 | 1657 | 1597 |
| TP2 | 310 | 390 | 403 | 463 | 579 | 681 | 934 | 1133 | 1185 | 1256 |
| IF | 1.432 | 1.310 | 1.325 | 1.414 | 1.321 | 1.342 | 1.167 | 1.364 | 1.398 | 1.271 |

Abbreviations: TP = Total number of paper published in year *n*; TC = Total number of citations received from papers published in year *n*; TC2 = Total citations received in year *n* – 1 and *n* – 2 from year *n*; TP2 = Total number of papers published in year *n* – 1 and *n* – 2; IF = Impact factor of year *n*.

**Table 4.** 300 most cited papers in accounting research

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| J | R | TC | Title | Author/s | Year | C/Y |
| JAE | 3 | 529 | The effects of bonus schemes on accounting decisions | PM Healy | 1985 | 19 |
| JAE | 6 | 466 | Complementarities and fit: Strategy, structure and organizational change in manufacturing | P Milgrom, J Roberts | 1995 | 27 |
| JAE | 9 | 393 | Corporate performance and managerial remuneration | KJ Murphy | 1985 | 14 |
| JAE | 10 | 374 | Earnings management to avoid earnings decreases and losses | D Burgstahler, I Dichev | 1997 | 24 |
| JAE | 11 | 373 | Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure and the capital markets | PM Healy, KG Palepu | 2001 | 33 |
| JAE | 14 | 347 | The effect of international institutional factors on properties of accounting earnings | R Ball, SP Kothari, A Robin | 2000 | 28 |
| JAE | 15 | 338 | The economic implications of corporate financing reporting | JR Graham, CR Harvey, S Rajgopal | 2005 | 48 |
| JAE | 17 | 334 | The conservatism principle and the asymmetric timeliness of earnings | S Basu | 1997 | 22 |
| JAE | 19 | 320 | Auditor size and audit quality | L De Angelo | 1981 | 10 |
| JAE | 21 | 313 | Audit committee, board of director characteristics and earnings management | A Klein | 2002 | 31 |
| JAE | 22 | 312 | The information content of losses | C Hayn | 1995 | 18 |
| JAE | 23 | 307 | Performance matched discretionary accrual measures | SP Kothari, AJ Leone, CE Wasley | 2005 | 43 |
| JAE | 24 | 304 | Evidence that stock prices do not fully reflect the implications of current earnings for future earnings | VL Bernard, JK Thomas | 1990 | 13 |
| JAE | 25 | 303 | Executive compensation, management turnover and firm performance | AT Coughlan, RM Schmidt | 1985 | 11 |
| JAE | 27 | 299 | Discretionary disclosure | RE Verrecchia | 1983 | 10 |
| JAE | 31 | 285 | Debt covenant violation and manipulation of accruals | ML Defond, J Jiambalvo | 1994 | 15 |
| JAE | 33 | 273 | Accounting earnings and cash flows as measures of firm performance | PM Dechow | 1994 | 15 |
| JAE | 35 | 269 | Capital markets research in accounting | SP Kothari | 2001 | 24 |
| JAE | 38 | 266 | Predicting takeover targets | KG Palepu | 1986 | 10 |
| JAE | 40 | 255 | An analysis of intertemporal and cross sectional determinants of earnings response coefficients | DW Collins, SP Kothari | 1989 | 11 |
| JAE | 44 | 228 | The capitalization, amortization and value relevance of R&D | B Lev, T Sougiannis | 1996 | 14 |
| JAE | 45 | 222 | Additional evidence on the association between investment opportunity set and corporate financing, dividend and compensation policies | JJ Gaver, KM Gaver | 1993 | 11 |
| JAE | 50 | 216 | The market pricing of accruals quality | J Francis, R LaFond, P Olsson, et al. | 2005 | 30 |
| JAE | 51 | 216 | Essays on disclosure | RE Verrecchia | 2001 | 19 |
| JAE | 55 | 206 | Stock options for undiversified executives | BJ Hall, KJ Murphy | 2002 | 20 |
| JAE | 57 | 198 | The use of equity grants to manage optimal equity incentive levels | J Core, W Guay | 1999 | 15 |
| JAE | 61 | 195 | Financial accounting information and corporate governance | RM Bushman, AJ Smith | 2001 | 17 |
| JAE | 63 | 193 | Underwriting relationships, analysts’ earnings forecast and investment recommendations | HW Lin, MF McNichols | 1998 | 13 |
| JAE | 65 | 187 | Earnings quality in UK private firms | R Ball, L Shivakumar | 2005 | 26 |
| JAE | 67 | 184 | Incentives versus standards | R Ball, A Robin, JS Wu | 2003 | 20 |
| JAE | 68 | 181 | The relevance of the value-relevance literature for financial accounting standard setting | RW Holthausen, RL Watts | 2001 | 16 |
| JAE | 69 | 181 | Auditor brand name reputations and industry specializations | AT Craswell, JR Francis, SL Taylor | 1995 | 10 |
| JAE | 73 | 176 | Market liquidity and volume around earnings announcements | O Kim, RE Verrecchia | 1994 | 9 |
| JAE | 75 | 174 | Information quality and the valuation of new issues | S Titman, B Trueman | 1986 | 6 |
| JAE | 76 | 172 | Firm characteristics and analyst following | R Bhushan | 1989 | 7 |
| JAE | 80 | 168 | The rewards to meeting or beating earnings expectations | E Bartov, D Givoly, C Hayn | 2002 | 16 |
| JAE | 82 | 164 | Executive incentives and the horizon problem | PM Dechow, RG Sloan | 1991 | 7 |
| JAE | 84 | 161 | Board composition, ownership structure and hostile takeovers | A Shivdasani | 1993 | 8 |
| JAE | 88 | 158 | Analysts forecasts as earnings expectations | PC O’Brien | 1988 | 6 |
| JAE | 99 | 149 | Changes in the value-relevance of earnings and book values over the past forty years | DW Collins, EL Maydew, IS Weiss | 1997 | 9 |
| JAE | 100 | 149 | Managerial ownership, accounting choices and informatives of earnings | TD Warfield, JJ Wild, KL Wild | 1995 | 8 |
| JAE | 102 | 148 | CEO stock option awards and the timing of corporate voluntary disclosures | D Aboody, R Kasznik | 2000 | 12 |
| JAE | 103 | 148 | Value-relevance of nonfinancial information | E Amir, B Lev | 1996 | 9 |
| JAE | 106 | 146 | Accounting valuation, market expectation and cross-sectional stock returns | R Frankel, CMC Lee | 1998 | 10 |
| JAE | 109 | 144 | The pricing of discretionary accruals | KR Subramanyam | 1996 | 9 |
| JAE | 112 | 142 | Empirical research on accounting choice | TD Fields, TZ Lys, L Vincent | 2001 | 12 |
| JAE | 116 | 141 | Accounting earnings and top executive compensation | RG Sloan | 1993 | 7 |
| JAE | 118 | 140 | Auditor independence, “low balling” and disclosure regulation | L De Angelo | 1981 | 4 |
| JAE | 119 | 139 | Corporate ownership structure and the informativeness of accounting earnings in East Asia | JPH Fan, TJ Wong | 2002 | 13 |
| JAE | 122 | 137 | Debt covenant violations and managers accounting responses | AP Sweeney | 1994 | 7 |
| JAE | 126 | 132 | Assessing empirical research in managerial accounting | CD Ittner, DF Larcker | 2001 | 12 |
| JAE | 127 | 132 | The relation between earnings and cash flows | PM Dechow, SP Kothari, RL Watts | 1998 | 9 |
| JAE | 129 | 131 | The changing time-series properties of earnings, cash flows and accruals | D Givoly, C Hayn | 2000 | 10 |
| JAE | 133 | 129 | Contracting theory and accounting | RA Lambert | 2001 | 11 |
| JAE | 137 | 126 | Annual bonus schemes and the manipulation of earnings | RW Holthausen, DF Larcker, RG Sloan | 1995 | 7 |
| JAE | 146 | 121 | Analyst forecast accuracy | MB Clement | 1999 | 9 |
| JAE | 148 | 119 | Financial analysts forecasts of earnings | D Fried, D Givoly | 1982 | 3 |
| JAE | 149 | 118 | Earnings disclosures and stockholder lawsuits | DJ Skinner | 1997 | 7 |
| JAE | 152 | 117 | Cross-sectional variation in the stock market response to accounting earnings announcements | PD Easton, ME Zmijewski | 1989 | 5 |
| JAE | 159 | 115 | Financial statement analysis and the predictions of stock returns | JA Ou, SH Penman | 1989 | 5 |
| JAE | 164 | 113 | Financial performance surrounding CEO turnover | KJ Murphy, JL Zimmerman | 1993 | 5 |
| JAE | 169 | 112 | The economic consequences of accounting choice | RW Holthausen, RW Leftwich | 1983 | 3 |
| JAE | 170 | 110 | The information content of security prices | WH Beaver, RA Lambert | 1980 | 3 |
| JAE | 172 | 109 | Determinants of market reactions to restatement announcements | ZV Palmrose, VJ Richardson, S Scholz | 2004 | 13 |
| JAE | 174 | 109 | An empirical assessment of the residual income valuation model | PM Dechow, AP Hutton, RG Sloan | 1999 | 8 |
| JAE | 175 | 109 | Relative valuation roles of equity book value and net incomes as a function of financial health | ME Barth, WH Beaver, WR Landsman | 1998 | 7 |
| JAE | 177 | 108 | The relevance of the value relevance literature for financial accounting standard setting | ME Barth, WH Beaver, WR Landsman | 2001 | 9 |
| JAE | 178 | 108 | On cross sectional analysis in accounting research | AA Christie | 1987 | 4 |
| JAE | 179 | 107 | Board characteristics, accounting report integrity and the cost of debt | RC Anderson, SA Mansi, DM Reeb | 2004 | 13 |
| JAE | 184 | 106 | Earnings management through real activities manipulation | S Roychowdhury | 2006 | 17 |
| JAE | 194 | 102 | Stock based incentive compensation and investment behavior | JM Bizjak, JA Brickley, JL Coles | 1993 | 5 |
| JAE | 207 | 97 | Employee stock option exercises | S Huddart, M Lang | 1996 | 6 |
| JAE | 208 | 97 | The association between accounting earnings and security returns for large and small firms | RN Freeman | 1987 | 3 |
| JAE | 209 | 97 | The association between performance plan adoption and corporate capital investment | DF Larcker | 1983 | 3 |
