

From Accounting Professional to Accounting Professor: The Gravitational Hypothesis as an Explanation for Career Change

Gary P. Braun

University of Texas at El Paso

Mary A. Gowan

University of Central Florida

John M. Strefeler

Mt. Union College

Abstract

According to the Accounting Education Change Commission (AECC), students should identify with the accounting profession in a number of areas, including knowledge, skills, and values [AECC, 1990]. One way students begin to gain this identification is through interactions with members of the accounting profession. However, research of accounting students has shown that many accounting majors have limited, if any, exposure to accountants outside the academic setting [Davidson and Dalby, 1995]. Consequently, students may decide to become accountants because of their identification with faculty and their perceptions that the interests, values, and abilities of accounting faculty reflect those of practicing accountants.

Research has shown that faculty do indeed influence the career choice of accounting students [e.g., Ames and Ames, 1984; Reid, 1979]. Given this influence, it is surprising that more research has not focused on identifying the values, skills, and abilities of accounting faculty, factors that likely affect student perceptions of what an accounting career will involve and the factors career research has shown to be important in career decision making [e.g., Holland, 1973]. This research is especially needed since decision making literature has found that information accessibility is often a better predictor of information use than is information quality [O'Reilly, 1982] even though accurate information is a better predictor of intentions to stay in a job [Caldwell and O'Reilly, 1985].

Research on the choice of accounting as a career has primarily focused on accounting practitioner career choice [e.g., Bundy and Norris, 1992]. Most of this research has examined factors that led accountants to choose a particular job within a given organization rather than factors influencing the decision to become an accountant. We found only two research studies that specifically addressed characteristics of accounting faculty. Davidson and Dalby [1995] studied personality characteristics of accounting faculty in Canada. They compared those profiles with personality profiles of public accountants in Canada and found that differences did exist. Newell, et al. [1996] compared demographic data, motivating factors for pursuing an academic career,

We acknowledge the insightful comments of Som Bhattacharya, Audrey Gramling, and Sri Rammamoorti. In addition, the first author thanks the University Research Institute at University of Texas at El Paso for financial assistance.

doctoral education, academic/professional experience, and career expectations for graduates of doctoral programs in accounting from the years of 1970, 1980, and 1990. Their goal was to present a profile of accounting faculty relative to these dimensions.

While Davidson and Dalby [1995] and Newell et al. [1996] provide some information about characteristics of accounting faculty, these studies did not include a number of attributes typically used to explain career choice. Specifically, the studies did not examine values, skills, and abilities of accounting faculty, characteristics that are important for career choice and subsequent person-job fit [e.g., Holland, 1973; Locke, 1976; Dawis, 1990]. Accordingly this study attempts to identify the work values, abilities, and skills of accounting faculty within the context of the well-defined career choice and person-job fit literature to help explain why differences might exist between academic and practitioner accounting careers and why understanding those differences is important.

In the following section, we review research on career choice and person-job fit to develop hypotheses. The third section describes our methodology. The final two sections present results our analyses and discuss the implications of these results and directions for future research.

Career Choice and Person-Job Fit

Understanding why an individual chooses one career over another has long been of interest to researchers [e.g., Hall, 1976; Holland, 1973; Super, 1957]. Models such as Holland's vocational typology, a trait-factor theory [1973, 1985] and Schein's [1996] career anchors have done much to help us understand the choices individuals make when selecting careers. Additionally, the person-job fit literature helps us understand why it is important for individuals' interests, values, skills, and abilities to match the type of work they perform [Gottfredson, 1977; Holland, 1973]. As Dawis [1990] points out, a well-established finding of research is that occupational groups differ relative to the level and patterns of interests and values of individuals in those occupations. Consequently, the closer the match between the attributes of individuals entering a career and the attributes of the career, the more likely individuals are to be satisfied in their careers. Further, the person-job fit literature has shown a relationship between lack of fit and turnover in a job [Wilk et al., 1995].

Individuals often choose their first occupations based on limited information. In fact, many individuals select occupations while in college. As already noted, much of the career information available to these individuals comes from interactions with faculty [Davidson and Dalby, 1995]. For many disciplines, if not most, the academic career is very different from the practitioner career.

An examination of Holland's vocational types [1966, 1985] illustrates the problems inherent in using accounting faculty as the referent group for deciding on a career in accounting. Holland [1966, 1985] identified six vocational categories. These categories are labeled as realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional. According to Holland [1966, 1985], there is a specific vocational personality type associated with each of these six categories. For instance, individuals in the vocational category of conventional, the category that includes accountants, can be described as having a preference for orderliness, unambiguous activities, and rules and regulations.

On the other hand, individuals in the social vocational category, the category that includes teachers, prefer activities that involve helping and developing others. These individuals are often seen by others as being sociable, friendly, cooperative, and

understanding. Individuals in the investigative category, the category into which faculty who are researchers are most likely to fall, prefer to think through problems rather than to act upon them, and prefer abstract problems and a task-orientation. While not as diametrically opposite as the conventional vs. artistic categories or the social vs. realistic categories, the conventional and social vocational personality types have considerable differences as do the conventional and investigative vocational personality types. Research supports these differences in terms of personality characteristics of practicing accountants vs. accounting faculty [Davidson and Dalby, 1995].

Further, based on Holland's trait-factor theory [1966, 1985], one would expect that among these differing characteristics of faculty and practitioners would be differences in preferences for work values. While a common definition of the construct of values is not always readily achieved, there is some agreement that values are basically standards used by individuals to evaluate the relative importance of things to them [Dawis, 1990]. For instance, individuals are likely to have different standards for evaluating the importance of attributes of work, such as lifestyle, financial rewards, and task variety. In fact, Knoop [1991] defines work values in terms of the degree of worth, desirability, and importance of what happens at work. Some work values, such as lifestyle and autonomy, can be described as intrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are those less tangible aspects of jobs. Other work values, such as financial rewards and working conditions, can be described as extrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors are the more tangible aspects of jobs [Caston and Braitto, 1985].

A large number of studies exist on the choice of an accounting practitioner career [e.g., Bundy and Norris, 1992]. However, as previously noted, most of this research identifies factors that have led accountants to choose a particular job within a given organization, not factors influencing their decision to become accountants. There are a few studies, however, that have identified factors influencing the choice of accounting as a career.

For instance, Paolillo and Estes [1982] found that availability of jobs, an extrinsic factor, was the most important factor influencing the career choice of accountants. Earnings potential, number of years of education required, influence of instructors, and affinity for the subject of accounting were also decision factors. Felton, et al. [1994] also found that extrinsic factors in the form of long-term financial rewards and job availability influenced the choice of an accounting major. They found that students majoring in subjects other than accounting were more interested in short-term financial rewards and intrinsic factors (e.g., autonomy, opportunity to be creative, and intellectual challenge). Additionally, Cohen and Hanno [1993] found that success in introductory accounting courses was an influential factor in choosing to major in accounting.

Newell et al. [1996] found that lifestyle, status, compensation, and job security were reasons faculty gave for career choice. Lifestyle, an intrinsic factor, was by far the most important reason given. These studies suggest that while there may be some overlap, there are differences in preferences for work values between accounting faculty and accounting practitioners. Consequently, we hypothesize:

- H1a:** Work values *influencing the career choice* of accounting faculty are more intrinsically-oriented than those present in and influencing the choice of an accounting practitioner career.
- H1b:** Work values *present in the career* of accounting faculty are more intrinsically-oriented than those present in an accounting practitioner career.

Additionally, literature has shown the importance of examining the relationships between individual ability and ability requirements of jobs [Wilk et al., 1995]. Understanding the relationship between attributes, such as abilities and skills, of persons and job requirements is important for achieving a better match between persons and jobs, a goal of employee recruitment and selection [Gatewood and Feild, 1998]. This person-job congruence should also affect career stability [Gottfredson, 1977].

A comparison of accounting faculty job descriptions and accounting practitioner job descriptions suggests the need for at least some different abilities and skills. The following descriptions of accountants and professors can be found in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* and the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* [U.S. Department of Labor, 1977, 1998]:

Accountants and auditors prepare, analyze, and verify financial reports and taxes, and monitor information systems that furnish this information to managers in business, industry, and governmentComputers are widely used in accounting and auditing.

Professors usually teach several different courses in their department—algebra, calculus, and statistics, for example. They may instruct undergraduate or graduate students, or both. College and university faculty may give lectures to several hundred students in large halls, lead small seminars, or supervise students in laboratories. They prepare lectures, exercises, and laboratory experiments, grade exams and papers, and advise and work with students individually. In universities, they also counsel, advise, teach, and supervise graduate student teaching and research. College faculty work with an increasingly varied student population made up of growing shares of part-time, older, and culturally and racially diverse students.