| JAE | 212 | 96 | Security analyst superiority relative to univariate time series models in forecasting quarterly earnings | LD Brown, RL Hager-man, PA Griffin, et al. | 1987 | 3 |
| JAE | 213 | 95 | Accrual reliability, earnings persistence and stock prices | SA Richardson, RG Sloan, MT Soliman, et al. | 2005 | 13 |
| JAE | 215 | 95 | Firm size and the information content of prices with respect to earnings | DW Collins, SP Kothari, JD Rayburn | 1987 | 3 |
| JAE | 221 | 93 | Managerial competition, information costs and corporate governance | L De Angelo | 1988 | 3 |
| JAE | 222 | 92 | Expertise in forecasting performance of security analysts | J Jacob, TZ Lys, MA Neale | 1999 | 7 |
| JAE | 224 | 91 | Limited attention, information disclosure and financial reporting | D Hirshleifer, SH Teoh | 2003 | 10 |
| JAE | 226 | 91 | Earnings news and small traders | CMC Lee | 1992 | 4 |
| JAE | 227 | 91 | Merger decisions and executive stock ownership in acquiring firms | W Lewellen, C Loderer, A Rosenfeld | 1985 | 3 |
| JAE | 231 | 90 | Financial accounting information, organizational complexity and corporate governance systems | R Bushman, Q Chen, E Engel, et al. | 2004 | 11 |
| JAE | 232 | 90 | The structure and performance consequences of equity grants employees of new economy firms | CD Ittner, RA Lambert, DF Larcker | 2003 | 10 |
| JAE | 245 | 89 | Financial disclosure policy in an entry game | MN Darrough, NM Stoughton | 1990 | 4 |
| JAE | 250 | 88 | Intra-industry information transfers associated with earnings releases | G Foster | 1981 | 2 |
| JAE | 251 | 87 | Use of R-2 in accounting research | S Brown, K Lo, T Lys | 1999 | 6 |
| JAE | 252 | 87 | Accounting choice in troubled companies | H De Angelo, L De Angelo, DJ Skinner | 1994 | 4 |
| JAE | 253 | 87 | Do analysts’ earnings forecasts incorporate information in prior stock price changes | JS Abarbanell | 1991 | 4 |
| JAE | 255 | 87 | The association between revisions of financial analysts earnings forecasts and security price changes | T Lys, SK Sohn | 1990 | 3 |
| JAE | 256 | 87 | An income strategy approach to the positive theory of accounting standard setting/choice | ME Zmijewski, RL Hagerman | 1981 | 2 |
| JAE | 264 | 85 | Determinants of weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting | J Doyle, W Ge, S McVay | 2007 | 17 |
| JAE | 268 | 85 | Empirical evidence on the relation between stock option compensation and risk taking | S Rajgopal, T Shevlin | 2002 | 8 |
| JAE | 270 | 85 | Empirical tax research in accounting | DA Shackelford, T Shevlin | 2001 | 7 |
| JAE | 275 | 84 | Science, specific knowledge and total quality management | KH Wruck, MC Jensen | 1994 | 4 |
| JAE | 279 | 83 | Auditor changes and discretionary accruals | ML DeFond, KR Subramanyam | 1998 | 5 |
| JAE | 280 | 83 | Smoothing income in anticipation of future earnings | ML DeFond, CW Park | 1997 | 5 |
| JAE | 281 | 83 | Investment opportunities and the structure of executive compensation | WR Baber, SN Janakiraman, SH Kang | 1996 | 5 |
| JAE | 286 | 82 | The discovery and reporting of internal control deficiencies prior to SOX-mandated audits | H Ashbaugh-Skaife, DW Collins, WR Kinney | 2007 | 16 |
| JAE | 292 | 81 | The effects of corporate governance on firms credit ratings | H Ashbaugh-Skaife, DW Collins, R LaFond | 2006 | 13 |
| JAE | 296 | 81 | An analysis of the stock price reaction to sudden executive deaths | WB Johnson, RP Magee, NJ Nagarajan et al. | 1985 | 3 |
| JAE | 297 | 81 | Golden parachutes, executive decision making and shareholder wealth | RA Lambert, DF Larcker | 1985 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JAR | 1 | 651 | Empirical evaluation of accounting income numbers | R Ball, P Brown | 1968 | 14 |
| JAR | 2 | 540 | Financial ratios and the probabilistic prediction of bankruptcy | JA Ohlson | 1980 | 16 |
| JAR | 4 | 505 | Earnings management during import relief investigations | JJ Jones | 1991 | 24 |
| JAR | 20 | 319 | Financial ratios as predictors of failure | WH Beaver | 1966 | 6 |
| JAR | 26 | 300 | Corporate forecasts of earnings per share and stock price behavior | JM Patell | 1976 | 8 |
| JAR | 28 | 298 | Post earnings announcement drift delayed price response or risk premium | VL Bernard, JK Thomas | 1989 | 12 |
| JAR | 30 | 291 | Cross sectional determinants of analyst ratings of corporate disclosures | M Lang, R Lundholm | 1993 | 15 |
| JAR | 32 | 283 | Methodological issues related to the estimation of financial distress prediction models | ME Zmijewski | 1984 | 10 |
| JAR | 34 | 271 | Why firms voluntarily disclose bad news | DJ Skinner | 1994 | 15 |
| JAR | 42 | 240 | The economic consequences of increased disclosure | C Leuz, RE Verrecchia | 2000 | 20 |
| JAR | 43 | 233 | Information content or annual earnings announcements | WH Beaver | 1968 | 5 |
| JAR | 52 | 215 | Are nonfinancial measures leading indicators of financial performance? | CD Ittner, DF Larcker | 1998 | 15 |
| JAR | 53 | 214 | The pricing of audit services | DA Simunic | 1980 | 6 |
| JAR | 56 | 199 | Errors in estimating accruals | P Hribar, DW Collins | 2002 | 19 |
| JAR | 60 | 197 | Predisclosure information, firm capitalization and security price behaviour around earnings announcements | RK Atiase | 1985 | 7 |
| JAR | 62 | 194 | Analysis of the use of accounting and market measures of performance in executive compensation contracts | RA Lambert, DF Larcker | 1987 | 7 |
| JAR | 64 | 190 | Toward an implied cost of capital | WR Gebhardt, CMC Lee, B Swaminathan | 2001 | 17 |
| JAR | 78 | 170 | Portfolio considerations in valuing executive compensation | RA Lambert, DF Larcker, RE Verrecchia | 1991 | 8 |
| JAR | 79 | 169 | Disclosure of non-proprietary information | RA Dye | 1985 | 6 |
| JAR | 83 | 163 | Shareholder litigation and corporate disclosures | J Francis, D Philbrick, K Schipper | 1994 | 9 |
| JAR | 87 | 159 | Sensitivity, precision and linear aggregation of signals for performance evaluation | RD Banker, SM Datar | 1989 | 6 |
| JAR | 89 | 157 | An empirical investigation of the relative performance evaluation of corporate executives | R Antle, A Smith | 1986 | 6 |
| JAR | 90 | 155 | What determines corporate transparency? | RM Bushman, JD Piotroski, AJ Smith | 2004 | 19 |
| JAR | 91 | 155 | Do non-audit service fees impair auditor independence? | ML DeFond, K Raghu-nandan, KR Subramanyam | 2002 | 15 |
| JAR | 92 | 154 | The boundaries of financial reporting and how to extend them | B Lev, P Zarowin | 1999 | 11 |
| JAR | 94 | 153 | Have financial statements lost their relevance? | J Francis, K Schipper | 1999 | 11 |
| JAR | 97 | 151 | The impact of merger related regulations on the shareholders of acquiring firms | K Schipper, R Thompson | 1983 | 5 |
| JAR | 98 | 150 | ADRs, analysts and accuracy | MH Lang, KV Lins, DP Miller | 2003 | 16 |
| JAR | 104 | 148 | Cross sectional dependence and problems in inference in market based accounting research | VL Bernard | 1987 | 5 |
| JAR | 110 | 143 | Estimating the value of employee stock option portfolios and their sensitivities to price and volatility | J Core, W Guay | 2002 | 14 |
| JAR | 114 | 141 | A re-examination of disclosure level and the expected cost of equity capital | CA Botosan, MA Plumlee | 2002 | 14 |
| JAR | 115 | 141 | Self-selection and analyst coverage | M McNichols, PC O’Brien | 1997 | 9 |
| JAR | 125 | 133 | Fundamental information analysis | B Lev, SR Thiagarajan | 1993 | 7 |
| JAR | 131 | 131 | Trading volume and price reactions to public announcements | O Kim, RE Verrecchia | 1991 | 6 |
| JAR | 139 | 125 | Market rewards associated with patterns of increasing earnings | ME Barth, JA Elliott, MW Finn | 1999 | 9 |
| JAR | 141 | 125 | Earnings as an explanatory variable for returns | PD Easton, TS Harris | 1991 | 5 |
| JAR | 143 | 122 | International differences in the cost of equity capital | L Hail, C Leuz | 2006 | 20 |
| JAR | 151 | 117 | A temporal analysis of earnings surprises | LD Brown | 2001 | 10 |
| JAR | 153 | 117 | On the usefulness of earnings and earnings research | B Lev | 1989 | 5 |
| JAR | 154 | 116 | Accounting information, disclosure and the cost of capital | RA Lambert, C Leuz, RE Verrecchia | 2007 | 23 |
| JAR | 160 | 115 | Audit fees and auditor size | ZV Palmrose | 1986 | 4 |
| JAR | 162 | 114 | On the association between voluntary disclosure and earnings management | R Kasznik | 1999 | 8 |
| JAR | 163 | 114 | The financial and market effects of the SECS accounting and auditing enforcement releases | EH Feroz, K Park, VS Pastena | 1991 | 5 |
| JAR | 167 | 112 | Analyst following and institutional ownership | PC O’Brien, R Bhushan | 1990 | 5 |
| JAR | 176 | 109 | Discriminant analysis of predictors of business failure | EB Deakin | 1972 | 2 |
| JAR | 181 | 107 | Country specific factors related to financial reporting and the value relevance of accounting data | A Ali, LS Hwang | 2000 | 8 |
| JAR | 182 | 107 | Corporate disclosure practices, institutional investors and stock return volatility | BJ Bushee, CF Noe | 2000 | 8 |
| JAR | 183 | 107 | A nonlinear model of security price responses to unexpected earnings | RN Freeman, SY Tse | 1992 | 5 |
| JAR | 187 | 105 | Economically optimal performance evaluation and control systems | S Baiman, JS Demski | 1980 | 3 |
| JAR | 195 | 101 | Analysts decisions as products of a multitask environment | J Francis, D Philbrick | 1993 | 5 |
| JAR | 196 | 101 | Auditing, consulting and auditor independence | DA Simunic | 1984 | 3 |
| JAR | 205 | 98 | A market based evaluation of discretionary accrual models | WR Guay, SP Kothari, RL Watts | 1996 | 6 |
| JAR | 206 | 97 | GAAP versus the street | MT Bradshaw, RG Sloan | 2002 | 9 |
| JAR | 211 | 96 | The production of audit services | TB Okeefe, DA Simunic, MT Stein | 1994 | 5 |
| JAR | 216 | 95 | Timeliness of reporting and the stock price reaction to earnings announcements | AE Chambers, SH Penman | 1984 | 3 |
| JAR | 217 | 94 | Consequences of financial reporting failure for outside directors | S Srinivasan | 2005 | 13 |
| JAR | 218 | 93 | Auditor independence, non-audit services and restatements | WR Kinney, ZV Palmrose, S Scholz | 2004 | 11 |
| JAR | 233 | 90 | Large sample evidence on the debt covenant hypothesis | ID Dichev, DJ Skinner | 2002 | 9 |
| JAR | 236 | 90 | Earnings management in an overlapping generations model | RA Dye | 1988 | 3 |
| JAR | 239 | 89 | The association between outside directors, institutional investors and the properties of management earnings forecasts | B Ajinkya, S Bhojraj, P Sengupta | 2005 | 12 |
| JAR | 240 | 89 | Disclosure practices, enforcement of accounting standards and analysts forecast accuracy | OK Hope | 2003 | 9 |
| JAR | 241 | 89 | Does meeting earnings expectations matter? | R Kasznik, MF McNichols | 2002 | 8 |
| JAR | 244 | 89 | The relative informativeness of accounting disclosures in different countries | A Alford, J Jones, R Leftwich et al. | 1993 | 4 |
| JAR | 248 | 88 | Pressure and performance in accounting decision settings | RH Ashton | 1990 | 4 |
| JAR | 257 | 87 | Association between unsystematic security returns and the magnitude of earnings forecast errors | WH Beaver, R Clarke, WF Wright | 1979 | 2 |
| JAR | 260 | 86 | Comprehensive income reporting and analysts valuation judgements | DE Hirst, PE Hopkins | 1998 | 6 |
| JAR | 261 | 86 | Fundamental analysis, future earnings and stock prices | JS Abarbanell, BJ Bushee | 1997 | 5 |
| JAR | 262 | 86 | Do security analysts improve their performance with experience? | MB Mikhail, BR Walther, RH Willis | 1997 | 5 |
| JAR | 269 | 85 | Earnings performance and discretionary disclosure | GS Miller | 2002 | 8 |
| JAR | 285 | 83 | Behavioral models of risk taking in business decisions | R Libby, PC Fishburn | 1977 | 2 |
| JAR | 289 | 82 | Managing financial reports of commercial banks | A Beatty, SL Chamberlain, J Magliolo | 1995 | 4 |
| JAR | 293 | 81 | The role of supplementary statements with management earnings forecasts | AP Hutton, GS Miller, DJ Skinner | 2003 | 9 |
| JAR | 295 | 81 | Amortization policy for advertising and research and development expenditures | M Hirschey, JJ Weygandt | 1985 | 3 |
| JAR | 300 | 80 | International accounting standards and accounting quality | ME Barth, WR Landsman, MH Lang | 2008 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TAR | 5 | 466 | Detecting earnings management | PM Dechow, RG Sloan, AP Sweeney | 1995 | 27 |
| TAR | 8 | 443 | Do stock prices fully reflect information in accruals and cash flows about future earnings? | RG Sloan | 1996 | 27 |
| TAR | 13 | 359 | Disclosure level and the cost of equity capital | CA Botosan | 1997 | 23 |
| TAR | 16 | 338 | An empirical analysis of the relation between the board of director composition and financial statement fraud | MS Beasley | 1996 | 21 |
| TAR | 29 | 293 | Corporate disclosure policy and analyst behavior | MH Lang, RJ Lundholm | 1993 | 15 |
| TAR | 36 | 267 | The quality of accruals and earnings | PM Dechow, ID Dichev | 2002 | 26 |
| TAR | 37 | 267 | The influence of institutional investors on myopic R&D investment behavior | BJ Bushee | 1998 | 19 |
| TAR | 41 | 251 | Towards a positive theory of determination of accounting standards | RL Watts, JL Zimmerman | 1978 | 7 |
| TAR | 48 | 219 | The relation between auditors’ fees for nonaudit services and earnings management | RM Frankel, MF Johnson, KK Nelson | 2002 | 21 |
| TAR | 54 | 212 | Performance measure congruity and diversity in multitask principal agent relations | GA Feltham, J Xie | 1994 | 11 |
| TAR | 66 | 186 | Management’s incentives to avoid negative earnings surprises | DA Matsumoto | 2002 | 18 |
| TAR | 70 | 181 | Positive accounting theory: A 10 year perspective | RL Watts, JL Zimmerman | 1990 | 8 |
| TAR | 71 | 179 | Costs of equity and earnings attributes | J Francis, R LaFond, PM Olsson, et al. | 2004 | 22 |
| TAR | 72 | 177 | Measuring manufacturing performance | RS Kaplan | 1983 | 6 |
| TAR | 74 | 174 | Do nonaudit services compromise auditor independence? | H Ashbaugh, R LaFond, BW Mayhew | 2003 | 19 |
| TAR | 81 | 166 | Association between market determined and accounting determined risk measures | WH Beaver, P Kettler, M Scholes | 1970 | 3 |
| TAR | 95 | 153 | To warn or not to warn | R Kasznik, B Lev | 1995 | 9 |
| TAR | 96 | 153 | Earnings releases, anomalies and the behaviour of security returns | G Foster, C Olsen, T Shevlin | 1984 | 5 |
| TAR | 101 | 149 | Perceived auditor quality and the earnings response coefficient | SH Teoh, TJ Wong | 1993 | 7 |
| TAR | 111 | 143 | The mispricing of abnormal accruals | H Xie | 2001 | 13 |
| TAR | 120 | 139 | Auditor reputation and the pricing of initial public offerings | RP Beatty | 1989 | 6 |
| TAR | 123 | 135 | The choice of performance measures in annual bonus contracts | CD Ittner, DF Larcker, MV Rajan | 1997 | 9 |
| TAR | 128 | 132 | Quarterly accounting data: Time series properties and predictive ability results | G Foster | 1977 | 3 |
| TAR | 132 | 130 | Organization theory and methodology | MC Jensen | 1983 | 4 |
| TAR | 134 | 129 | Corporate disclosure quality and the cost of debt | P Sengupta | 1998 | 9 |
| TAR | 142 | 124 | Subjectivity and the weighting of performance measures | CD Ittner, DF Larcker, MW Meyer | 2003 | 13 |
| TAR | 147 | 119 | Discretionary disclosure and external financing | R Frankel, M McNichols, GP Wilson | 1995 | 7 |
| TAR | 150 | 118 | An analysis of auditor litigation and audit service quality | ZV Palmrose | 1988 | 4 |
| TAR | 156 | 116 | Evidence form auditors about managers’ and auditors’ earnings management decisions | MW Nelson, JA Elliott, RL Tarpley | 2002 | 11 |
| TAR | 157 | 116 | The balanced scorecard: Judgemental effects of common and unique performance measures | MG Lipe, SE Salterio | 2000 | 9 |
| TAR | 173 | 109 | Client importance, nonaudit services and abnormal accruals | HS Chung, S Kallapur | 2003 | 12 |
| TAR | 180 | 107 | Exploring the term of the auditor client relationship and the quality of earnings | JN Myers, LA Myers, TC Omer | 2003 | 11 |
| TAR | 186 | 105 | The impact of structure, environment and interdependence on the perceived usefulness of management accounting systems | RH Chenhall, D Morris | 1986 | 4 |
| TAR | 190 | 103 | Using financial and market information to identify pre-engagement factors associated with lawsuits against auditors | JD Stice | 1991 | 4 |
| TAR | 191 | 103 | Radical developments in accounting thought | WF Chua | 1986 | 3 |
| TAR | 192 | 103 | Accounting numbers as market valuation substitutes | LE De Angelo | 1986 | 3 |
| TAR | 197 | 100 | Equity incentives and earnings management | Q Cheng, TA Warfield | 2005 | 14 |
| TAR | 198 | 100 | An empirical investigation of an incentive plan that includes nonfinancial performance measures | RD Banker, G Potter, D Srinivasan | 2000 | 8 |
| TAR | 199 | 100 | Investor sophistication and patterns in stock returns after earnings announcements | E Bartov, S Radhakrishnan, I Krinsky | 2000 | 8 |
| TAR | 203 | 99 | The evolution of management accounting | RS Kaplan | 1984 | 3 |
| TAR | 210 | 97 | Investors, corporate social performance and information disclosure | BH Spicer | 1978 | 2 |
| TAR | 214 | 95 | PE ratios, PEG ratios and estimating the implied expected rate of return on equity capital | PD Easton | 2004 | 11 |
| TAR | 220 | 93 | Accruals and the prediction of future cash flows | ME Barth, DP Cram, KK Nelson | 2001 | 8 |
| TAR | 242 | 89 | Discussion of the quality of accruals and earnings | MF McNichols | 2002 | 8 |
| TAR | 249 | 88 | Auditor changes: A joint test of theories relating to agency costs and auditor differentiation | JR Francis, ER Wilson | 1988 | 3 |
| TAR | 255 | 87 | The design of the corporate budgeting system | KA Merchant | 1981 | 2 |
| TAR | 258 | 86 | Restoring trust after fraud | DB Farber | 2005 | 12 |
| TAR | 259 | 86 | Effects of comprehensive income characteristics on nonprofessional investors’ judgments | LA Maines, LS McDaniel | 2000 | 7 |
| TAR | 266 | 85 | The world price of earnings opacity | U Bhattacharya, H Daouk, M Welker | 2003 | 9 |
| TAR | 271 | 85 | Earnings, adaptation and equity value | DC Burgstahler, ID Dichev | 1997 | 5 |
| TAR | 274 | 84 | Does forecast accuracy matter to security analysts? | MB Mikhail, BR Walther, RH Willis | 1999 | 6 |