Faculty keep abreast of developments in their field by reading current literature, talking with colleagues, and participating in professional conferences. They also do their own research to expand knowledge in their field. They experiment, collect and analyze data, and examine original documents, literature, and other source material. From this, they develop hypotheses, arrive at conclusions, and publish their findings in scholarly journals, books, and electronic media.

College and university faculty increasingly use technology in all areas of their work. In the classroom, they may use computers—including the Internet; electronic mail; software programs, such as statistical packages; and CD-ROMs—as teaching aids. Some professors teach “satellite” courses that are broadcast to students at off-campus sites through closed-circuit or cable television. Faculty also use computers to do their own research, participate in discussion groups in their field, or publicize their professional research papers.

These tasks require different sets of abilities and skills. On that basis, we derive the following hypotheses.

H2a: Accounting faculty will possess different abilities than accounting practitioners.

H2b: Accounting faculty careers will require different skills than accounting practitioner careers.

Last, we wanted to examine whether doctoral students were more similar to faculty or to practitioners. The majority of accounting faculty have practitioner experience before beginning their academic careers and often have had undergraduate or prior graduate-level training in accounting [Newell et al., 1996]. If the doctoral students are more similar to faculty, they may have migrated to the faculty career to seek a better person-job fit [Holland, 1973; Locke, 1976]. In fact, one theory, referred to as the gravitational hypothesis, suggests that individuals, during career progression, will "gravitate" toward a

career with characteristics that better "match" their abilities, values, and interests [Wilk et al., 1995]. According to this theory, individuals who find the career of an accounting professional does not meet their expectations and/or fit their values, abilities, and skills, will attempt to correct this lack of fit. If the gravitational hypothesis is valid in this case, individuals currently pursuing a terminal degree in accounting should have work values, abilities, and skills more similar to accounting faculty than to those of accounting professionals.

- H3:** Accounting doctoral students will have career choice factors, work values, abilities, and skills that are more similar to those of accounting faculty than to those of accounting practitioners.

Methodology

Respondents

We drew our survey sample from three distinct populations. First, we surveyed accounting faculty who are CPAs, have doctorates, and are currently employed as faculty at four-year colleges and universities in the United States. We used the *Accounting Faculty Directory* [Hasselback, 1996] for this purpose. Individuals in this directory with doctorates and CPAs served as the sampling frame for this population. The second population consisted of all members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), except those currently employed at educational institutions. The third population consisted of doctoral students enrolled in AACSB-accredited doctoral programs in accounting.

A total of 1,221 survey instruments were mailed (500 to faculty, 500 to professional accountants, and 221 to doctoral students). A total of 331 surveys were returned for an overall response rate of 27.1%. We received responses from 142 (28.4%) faculty, 90 (18%) professional accountants, and 99 (44.8%) doctoral students.

Demographics

Professional accountants. Of the 90 respondents, 57% were male and 92% were White. Ages ranged from 25 to 72 years with a mean of 39.7 (SD = 10.0). Respondents had been in their careers from zero to 48 years with an average time of 12.9 years (SD = 10.0). Public accounting firms employed 46% of the respondents, 22% worked for publicly-held companies, 18% worked for private companies, and 6% worked in the government sector. The remaining respondents either did not respond to this question or worked in some other area.

Faculty. Of the 142 faculty respondents, 80% were male and 80% were White. Ages ranged from 30 to 73 years with a mean of 48.7 (SD = 9.1). Respondents had been in their careers from zero to 38 years with an average time of 16.2 years (SD = 9.6). Forty-four percent of these respondents were full professors, 24% were associate professors, 29% were assistant professors, 3% were directors of their schools. Public institutions without doctoral programs employed 54% of respondents, 21% worked for public institutions with doctoral programs, 15% worked at private schools without doctoral programs, 1% were employed by private institutions with doctoral programs, and 8% did not respond to this question. Forty-three percent of respondents indicated that their college of business was accredited by the AACSB.

Doctoral students. Of the 99 doctoral student respondents, 56% were male, 72% were White, 14% Asian, and 9% African-American. Ages ranged from 23 to 53 years with a mean of 33.7 (SD = 7.5). With respect to what students plan to do when they

finished their degrees, 45% indicated they plan to teach at public, doctoral granting institutions, 15% plan to teach at a public, non-doctoral granting institution, 10% plan to teach at a private, non-doctoral granting institution, 3% plan to teach at a private doctoral granting institution, 6% responded that they did not know what they would do, 3% listed other, and 17% indicated more than one option. Sixty-one percent of respondents were CPAs, 13% were CMAs, 2% were CIAs and CFPs each, and 7% listed some other type of professional certification as well.