| TAR | 276 | 83 | Real and accrual based earnings management in the pre- and post-Sarbanes-Oxley periods | DA Cohen, A Dey, TZ Lys | 2008 | 20 |
| TAR | 282 | 83 | Auditors’ incentives and their application of financial accounting standards | K Hackenbrack, MW Nelson | 1996 | 5 |
| TAR | 284 | 83 | A test of audit pricing in the small client segment of the United States audit market | JR Francis, DT Simon | 1987 | 3 |
| TAR | 287 | 82 | Earnings predictability and bias in analysts’ earnings forecasts | S Das, CB Levine, K Sivaramakrishnan | 1998 | 5 |
| TAR | 290 | 82 | Incidence and circumstances of accounting errors | ML Defond, J Jiambalvo | 1991 | 3 |
| TAR | 291 | 81 | Correcting for cross-sectional and time series dependence in accounting research | ID Gow, G Ormazabal, DJ Taylor | 2010 | 40 |
| TAR | 294 | 81 | Unexpected earnings, firm size and trading volume around quarterly earnings announcements | LS Bamber | 1987 | 3 |
| TAR | 298 | 81 | An analysis of the factors associated with lawsuits against public accountants | K Stpierre, JA Anderson | 1984 | 2 |
| TAR | 299 | 81 | The REA accounting model | WE McCarthy | 1982 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AOS | 12 | 365 | The new public management in the 1980s | C Hood | 1995 | 21 |
| AOS | 47 | 220 | Accounting and the construction of the governable person | P Miller, T O’Leary | 1987 | 8 |
| AOS | 58 | 197 | Management control systems design within its organizational context | RH Chenhall | 2003 | 21 |
| AOS | 86 | 160 | The archaeology of accounting systems | AG Hopwood | 1987 | 6 |
| AOS | 108 | 145 | Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure | RW Roberts | 1992 | 7 |
| AOS | 124 | 135 | Accounting control systems and business strategy | R Simons | 1987 | 5 |
| AOS | 135 | 127 | Managing public impressions | D Neu, H Warsame, K Pedwell | 1998 | 9 |
| AOS | 136 | 127 | Management control systems and strategy | K Langfield-Smith | 1997 | 8 |
| AOS | 138 | 125 | Control of inter-organizational relationships | HC Dekker | 2004 | 15 |
| AOS | 144 | 122 | Performance implications of strategic performance measurement in financial services firms | CD Ittner, DF Larcker, T Randall | 2003 | 13 |
| AOS | 145 | 122 | Agency research in managerial accounting | S Baiman | 1990 | 5 |
| AOS | 165 | 112 | Inter-dependencies, trust and information in relationships, alliances and networks | C Tomkins | 2001 | 10 |
| AOS | 166 | 112 | Intraindustry environmental disclosures in response to the Alaskan oil spill | DM Patten | 1992 | 5 |
| AOS | 168 | 112 | Accounting and the examination | KW Hoskin, RH Macve | 1986 | 4 |
| AOS | 185 | 106 | The roles of accounting in organizations and society | S Burchell, C Clubb, A Hopwood, et al | 1980 | 3 |
| AOS | 188 | 104 | The relations among environmental disclosures, environmental performance and economic performance | Sa Al-Tuwaijri, TE Christensen, KE Hughes | 2004 | 13 |
| AOS | 189 | 104 | The role of management control systems in creating competitive advantage | R Simons | 1990 | 4 |
| AOS | 193 | 103 | Linking control systems to business unit strategy | V Govindarajan, AK Gupta | 1985 | 3 |
| AOS | 200 | 100 | Accounting in its social context | S Burchell, C Clubb, AG Hopwood | 1985 | 3 |
| AOS | 201 | 100 | An evaluation of environmental disclosures made in corporate annual reports | J Wiseman | 1982 | 3 |
| AOS | 223 | 92 | Financial accounting | RD Hines | 1988 | 3 |
| AOS | 225 | 91 | Determinants of judgement performance in accounting settings | R Libby, J Luft | 1993 | 4 |
| AOS | 228 | 91 | Management accounting systems, perceived environmental uncertainty and organization structure | LA Gordon, VK Narayanan | 1984 | 3 |
| AOS | 229 | 91 | On trying to study accounting in the contexts in which it operates | AG Hopwood | 1983 | 3 |
| AOS | 230 | 91 | The normative origins of positive theories | AM Tinker, BD Merino, MD Neimark | 1982 | 3 |
| AOS | 235 | 90 | Governing by numbers: Figuring out democracy | N Rose | 1991 | 4 |
| AOS | 237 | 90 | The impact of corporate characteristics on social responsibility disclosure | SS Cowen, LB Ferreri, LD Parker | 1987 | 3 |
| AOS | 238 | 89 | Integrative strategic performance measurement systems, strategic alignment of manufacturing, learning and strategic outcomes | RH Chenhall | 2005 | 12 |
| AOS | 246 | 88 | The relationship between strategic priorities, management techniques and management accounting | RH Chenhall, K Langfield-Smith | 1998 | 6 |
| AOS | 247 | 88 | The impact of manufacturing flexibility on management control system design | MA Abernethy, AM Lillis | 1995 | 5 |
| AOS | 263 | 86 | Accounting numbers as inscription | K Robson | 1992 | 4 |
| AOS | 267 | 85 | Mapping management accounting | J Luft, MD Shields | 2003 | 9 |
| AOS | 272 | 85 | Designing semi-confusing information systems for organizations in changing environments | B Hedberg, S Jonsson | 1978 | 2 |
| AOS | 277 | 83 | Hofstede never studied culture | RF Baskerville | 2003 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAR | 7 | 460 | Earnings, book values and dividends in equity valuation | JA Ohlson | 1995 | 17 |
| CAR | 39 | 262 | The effect of audit quality on earnings management | CL Becker, ML Defond, J Jiambalvo, KR Subramanyam | 1998 | 18 |
| CAR | 49 | 217 | Valuation and clean surplus accounting for operating and financial activities | GA Feltham, JA Ohlson | 1995 | 12 |
| CAR | 59 | 197 | Stock performance and intermediation changes surrounding sustained increases in disclosure | PM Healy, AP Hutton, KG Palepu | 1999 | 15 |
| CAR | 130 | 131 | The effect of investment banking relationships on financial analysts earnings forecasts and investment recommendations | A Dugar, S Nathan | 1995 | 7 |
| CAR | 171 | 109 | The walk-down to beatable analyst forecasts | S Richardson, SH Teoh, PD Wysocki | 2004 | 13 |
| CAR | 202 | 99 | Disclosure policy, information asymmetry and liquidity in equity markets | M Welker | 1995 | 5 |
| CAR | 234 | 90 | Voluntary disclosure and equity offerings: Reducing information asymmetry or hyping the stock? | M Lang, RJ Lundholm | 2000 | 7 |
| CAR | 243 | 89 | Do institutional investors prefer near-term earnings over long run value? | BJ Bushee | 2001 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AH | 18 | 329 | A review of the earnings management literature and its implications for standard setting | PM Healy, JM Wahlen | 1999 | 25 |
| AH | 46 | 221 | Conservatism in accounting Part I: Explanations and implications | RL Watts | 2003 | 24 |
| AH | 105 | 147 | Earnings management | K Schipper | 1989 | 6 |
| AH | 113 | 142 | Analysts forecasts | K Schipper | 1991 | 6 |
| AH | 121 | 138 | Transforming the balanced scorecard from performance measurement to strategic management: Part I | RS Kaplan | 2001 | 12 |
| AH | 158 | 115 | Earnings management: Reconciling the views of accounting academics, practitioners and regulators | PM Dechow, DJ Skinner | 2000 | 9 |
| AH | 273 | 84 | Fraudulent financial reporting: Consideration of industry traits and corporate governance mechanisms | MS Beasley, JV Carcello, DR Hermanson, et al | 2000 | 7 |
| AH | 278 | 83 | Conservatism in accounting Part II: Evidence and research opportunities | RL Watts | 2003 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RAS | 77 | 171 | Earnings surprises, growth expectations and stock returns or don’t let an earnings torpedo sink your portfolio | DJ Skinner, RG Sloan | 2002 | 17 |
| RAS | 155 | 116 | Assessing the probability of bankruptcy | SA Hillegeist, EK Keating, DP Cram, et al. | 2004 | 14 |
| RAS | 219 | 93 | Why are earnings kinky? An examination of the earnings management explanation | PM Dechow, SA Richardson, I Tuna | 2003 | 10 |
| RAS | 265 | 85 | Expected EPS and EPS growth as determinants of value | JA Ohlson, BE Juettner-Nauroth | 2005 | 12 |
| RAS | 288 | 82 | Are accruals during initial public offerings opportunistic? | SH Teoh | 1998 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JAPP | 161 | 114 | Research design issues in earnings management studies | MF McNichols | 2000 | 9 |
| JAPP | 283 | 83 | Exposure, legitimacy and social disclosure | DM Patten | 1991 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAR | 93 | 154 | Performance management: A framework for management control systems research | D Otley | 1999 | 11 |
| MAR | 107 | 145 | The balance on the balanced scorecard. A critical analysis of some of its assumptions | H Norreklit | 2000 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AUD | 117 | 140 | The role of Big 6 auditors in the credible reporting of accruals | JR Francis, El Maydew, HC Sparks | 1999 | 10 |
| AUD | 204 | 98 | Audit committee characteristics and restatements | LJ Abbott, S Parker, GF Peters | 2004 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AAAJ | 85 | 160 | Corporate social and environmental reporting: A review of the literature and a longitudinal study of UK disclosure | RH Gray, R Kouhy, S Lavers | 1995 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ABR | 140 | 125 | A study of the environmental disclosure practices of Australian corporations | C Deegan, B Gordon | 1996 | 7 |

Abbreviations are available in Table 1 except for: J = Journal name; C/Y = Citations per year.

**Table 5.** The most productive and influential authors in accounting research

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R | Name | Country | TC4 | H4 | TP4 | HA | TCA | TPA | TP | TC | H | T300 |
| 1 | RG Sloan | USA | 2158 | 18 | 21 | 19 | 2373 | 25 | 36 | 2936 | 21 | 9 |
| 2 | DF Larcker | USA | 2155 | 23 | 36 | 23 | 2197 | 40 | 77 | 10904 | 33 | 8 |
| 3 | SP Kothari | USA | 1984 | 17 | 23 | 17 | 1984 | 23 | 52 | 3251 | 26 | 5 |
| 4 | RE Verrecchia | USA | 1941 | 18 | 33 | 18 | 1941 | 33 | 56 | 3434 | 24 | 7 |
| 5 | R Ball | USA | 1799 | 14 | 19 | 15 | 1841 | 22 | 62 | 2646 | 21 | 4 |
| 6 | PM Dechow | USA | 1582 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 1856 | 19 | 25 | 2355 | 19 | 8 |
| 7 | WH Beaver | USA | 1482 | 19 | 29 | 22 | 1593 | 34 | 68 | 2018 | 24 | 7 |
| 8 | B Lev | USA | 1422 | 15 | 27 | 16 | 1496 | 34 | 68 | 2807 | 24 | 6 |
| 9 | M Lang | USA | 1328 | 15 | 18 | 16 | 1418 | 19 | 25 | 1738 | 18 | 5 |
| 10 | J Francis | USA | 1282 | 16 | 22 | 18 | 1339 | 25 | 34 | 1627 | 20 | 5 |
| 11 | DW Collins | USA | 1279 | 14 | 19 | 14 | 1336 | 22 | 29 | 1531 | 15 | 6 |
| 12 | RL Watts | USA | 1245 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 1550 | 18 | 26 | 2993 | 18 | 7 |
| 13 | ME Barth | USA | 1182 | 18 | 26 | 19 | 1252 | 32 | 37 | 1459 | 21 | 4 |
| 14 | PM Healy | USA | 1179 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 1705 | 13 | 47 | 2417 | 19 | 3 |
| 15 | JL Zimmerman | USA | 1079 | 14 | 17 | 14 | 1079 | 17 | 32 | 1345 | 16 | 2 |
| 16 | CD Ittner | USA | 1039 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 1063 | 17 | 29 | 1716 | 18 | 6 |
| 17 | K Schipper | USA | 1016 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 1359 | 22 | 42 | 1985 | 19 | 5 |
| 18 | DJ Skinner | USA | 1000 | 13 | 23 | 15 | 1301 | 27 | 58 | 1883 | 22 | 7 |
| 19 | R Libby | USA | 993 | 21 | 35 | 21 | 1019 | 38 | 50 | 1340 | 24 | 2 |
| 20 | ML Defond | USA | 990 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 1430 | 22 | 28 | 1722 | 19 | 5 |
| 21 | JA Ohlson | USA | 942 | 11 | 19 | 14 | 1720 | 26 | 55 | 2062 | 18 | 4 |
| 22 | RA Lambert | USA | 932 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 962 | 16 | 34 | 1743 | 19 | 6 |
| 23 | C Leuz | USA | 881 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 918 | 15 | 27 | 1818 | 18 | 2 |
| 24 | R Kasznik | USA | 793 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 816 | 16 | 16 | 816 | 12 | 2 |
| 25 | L De Angelo | USA | 783 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 783 | 9 | 29 | 1701 | 20 | 5 |
| 26 | RJ Lundholm | USA | 757 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 914 | 15 | 20 | 1186 | 14 | 2 |
| 27 | D Burgstahler | USA | 740 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 818 | 15 | 15 | 818 | 11 | 1 |
| 28 | JR Francis | USA | 738 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 1164 | 34 | 43 | 1691 | 23 | 4 |
| 29 | S Rajgopal | USA | 727 | 11 | 16 | 14 | 854 | 25 | 33 | 1098 | 16 | 2 |
| 30 | BJ Bushee | USA | 722 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 811 | 14 | 16 | 955 | 12 | 4 |
| 31 | T Shevlin | USA | 691 | 12 | 20 | 13 | 725 | 23 | 34 | 904 | 15 | 2 |
| 32 | RM Bushman | USA | 680 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 683 | 17 | 24 | 1000 | 12 | 2 |
| 33 | GA Feltham | CAN | 645 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 877 | 19 | 31 | 1001 | 16 | 2 |
| 34 | SH Penman | USA | 642 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 677 | 21 | 40 | 972 | 16 | 2 |
| 35 | LD Brown | USA | 624 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 673 | 20 | 47 | 1120 | 17 | 1 |
| 36 | WR Landsman | USA | 623 | 12 | 21 | 13 | 684 | 30 | 42 | 967 | 17 | 3 |
| 37 | RA Dye | USA | 618 | 14 | 19 | 14 | 630 | 21 | 40 | 1135 | 20 | 2 |
| 38 | WR Kinney | USA | 607 | 12 | 27 | 14 | 672 | 32 | 61 | 1047 | 17 | 1 |
| 39 | JS Demski | USA | 602 | 13 | 34 | 13 | 614 | 38 | 84 | 1033 | 17 | 1 |
| 40 | S Baiman | USA | 597 | 13 | 19 | 13 | 597 | 19 | 30 | 766 | 15 | 2 |

Abbreviations: R = Rank; H4, TC4 and TP4 = Total papers, citations and *h*-index in the top four accounting journals; HA = *h*-index in all the accounting journals; TPA and TCA = Total papers and citations in accounting journals indexed in WoS; TP, TC and H = Total papers, citations and H-index; T300 = Number of papers in the Top 300 list shown in Table 4.