Survey Instrument

Development of our survey instrument involved three steps. First, we reviewed the career choice literature to identify factors indicative of work values, abilities, and skills, and factors affecting career choice. Next, we informally surveyed several individuals currently employed as either accounting faculty or as professional accountants to ensure that our lists were representative of characteristics related to these occupations. Lastly, we used our input from both of these sources to develop the list of items included in our survey to assess work values, abilities, and skills (see Appendix).

Work Values

Our survey first asked respondents to indicate the extent to which each of 29 items influenced their choice to pursue their present careers. For example, using the stem of "I felt this career would provide," respondents indicated the extent to which they felt items such as freedom of expression, an enjoyable occupation, financial rewards, good physical working environment, and well-defined job expectations influenced their choice of a career. In the cover letter for the doctoral students, we included instructions requesting that they think of the academic career they had selected when responding to items in this section (as well as the items in the sections on work values and skills required). The anchors for the five-point Likert scale ranged from one - no influence to five - very strong influence.

In addition to determining the extent to which these work values influenced career choice, we were also interested in the extent to which these work values are present in these occupations. Therefore, we asked respondents to "indicate the extent to which the following work values are present in your current career." The anchors for the five-point Likert scale ranged from one - strongly disagree to five - strongly agree.

Abilities

The gravitational hypothesis suggests that individuals gravitate to careers more commensurate with their interests, values, and abilities. Therefore, we included a list of 46 abilities in our survey. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed they possessed these abilities. Examples of abilities included in the survey are the ability to solve problems, the ability to supervise the work of others, and the ability to apply technology to tasks. Responses were on a five-point Likert scale ranging from one - definitely don't possess to five - definitely possess.

Skills

The last section included a list of ten skills required to perform the job of accountant and/or professor. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed that their careers required these skills. Doctoral respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt the career they were preparing for would require these skills. Examples of skills included are interpersonal, decision-making, critical thinking, and

written communication. Responses were on a five-point Likert scale ranging from one - definitely not required to five - always required.

Results

Factor Analysis

We first used factor analysis to determine if the items in each of the four sections of the survey (i.e., career choice factors, work values, abilities possessed and skills required) could be placed into scales based on similarity. We used varimax rotation with decision criteria of eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and factor loadings of .30 or higher considered significant [Hair, et al., 1995] for inclusion of items in each factor. If an item had more than one factor loading of .30 or higher, the item was included in the factor for which it had the best fit with the other items. The average of the items serves as scale scores for each factor. For a scale to be included in further data analysis, a minimum Cronbach's alpha of .60 was required.

Table 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 list the various items that comprise each of the factors for each factor category. For example, Table 1 includes information pertaining to work values that influenced career choice, along with the Cronbach's alphas for each factor. The first set of items relate to what respondents felt their career would provide. Factors are labeled *lifestyle* (seven items), *financial security* (six items), *motivators* (five items), *nature of work* (five items), and *work roles* (two items). Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 present this same information for work values present in current career, abilities possessed, and skills required, respectively.

Hypothesis Tests

Work Values — H1a and H1b

Hypotheses 1a and 1b suggest that the work values that influence career choice and that are present in careers of faculty (practitioners) will be relatively more intrinsic (extrinsic). Intrinsic factors are those that are relatively more intangible aspects of a job or career. In contrast, extrinsic factors are those that are relatively more tangible. Accordingly, the factors identified in the factor analysis discussed above can be categorized as intrinsic or extrinsic.

Regarding the work values affecting career choice, the following factors (which are found in Table 1) are classified as intrinsic: *Lifestyle* and *Motivators*. Two factors are classified as extrinsic: *Work Roles* and *Financial Security*. The remaining factor, *Nature of Work* does not clearly fit either category.

This discussion implies a significant relationship between job type (faculty or practitioner) and the average of the items included in each factor. Further, these hypotheses imply that the item averages for the factors classified as intrinsic (extrinsic) will be greater for the faculty (practitioners). We tested Hypothesis 1a and 1b using ANCOVA. Work values affecting career choice and the work values present in current careers were examined separately as follows. An ANCOVA model was estimated for each of the five factors. The average of the items comprising each factor represented the dependent variable. The independent variable was job type (faculty or practitioner). Length of time in current career (in years) served as a covariate. Job type is the variable of interest. Length of time was included as a covariate because of the possibility that it could moderate the relationship between job type and work value preferences.

The results reported in panels A and B of [Table 5](#) indicate that faculty had significantly higher scores on *Lifestyle* and *Nature of Work*, suggesting that these factors influenced the career choice of accounting faculty more than the career choice of professionals. Professional accountants had higher scores on *Financial Security*, suggesting that this factor influenced the career choice of professional accountants more than the career choice of accounting faculty. The differences between faculty and professional accountants on the *Motivators* and *Work Roles* factors were not statistically significant. The length of time covariate was not statistically significant for any of the analyses. These results are consistent with H1a.

Regarding work values present in current careers, *Lifestyle* and *Motivators* are classified as intrinsic factors. *Recognition*, *Financial Security*, and *Work Roles* are considered to be extrinsic factors. Again, *Nature of Work* is not clearly intrinsic or extrinsic. Faculty had significantly higher scores on *Lifestyle* and *Motivators*, suggesting that these factors are more descriptive of the careers of accounting faculty than those of professional accountants. Professional accountants had higher scores on *Financial Security*, *Recognition*, *Work Roles*, and *Nature of Work*. This suggests that these factors were present to a greater degree in the careers of professional accountants. These results, which support H1b, are presented in [Table 6](#).

Abilities and Skills — H2a and H2b

Hypothesis 2a and 2b suggest that the abilities possessed by and skills required of faculty and practitioners will differ. These hypotheses are tested in essentially the same manner as the previous hypotheses, and the results are presented in [Table 7](#) and [Table 8](#). With respect to abilities possessed, four of six factors were statistically significant between accounting faculty and professional accountants. These factors were *training*, *research*, *technology*, and *management*. Accounting faculty had higher scores on *training* and *research* abilities, suggesting that these abilities are more reflective of those in academic careers than of professional accountants. The scores of professional accountants were higher on *management*, and *technology*. This supports H2a which suggests that there will be differences for these factors.

Hypothesis 2b deals with skills required. In this area, *communication* and *thinking* were rated higher for accounting faculty, suggesting that these skills are relatively more necessary for accounting faculty than for professional accountants. *Supervisory* factor scores were higher for professional accountants. This supports H2b which suggests that there will be differences for these factors.

Intergroup Comparisons — H3

Hypothesis three suggests that the work values, abilities, and skills of doctoral students in accounting will be more similar to those of accounting faculty than to those of professional accountants. We used a two-step approach to test this hypothesis. First, discriminant functions were estimated, using the means of the factor items as the scale scores, for the accounting faculty and accounting professionals only. We did this to determine if the scales differentiated between accounting faculty and accounting professionals. Next, these functions, along with the factor means for the doctoral students, were used to classify the students. This hypothesis was then tested by comparing the ratio of doctoral students who were “classified” as accounting faculty to the 50% ratio who would be expected to be randomly classified as accounting faculty.

Using the work values factors pertaining to the decision to pursue career, we found that 86.9% (86 out of 99) of the doctoral students were classified as accounting faculty. If

the discriminant function had no ability to classify doctoral students, we would expect that 50% of the doctoral students would be included in each of the two groups. A binomial test, using the normal approximation [Siegel and Castellan, 1988], and assuming probability of 0.5 for each group was also performed. The resulting $z = 7.64$ ($p < .0001$) provides strong support for this hypothesis.

The results using the factors related to work values present in current career supported H3 with 64.6% of the doctoral students classified as accounting faculty. The resulting $z = 2.76$ ($p < .003$) provides strong support for the second hypothesis. The results pertaining to abilities also provide support for H3 as 67.3% of the doctoral students were classified as accounting faculty, $z = 3.33$ ($p < .0005$). Finally, H3 was also supported using the data pertaining to skills with 87.8% of the doctoral students classified as accounting faculty, $z = 7.37$ ($p < .0001$).

Discussion

Our analyses support the hypotheses pertaining to the differences in work values, abilities and skills between accounting faculty and accounting practitioners. With respect to both sets of work values factors, results were consistent with Newell et al. [1996], as *lifestyle* was the most important factor for purposes of classifying between groups. In the area of abilities, accounting faculty' ratings were higher in the areas of *training* and *research*. Accounting professional's ratings were higher in the areas of *technology*, *management*, and *accounting*.