**Table 6.** Authors with the highest number of papers in the top four accounting journals

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | JAE | | | JAR | | | TAR (1963 – 2012) | | | TAR (All time) | | | AOS | | |
| R | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC |
| 1 | SP Kothari | 16 | 1745 | R Libby | 18 | 523 | JS Demski | 14 | 243 | HT Chamberlain | 55 | 1 | MW Dirsmith | 19 | 363 |
| 2 | DJ Skinner | 16 | 472 | JS Demski | 17 | 328 | H Bierman | 12 | 8 | AC Littleton | 50 | 25 | MD Shields | 15 | 362 |
| 3 | RE Verrecchia | 13 | 959 | DF Larcker | 14 | 903 | ME Barth | 11 | 395 | JH Chamberlain | 22 | 0 | DJ Cooper | 12 | 396 |
| 4 | RG Sloan | 11 | 885 | RE Verrecchia | 14 | 840 | WR Kinney | 11 | 209 | H Bierman | 19 | 32 | MA Covaleski | 12 | 300 |
| 5 | DF Larcker | 11 | 676 | B Lev | 14 | 739 | JH Chamberlain | 11 | 0 | El Kohler | 19 | 6 | P Miller | 12 | 568 |
| 6 | ML Defond | 11 | 616 | JA Ohlson | 13 | 808 | B Lev | 10 | 275 | HG Avery | 16 | 5 | D Neu | 12 | 231 |
| 7 | WH Beaver | 11 | 433 | WR Kinney | 13 | 222 | L Revsine | 10 | 21 | RK Mautz | 16 | 5 | JG Birnberg | 11 | 116 |
| 8 | T Shevlin | 11 | 378 | RA Dye | 12 | 421 | R Libby | 9 | 222 | CT Zlatkovich | 16 | 0 | K Robson | 11 | 317 |
| 9 | DW Collins | 10 | 809 | S Baiman | 12 | 371 | WR Landsman | 9 | 154 | JS Demski | 15 | 243 | SP Walker | 11 | 114 |
| 10 | A Beatty | 10 | 122 | N Dopuch | 11 | 161 | JS Hughes | 9 | 80 | WA Paton | 15 | 6 | WF Chua | 10 | 317 |
| 11 | TZ Lys | 9 | 305 | R Ball | 10 | 881 | GA Feltham | 8 | 409 | ME Murphy | 15 | 2 | CW Chow | 9 | 239 |
| 12 | DA Shackelford | 9 | 172 | WH Beaver | 10 | 740 | MW Nelson | 8 | 335 | HD Kerrigan | 14 | 5 | M Ezzamel | 9 | 126 |
| 13 | RW Holthausen | 8 | 566 | J Francis | 10 | 653 | GJ Staubus | 8 | 13 | WB Meigs | 14 | 0 | KA Merchant | 9 | 301 |
| 14 | S Rajgopal | 8 | 564 | HT Tan | 10 | 223 | JR Francis | 7 | 311 | GJ Staubus | 13 | 18 | AM Preston | 9 | 184 |
| 15 | J Francis | 8 | 379 | NJ Gonedes | 10 | 165 | SE Bonner | 7 | 274 | HC Greer | 13 | 7 | KT Trotman | 9 | 211 |
| 16 | ME Barth | 8 | 355 | C Kanodia | 10 | 151 | K Schipper | 7 | 261 | P Mason | 13 | 5 | SM Young | 9 | 188 |
| 17 | JL Zimmerman | 8 | 347 | Y Ijiri | 10 | 74 | RD Banker | 7 | 226 | GR Husband | 13 | 4 | PJ Arnold | 8 | 87 |
| 18 | R Ball | 7 | 846 | SH Penman | 9 | 418 | MV Rajan | 7 | 211 | CT Horhgren | 12 | 15 | RH Chenhall | 8 | 468 |
| 19 | AJ Leone | 7 | 451 | G Waymire | 9 | 198 | WH Beaver | 7 | 200 | S Davidson | 12 | 11 | AJ Richardson | 8 | 99 |
| 20 | S Huddart | 7 | 335 | JC McKeown | 9 | 125 | RS Kaplan | 7 | 164 | AN Lorig | 12 | 5 | J Roberts | 8 | 223 |
| 21 | WR Landsman | 7 | 288 | MV Rajan | 9 | 115 | HT Tan | 7 | 102 | HF Taggart | 12 | 3 | PF Williams | 8 | 72 |
| 22 | K Lo | 7 | 158 | S Sunder | 9 | 105 | Y Ijiri | 7 | 34 | FP Smith | 12 | 1 | H Willmott | 8 | 226 |
| 23 | K Ramesh | 7 | 124 | M Lang | 8 | 559 | RC Sansing | 7 | 16 | ME Barth | 11 | 395 | JJ Young | 8 | 102 |
| 24 | C Lennox | 7 | 104 | R Antle | 8 | 410 | SA Zeff | 7 | 14 | WR Kinney | 11 | 209 | MA Abernethy | 7 | 350 |
| 25 | PM Healy | 6 | 986 | LD Brown | 8 | 331 | WB Meigs | 7 | 0 | M Moonitz | 11 | 13 | RJ Boland | 7 | 115 |
| 26 | KJ Murphy | 6 | 825 | RM Bushman | 8 | 278 | JL Zimmermann | 6 | 640 | NM Bedford | 11 | 9 | Y Gendron | 7 | 73 |
| 27 | PM Dechow | 6 | 698 | S Reichelstein | 8 | 134 | KK Nelson | 6 | 379 | JL Dohr | 11 | 3 | T Hopper | 7 | 191 |
| 28 | B Trueman | 6 | 316 | WS Hopwood | 8 | 92 | DF Larcker | 6 | 374 | WJ Graham | 11 | 3 | AG Hopwood | 7 | 410 |
| 29 | JA Brickley | 6 | 295 | J Ronen | 8 | 84 | LA Maines | 6 | 215 | WL Campfield | 11 | 1 | R Libby | 7 | 246 |
| 30 | 8 authors | 6 | - | AR Abdelkhalik | 8 | 67 | 30 authors | 6 | - | 2 authors | 11 | - | 5 authors | 7 | - |

Abbreviations are shown in Table 1.

**Table 7.** The most productive and influential institutions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R | Institution | Country | TP4 | TC4 | H4 | >200 | >100 | >50 | TP | TC | H |
| 1 | U Chicago | USA | 278 | 9690 | 50 | 6 | 20 | 53 | 295 | 9829 | 50 |
| 2 | Stanford U | USA | 194 | 6672 | 45 | 4 | 14 | 41 | 226 | 6999 | 46 |
| 3 | U Pennsylvania | USA | 186 | 8185 | 47 | 7 | 25 | 49 | 211 | 8645 | 49 |
| 4 | U Texas Austin | USA | 179 | 2703 | 28 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 230 | 3066 | 29 |
| 5 | U Michigan | USA | 175 | 6312 | 43 | 6 | 13 | 37 | 204 | 6731 | 44 |
| 6 | U Washington Seattle | USA | 144 | 4024 | 35 | 3 | 4 | 19 | 170 | 4314 | 36 |
| 7 | U Illinois Urbana | USA | 135 | 1883 | 23 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 171 | 1993 | 23 |
| 8 | Penn State U | USA | 130 | 2021 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 152 | 2183 | 27 |
| 9 | Northwestern U | USA | 125 | 3237 | 34 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 134 | 3448 | 35 |
| 10 | Cornell U | USA | 123 | 3009 | 31 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 142 | 3243 | 31 |
| 11 | New York U | USA | 119 | 2997 | 29 | 1 | 5 | 21 | 170 | 3458 | 30 |
| 12 | U Southern California | USA | 117 | 3592 | 35 | 2 | 6 | 27 | 147 | 3997 | 37 |
| 13 | U Iowa | USA | 115 | 2628 | 26 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 139 | 2902 | 29 |
| 14 | Michigan State U | USA | 109 | 2014 | 23 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 130 | 2133 | 24 |
| 15 | Harvard U | USA | 103 | 5131 | 40 | 6 | 13 | 32 | 119 | 5324 | 41 |
| 16 | UC Berkeley | USA | 102 | 3293 | 28 | 2 | 10 | 18 | 116 | 3429 | 29 |
| 17 | UNC Chapel Hill | USA | 99 | 3255 | 32 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 122 | 3482 | 32 |
| 18 | U Arizona | USA | 99 | 1602 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 132 | 1783 | 22 |
| 19 | Ohio State U | USA | 98 | 1195 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 136 | 1492 | 19 |
| 20 | Indiana U | USA | 96 | 2217 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 127 | 2339 | 26 |
| 21 | Columbia U | USA | 91 | 2404 | 24 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 124 | 2697 | 26 |
| 22 | MIT | USA | 87 | 4334 | 33 | 5 | 12 | 20 | 100 | 4567 | 34 |
| 23 | Duke U | USA | 86 | 2907 | 26 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 117 | 3115 | 26 |
| 24 | U Rochester | USA | 83 | 4883 | 38 | 5 | 14 | 29 | 88 | 4906 | 38 |
| 25 | U Pittsburgh | USA | 82 | 1239 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 92 | 1324 | 20 |
| 26 | U Minnesota | USA | 80 | 1387 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 91 | 1517 | 21 |
| 27 | U Florida | USA | 78 | 1774 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 116 | 2010 | 22 |
| 28 | UCLA | USA | 75 | 2190 | 25 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 88 | 2262 | 25 |
| 29 | Washington U | USA | 74 | 1427 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 92 | 1622 | 23 |
| 30 | U Wisconsin Madison | USA | 73 | 2133 | 23 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 112 | 2436 | 26 |
| 31 | Carnegie Mellon U | USA | 72 | 1622 | 18 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 85 | 1694 | 19 |
| 32 | Arizona State U | USA | 72 | 547 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 122 | 942 | 17 |
| 33 | U Georgia | USA | 68 | 1132 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 108 | 1413 | 20 |
| 34 | U Manchester | UK | 66 | 1536 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 109 | 1680 | 25 |
| 35 | HK U Sci Tech | CHN | 64 | 1319 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 81 | 1491 | 21 |
| 36 | U British Columbia | CAN | 61 | 2108 | 25 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 81 | 2335 | 26 |
| 37 | London Sch Econ | UK | 61 | 1618 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 95 | 1775 | 22 |
| 38 | U Alberta | CAN | 60 | 1450 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 82 | 1605 | 22 |
| 39 | Emory U | USA | 58 | 970 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 79 | 1148 | 19 |
| 40 | U Colorado Boulder | USA | 57 | 944 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 70 | 1037 | 19 |
| 41 | Purdue U | USA | 57 | 781 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 65 | 822 | 15 |
| 42 | U New South Wales | AUS | 56 | 1285 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 170 | 1630 | 24 |
| 43 | U Notre Dame | USA | 56 | 961 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 68 | 1025 | 18 |
| 44 | U Missouri Columbia | USA | 48 | 1011 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 85 | 1555 | 20 |
| 45 | Texas AM U Coll Station | USA | 48 | 701 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 107 | 1043 | 17 |
| 46 | CUNY Baruch Coll | USA | 46 | 970 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 66 | 1072 | 16 |
| 47 | Florida State U | USA | 46 | 486 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 68 | 582 | 15 |
| 48 | Yale U | USA | 44 | 775 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 57 | 808 | 16 |
| 49 | U Oklahoma | USA | 44 | 659 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 66 | 749 | 15 |
| 50 | U Kansas | USA | 43 | 660 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 74 | 773 | 13 |
| 51 | U Oregon | USA | 41 | 799 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 54 | 903 | 17 |
| 52 | U Texas Dallas | USA | 40 | 653 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 57 | 735 | 13 |
| 53 | Brigham Young U | USA | 39 | 725 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 68 | 879 | 15 |
| 54 | U Massachusetts Amherst | USA | 39 | 291 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 345 | 11 |
| 55 | U Toronto | CAN | 38 | 480 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 83 | 639 | 13 |
| 56 | SUNY Buffalo | USA | 37 | 830 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 50 | 865 | 14 |
| 57 | Rice U | USA | 37 | 315 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 397 | 14 |
| 58 | U Utah | USA | 36 | 1210 | 18 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 55 | 1401 | 20 |
| 59 | U Maryland Coll Park | USA | 35 | 812 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 54 | 874 | 14 |
| 60 | U South Carolina | USA | 34 | 359 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 62 | 457 | 12 |
| 61 | Georgia State U | USA | 33 | 516 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 68 | 841 | 14 |
| 62 | Nanyang Tech U | SGP | 33 | 490 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 704 | 14 |
| 63 | U Connecticut | USA | 32 | 535 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 720 | 17 |
| 64 | Boston Coll | USA | 32 | 477 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 63 | 796 | 16 |
| 65 | London Business Sch | UK | 31 | 1226 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 50 | 1283 | 17 |
| 66 | Southern Methodist U | USA | 31 | 604 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 40 | 645 | 15 |
| 67 | Queens U | CAN | 31 | 502 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 45 | 640 | 14 |
| 68 | U Houston | USA | 31 | 441 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 60 | 581 | 14 |
| 69 | Virginia Polytech Inst | USA | 31 | 386 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 48 | 477 | 11 |
| 70 | Rutgers State U | USA | 31 | 310 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 500 | 12 |
| 71 | U Melbourne | AUS | 30 | 881 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 89 | 1070 | 17 |
| 72 | Tel Aviv U | ISR | 30 | 687 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 41 | 714 | 13 |
| 73 | Ben Gurion U | ISR | 28 | 626 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 40 | 654 | 13 |
| 74 | U Illinois Chicago | USA | 28 | 461 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 51 | 554 | 12 |
| 75 | Dartmouth Coll | USA | 28 | 258 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 324 | 8 |
| 76 | MacQuarie U | AUS | 27 | 778 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 58 | 854 | 16 |
| 77 | Boston U | USA | 27 | 481 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 37 | 622 | 13 |
| 78 | Cardiff U | UK | 25 | 277 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 57 | 363 | 11 |
| 79 | U Oxford | UK | 24 | 570 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 669 | 14 |
| 80 | Louisiana State U | USA | 24 | 457 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 35 | 588 | 14 |
| 81 | U New Mexico | USA | 24 | 224 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 225 | 10 |
| 82 | Tilburg U | NET | 24 | 159 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 209 | 7 |
| 83 | Monash U | AUS | 23 | 769 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 84 | 930 | 15 |
| 84 | George Washington U | USA | 23 | 395 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 29 | 422 | 9 |
| 85 | U Queensland | AUS | 23 | 315 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 79 | 490 | 12 |
| 86 | U Calgary | CAN | 22 | 613 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 32 | 727 | 13 |
| 87 | Temple U | USA | 22 | 441 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 56 | 664 | 12 |
| 88 | U Edinburgh | UK | 22 | 321 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 51 | 437 | 13 |
| 89 | Syracuse U | USA | 22 | 252 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 307 | 9 |
| 90 | UC Irvine | USA | 21 | 1135 | 14 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 30 | 1156 | 14 |
| 91 | San Diego State U | USA | 21 | 368 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 390 | 13 |
| 92 | U Virginia | USA | 21 | 324 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 380 | 12 |
| 93 | U Warwick | UK | 20 | 444 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 35 | 479 | 10 |
| 94 | U Kentucky | USA | 20 | 396 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 544 | 13 |
| 95 | Georgetown U | USA | 20 | 364 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 436 | 11 |
| 96 | U Miami | USA | 20 | 286 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 348 | 11 |
| 97 | North Carolina State U | USA | 19 | 621 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 690 | 12 |
| 98 | Case Western Reserve U | USA | 19 | 352 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 420 | 13 |
| 99 | Tulane U | USA | 19 | 182 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 220 | 8 |
| 100 | U Arkansas Fayetteville | USA | 19 | 139 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 47 | 350 | 9 |

Abbreviations: TP4, TC4 and H4 = Total papers, citations and *h*-index in the top four accounting journals; >200, >100, >50 = number of papers with more than 200, 100 and 50 citations; TP, TC and H = Total papers, citations and *h*-index in accounting journals indexed in WoS.