While most of these relationships were consistent with what we expected, one exception to this was the *technology* factor. Professional accountants rated themselves significantly higher in this area than did accounting faculty. This has both encouraging and discouraging aspects. On the one hand, it is encouraging to observe that professional accountants do feel relatively comfortable and proficient in this area. However, it is somewhat discouraging that accounting faculty (in perception at least) trail professional accountants in this area. As previous research has found, accounting students are greatly influenced by and may adopt some characteristics of the faculty that they are involved with [Davidson and Dalby, 1995]. If, and to the extent that, these students are not positively influenced in the area of learning and being involved with technology, it is likely that their careers will suffer. This is especially true given the increasing focus of industry on the use of information technology [Scott, 1997]. Finally, in the area of skills required, accounting faculty perceived that their jobs required more skills in the area of *communication*, and *thinking* whereas the professional accountants perceived the need for more skills in the *supervisory* area.

Our results support the gravitational hypothesis [Wilk et al., 1995]. Specifically, we found that the various factor ratings of doctoral students were more similar to those of accounting faculty than they were to those of accounting professionals. This held true for factors in each area; career choice, work values, abilities, and skills required to do the job. In each case, the discriminant model we estimated was much more likely to categorize the responses of a doctoral student as an accounting faculty than as an accounting professional. In summary, this indicates strong support for the gravitational hypothesis in this context since the career decisions and related variables point to the "migration" of doctoral students toward a career that is much more consistent with their abilities and values.

Regarding directions for future research, the disparity in perceived abilities between accounting practitioners and accounting faculty in the area of technology could be

investigated. Given the increasing importance of technology, especially to future accountants, it is important to conduct research into the nature and causes of this difference. Another area for potential future research is the longitudinal study of the career paths of doctoral students in accounting. This paper has identified factors related to career choice, work values, abilities, and skills of both accounting faculty and professional accountants. The discriminant model developed here could also serve as the basis for a model that could be used to predict the occupational fit for potential doctoral students. This could be used in recruiting doctoral students. The model developed here could be "tested" on a sample of doctoral students. That is, it seems reasonable to expect the discriminant scores of new or prospective doctoral students to be correlated with their ultimate success in completing the doctoral degree and being successful in academic careers.

Appendix

Section One

Please indicate the extent to which the following factors influenced your choice to pursue your present career:

	<u>No</u> <u>Influence</u>	<u>Little</u> <u>Influence</u>	<u>Moderate</u> <u>Influence</u>	<u>Strong</u> <u>Influence</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Strong</u> <u>Influence</u>
I felt this career would provide:					
1. Freedom of expression	1	2	3	4	5
2. Cooperative coworkers	1	2	3	4	5
3. Flexibility to set my own work hours	1	2	3	4	5
4. Recognition for a job well-done	1	2	3	4	5
5. Opportunity to express myself creatively	1	2	3	4	5
6. Opportunity to engage in problem-solving	1	2	3	4	5
7. Opportunity to make decisions	1	2	3	4	5
8. Time to spend with family	1	2	3	4	5
9. Desirable geographical location	1	2	3	4	5
10. Little stress	1	2	3	4	5
11. Opportunity for advancement	1	2	3	4	5
12. Great deal of variety	1	2	3	4	5
13. Autonomy	1	2	3	4	5
14. Opportunity to work for prestigious organization	1	2	3	4	5
15. Financial rewards	1	2	3	4	5
16. Opportunity for additional income	1	2	3	4	5
17. High earnings potential	1	2	3	4	5
18. Job security	1	2	3	4	5
19. Good physical working environment	1	2	3	4	5
20. Challenging tasks	1	2	3	4	5
21. Opportunity to help people	1	2	3	4	5
22. Well-defined job expectations	1	2	3	4	5
23. Clearly-defined job responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
24. Opportunity to achieve personal goals	1	2	3	4	5
25. Opportunity to learn new things	1	2	3	4	5
26. Enjoyable occupation	1	2	3	4	5
27. Flexibility to take time off	1	2	3	4	5
28. Desirable lifestyle	1	2	3	4	5
29. Prestige	1	2	3	4	5

Section Two

Please indicate the extent to which the following work values are present *in your current career*:

(Note: Items 1. through 29. above are identical to those used in Section Two. Only the item introduction differs)

Section Three

Indicate the extent to which you believe that you possess the ability to:

	<i>Definitely don't <u>possess</u></i>	<i>Probably don't <u>possess</u></i>	<i>Not <u>sure</u></i>	<i>Somewhat <u>possess</u></i>	<i>Definitely <u>possess</u></i>
1. Solve problems	1	2	3	4	5
2. Teach/train others	1	2	3	4	5
3. Use computers to process information	1	2	3	4	5
4. Monitor and correct performance	1	2	3	4	5
5. Maintain and troubleshoot technology	1	2	3	4	5
6. Acquire and evaluate information	1	2	3	4	5
7. Plan work for others	1	2	3	4	5
8. Plan social activities	1	2	3	4	5
9. Supervise work of others	1	2	3	4	5
10. Understand written material of technical nature	1	2	3	4	5
11. Work with little or no supervision	1	2	3	4	5
12. Make oral presentations	1	2	3	4	5
13. Design research studies	1	2	3	4	5
14. Apply knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
15. Design learning experiences for others	1	2	3	4	5
16. Effectively convey knowledge to others	1	2	3	4	5
17. Prepare balance sheets	1	2	3	4	5
18. Select technology	1	2	3	4	5
19. Prepare profit and loss statements	1	2	3	4	5
20. Recruit employees	1	2	3	4	5
21. Listen to and to interpret requests	1	2	3	4	5
22. Conduct audits	1	2	3	4	5
23. Assess performance of others	1	2	3	4	5
24. Serve clients/customers	1	2	3	4	5
25. Interpret and communicate information	1	2	3	4	5
26. Exercise leadership	1	2	3	4	5
27. Allocate human resources	1	2	3	4	5
28. Write research papers	1	2	3	4	5
29. Apply technology to tasks	1	2	3	4	5
30. Advise others about school/career plans	1	2	3	4	5
31. Participate as member of team/committee	1	2	3	4	5
32. Delegate	1	2	3	4	5
33. Work with culturally diverse populations	1	2	3	4	5
34. Use computers to process information	1	2	3	4	5
35. Organize and maintain information	1	2	3	4	5
36. Allocate money	1	2	3	4	5
37. Prepare technical reports	1	2	3	4	5
38. Memorize information	1	2	3	4	5
39. Lift heavy objects	1	2	3	4	5
40. Make decisions	1	2	3	4	5
41. Stimulate learning	1	2	3	4	5
42. Conduct independent research	1	2	3	4	5
43. Apply statistical procedures to research questions	1	2	3	4	5
44. Explain theory to others	1	2	3	4	5
45. Explain complex procedures to others	1	2	3	4	5
46. Represent clients to government agencies	1	2	3	4	5

Section Four

Please indicate the extent to which you believe the job for which the Ph.D. is preparing you will require the following skills:

	<i>Definitely not <u>Required</u></i>	<i>Not often <u>Required</u></i>	<i><u>Not sure</u></i>	<i>Frequently <u>Required</u></i>	<i>Always <u>Required</u></i>
1. Written communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
2. Oral communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
3. Critical thinking skills	1	2	3	4	5
4. Analytical skills	1	2	3	4	5
5. Interpersonal skills	1	2	3	4	5
6. Creative skills	1	2	3	4	5
7. Listening skills	1	2	3	4	5
8. Leadership skills	1	2	3	4	5
9. Delegation skills	1	2	3	4	5
10. Decision-making skills	1	2	3	4	5