**Table 8.** Institutions with the highest number of papers in the top four accounting journals

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | JAE |  |  | JAR |  |  | TAR |  |  | AOS |  |  |
| R | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC | Author | TP | TC |
| 1 | U Chicago | 65 | 2714 | U Chicago | 149 | 5900 | U Texas Austin | 96 | 1000 | U Manchester | 55 | 1389 |
| 2 | U Pennsylvania | 61 | 3251 | Stanford U | 71 | 2659 | Stanford U | 71 | 1676 | London Sch Economics | 44 | 1506 |
| 3 | U Rochester | 47 | 3366 | U Pennsylvania | 66 | 2611 | U Michigan | 69 | 1637 | U Alberta | 30 | 629 |
| 4 | U Michigan | 43 | 2125 | U Texas Austin | 54 | 1158 | U Illinois Urbana | 66 | 879 | U New South Wales | 29 | 648 |
| 5 | Stanford U | 43 | 2078 | U Michigan | 51 | 2315 | U Washington Seattle | 62 | 1245 | Penn State U | 26 | 413 |
| 6 | MIT | 40 | 2667 | U Illinois Urbana | 51 | 571 | Michigan State U | 61 | 924 | Cardiff U | 24 | 274 |
| 7 | Northwestern U | 38 | 1333 | Cornell U | 50 | 1453 | U Chicago | 57 | 926 | U Oxford | 23 | 533 |
| 8 | U Sourthern California | 36 | 1691 | New York U | 42 | 743 | Indiana U | 54 | 1147 | U Southern California | 22 | 509 |
| 9 | U Washington Seattle | 34 | 1972 | UC Berkeley | 41 | 1656 | New York U | 54 | 1119 | U New Mexico | 22 | 209 |
| 10 | UNC Chapel Hill | 28 | 1069 | Columbia U | 38 | 1043 | U Iowa | 52 | 699 | U Pittsburgh | 22 | 208 |
| 11 | Harvard U | 27 | 2168 | U Iowa | 38 | 827 | U Pennsylvania | 51 | 2011 | U Warwick | 20 | 443 |
| 12 | Penn State U | 25 | 447 | U Washington Seattle | 38 | 703 | Cornell U | 50 | 952 | U Edinburgh | 20 | 317 |
| 13 | Ohio State U | 25 | 387 | Northwestern U | 36 | 953 | Northwestern U | 45 | 822 | Queens U Canada | 20 | 282 |
| 14 | HK U Sci. Tech. | 23 | 615 | Penn State U | 35 | 634 | U Arizona | 45 | 658 | U Calgary | 18 | 351 |
| 15 | Duke U | 20 | 1264 | U Minnesota | 34 | 584 | Penn State U | 44 | 520 | MacQuarie U | 16 | 449 |
| 16 | U Texas Austin | 20 | 421 | Harvard U | 33 | 943 | UC Berkeley | 44 | 833 | U Wisconsin Madison | 16 | 331 |
| 17 | New York U | 19 | 999 | Duke U | 31 | 685 | UNC Chapel Hill | 40 | 1034 | Case Western Reserve U | 16 | 324 |
| 18 | U British Columbia | 18 | 442 | Carnegie Mellon U | 30 | 616 | U Southern California | 40 | 713 | Michigan State U | 15 | 503 |
| 19 | Emory U | 18 | 282 | UNC Chapel Hill | 28 | 1089 | U Georgia | 39 | 471 | U South Carolina | 15 | 183 |
| 20 | UCLA | 17 | 1081 | U Arizona | 27 | 517 | U Florida | 38 | 631 | Arizona State U | 15 | 97 |
| 21 | U Iowa | 17 | 976 | U Florida | 26 | 804 | Arizona State U | 36 | 212 | Monash U | 14 | 715 |
| 22 | Columbia U | 17 | 785 | Washington U | 26 | 387 | Ohio State U | 36 | 252 | U Melbourne | 14 | 502 |
| 23 | UC Berkeley | 16 | 789 | MIT | 24 | 721 | Columbia U | 34 | 558 | Copenhagen Bus Sch | 14 | 281 |
| 24 | Washington U | 16 | 198 | Ohio State U | 24 | 333 | Texas AM U Coll Station | 34 | 418 | U Illinois Urbana | 14 | 158 |
| 25 | U Arizona | 15 | 214 | UCLA | 23 | 508 | U Wisconsin Madison | 33 | 807 | York U Canada | 14 | 138 |
| 26 | Michigan State U | 14 | 349 | Yale U | 22 | 510 | Harvard U | 32 | 1486 | Cornell U | 13 | 296 |
| 27 | Purdue U | 14 | 310 | U Colorado Boulder | 21 | 362 | Duke U | 31 | 831 | San Diego State U | 13 | 281 |
| 28 | U Pittsburgh | 13 | 324 | U British Columbia | 20 | 999 | U Missouri Columbia | 30 | 417 | Indiana U | 12 | 222 |
| 29 | UC Irvine | 11 | 902 | Indiana U | 19 | 698 | U Pittsburgh | 30 | 358 | Ohio State U | 12 | 217 |
| 30 | 7 institutions | 11 | - | U Southern California | 18 | 663 | U Notre Dame | 29 | 547 | U Arizona | 12 | 210 |

Abbreviations are available in Table 1.

**Table 9.** The most productive countries in accounting research

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | Name | TP4 | TC4 | TP | TC | >200 | >100 | >50 | P10Y | C10Y | H |
| 1 | USA | 4281 | 92910 | 6083 | 103870 | 45 | 161 | 492 | 2413 | 26108 | 118 |
| 2 | UK | 377 | 7942 | 906 | 9761 | 2 | 9 | 43 | 620 | 3849 | 48 |
| 3 | Canada | 315 | 6153 | 551 | 7379 | 2 | 8 | 37 | 291 | 2429 | 42 |
| 4 | Australia | 222 | 5660 | 838 | 7124 | 1 | 7 | 30 | 566 | 2512 | 43 |
| 5 | China | 146 | 2502 | 371 | 3351 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 308 | 1647 | 29 |
| 6 | Netherlands | 79 | 1043 | 179 | 1377 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 158 | 947 | 19 |
| 7 | Israel | 51 | 790 | 75 | 839 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 103 | 14 |
| 8 | Singapore | 49 | 558 | 119 | 853 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 469 | 16 |
| 9 | Sweden | 33 | 426 | 76 | 504 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 55 | 289 | 14 |
| 10 | N. Zealand | 30 | 390 | 143 | 718 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 112 | 512 | 14 |
| 11 | Denmark | 29 | 509 | 54 | 582 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 42 | 292 | 14 |
| 12 | France | 28 | 439 | 87 | 624 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 76 | 448 | 12 |
| 13 | S. Korea | 27 | 285 | 87 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 75 | 381 | 13 |
| 14 | Germany | 27 | 432 | 98 | 716 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 90 | 598 | 14 |
| 15 | Spain | 20 | 307 | 203 | 575 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 197 | 428 | 13 |
| 16 | Finland | 16 | 234 | 56 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 199 | 11 |
| 17 | Belgium | 15 | 181 | 61 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 201 | 9 |
| 18 | Ireland | 13 | 437 | 28 | 488 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 80 | 9 |
| 19 | Japan | 11 | 111 | 43 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 35 | 5 |
| 20 | Austria | 8 | 196 | 21 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 65 | 6 |
| 21 | Norway | 8 | 150 | 25 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 100 | 6 |
| 22 | Italy | 6 | 110 | 55 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 52 | 252 | 8 |
| 23 | Egypt | 4 | 13 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 24 | Greece | 4 | 49 | 18 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 97 | 5 |
| 25 | India | 4 | 94 | 7 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 35 | 5 |
| 26 | Indonesia | 4 | 52 | 6 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4 |
| 27 | Switzerland | 4 | 37 | 17 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 48 | 5 |
| 28 | U.A.E. | 4 | 39 | 7 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 |
| 29 | Portugal | 3 | 4 | 27 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 69 | 4 |
| 30 | S. Arabia | 2 | 106 | 2 | 106 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 106 | 2 |

Abbreviations: TP4 and TC4 = Total papers and citations in the top four accounting journals; TP and TC = Total papers and citations in accounting journals indexed in WoS; >200, >100, >50 = number of papers with more than 200, 100 and 50 citations; P10Y and C10Y = Number of papers and their citations in the last 10 years; H = *h*-index. Note that China includes Hong Kong and Taiwan.

**Table 10.** Countries classified by the twenty accounting journals indexed in WoS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | JAE | JAR | TAR | AOS | CAR | RAS | AUD | JBF | JAP | EAR | ABA | MAR | AF | ABR | AH | AAR | AAA | IFMA | APJ | SJF | Total |
| 1 | USA | 696 | 1207 | 1868 | 510 | 271 | 181 | 482 | 147 | 276 | 24 | 112 | 7 | 39 | 30 | 102 | 11 | 6 | 22 | 34 | 1 | 6026 |
| 2 | UK | 15 | 49 | 29 | 284 | 10 | 14 | 5 | 151 | 18 | 39 | 86 | 33 | 20 | 68 | 3 | 12 | 55 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 903 |
| 3 | Canada | 30 | 73 | 94 | 118 | 66 | 10 | 47 | 26 | 16 | 13 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 543 |
| 4 | Australia | 15 | 27 | 68 | 112 | 16 | 0 | 31 | 35 | 10 | 8 | 159 | 9 | 170 | 19 | 5 | 105 | 39 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 838 |
| 5 | China | 42 | 26 | 52 | 26 | 32 | 23 | 22 | 29 | 35 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 371 |
| 6 | Netherlands | 8 | 7 | 25 | 39 | 9 | 2 | 13 | 21 | 1 | 15 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 177 |
| 7 | Israel | 5 | 17 | 26 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| 8 | Singapore | 7 | 14 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 7 | 12 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| 9 | Sweden | 2 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 76 |
| 10 | N. Zealand | 4 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 21 | 1 | 21 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 143 |
| 11 | Denmark | 2 | 5 | 5 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| 12 | France | 6 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 85 |
| 13 | S. Korea | 7 | 4 | 15 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 87 |
| 14 | Germany | 3 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 98 |
| 15 | Spain | 1 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 24 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 110 | 203 |
| 16 | Finland | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| 17 | Belgium | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 61 |
| 18 | Ireland | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 19 | Japan | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 43 |
| 20 | Austria | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 21 | Norway | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 22 | Italy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 55 |
| 23 | Egypt | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 24 | Greece | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 25 | India | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 26 | Indonesia | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 27 | Switzer. | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 28 | U.A.E. | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 29 | Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| 30 | S. Arabia | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Abbreviations are available in Table 1.
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