References

- Accounting Education Change Commission. (1990), "Objectives of education for accountants: Position statement number one," *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 5, 2, pp. 307-312.
- Ames, C. and R. Ames. (1984), "Systems of student and teacher motivation: Toward a qualitative definition," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 76, 4, pp. 535-556.
- Bundy, P. and D. Norris. (1992), "What accounting students consider important in the job selection process," *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 8, 2, pp. 1-6.
- Caldwell, D. F. and C. A. O'Reilly III. (1985), "The impact of information on job choices and turnover," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 28, 4, pp. 934-943.
- Caston, R. J. and R. Braitto. (1985), "The worker-to-job "fit" hypothesis," *Work and Occupations*, Vol. 12, 3, pp. 269-284.
- Cohen, J. and D. M. Hanno. (1993), "An analysis of underlying constructs affecting the choice of accounting as a major," *Issues in Accounting Education* Vol. 8, 2, pp. 219-238.
- Davidson, R. A. and J. T. Dalby. (1995), "A comparison of the personalities of accounting faculty and public accountants," *Accounting Educators' Journal* Vol. 7, 1, pp. 54-71.
- Dawis, R. V. (1990), "Vocational interests, values, and preferences," In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc).
- Felton, S., N. Buhr, and M. Northey. (1994), "Factors influencing the business student's choice of a career in chartered accountancy," *Issues in Accounting Education* Vol. 9, 1, pp. 131-141.
- Gatewood, R. D. and H. Feild. (1998), *Human Resource Selection* (Orlando, FL: Dryden).
- Gottfredson, G. D. (1977), "Career stability and redirection in adulthood," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 62, 4, pp. 436-445.
- Hair, J. F., Jr., R. E. Anderson, and R. L. Tatham. (1995), *Multivariate Data Analysis* (New York: Macmillan).
- Hall, D. T. (1976), *Careers in Organizations* (Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear).
- Hasselback, J.R. (1996), *Accounting Faculty Directory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- Holland, J. L. (1966), *The Psychology of Vocational Choice: A Theory of Personality Types and Model Environments* (Waltham, MA: Blaisdell).
- _____. (1973), *Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Careers* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- _____. (1985), *Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Vocational Personalities and Work Environments* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- Knoop, R. (1991), "Achievement of work values and participative decision making," *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 68, 3, pp. 775-781.
- Locke, E. A. (1976), "The nature and causes of job satisfaction," In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial Organizational Psychology* (Chicago: Rand McNally).
- Newell, G., S. Langsam, and J. Kreuze. (1996), "Accounting Faculty Profiles: Demographics and Perceptions of Academia," *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 72, 2, pp. 87-93.
- O'Reilly III, C. (1982), "Variations in decision makers' use of information sources: The impact of quality and accessibility of information," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 25, 4, pp. 756-771.
- Paolillo, J. G. P. and R. W. Estes. (1982), "An empirical analysis of career choice factors among

- accountants, attorneys, engineers and physicians,” *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 62, 4, pp. 785-793.
- Reid, A. E. (1979), “The development of work-related attitudes and behavior of professional recruits: A test of the functional argument,” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 20, 4, pp. 338-351.
- Schein, E. H. (1996), “Career anchors revisited: Implications for career development in the 21st century,” *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 10, 4, pp. 80-88.
- Scott, R. W. 1997, “The AICPA’s technology vision,” *Accounting Technology*, Vol. 13, 5, pp. 18-26.
- Siegel, S. and N. J. Castellan, Jr. (1988), *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill).
- Super, D. E. (1957), *The Psychology of Careers* (New York: Harper).
- U.S. Department of Labor (1977), *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office).
- U.S. Department of Labor (1998), *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office).
- Wilk, S.L., L. B. Desmaris, and P. R. Sackett. (1995), “Gravitation to jobs commensurate with ability: Longitudinal and cross-sectional tests,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* Vol. 80, 1, pp. 79-85.

**Table 1: Factor Loadings for Items Influencing
Current Career Choice**

Responses to "I felt this career would provide"

<i>Lifestyle</i> ($\alpha = 0.84$)	
Flexibility to set my own work hours	.80
Time to spend with family	.70
Autonomy	.51
Opportunity to help people	.40
Enjoyable occupation	.52
Flexibility to take time off	.83
Desirable lifestyle	.83
<i>Financial Security</i> ($\alpha = 0.81$)	
Opportunity for advancement	.59
Financial rewards	.84
Opportunity for additional income	.72
High earnings potential	.89
Job security	.58
Prestige	.50
<i>Motivators</i> ($\alpha = 0.76$)	
Opportunity to engage in problem-solving	.55
Great deal of variety	.59
Challenging tasks	.75
Opportunity to achieve personal goals	.62
Opportunity to learn new things	.76
<i>Nature of Work</i> ($\alpha = 0.72$)	
Freedom of expression	.66
Cooperative co-workers	.63
Recognition for a job well done	.65
Opportunity to express myself creatively	.57
Opportunity to make decisions	.49
<i>Work Roles</i> ($\alpha = 0.91$)	
Well-defined job expectations	.91
Clearly-defined job responsibilities	.90

Note: This table includes standardized Cronbach's alphas for each factor and the factor loadings for each item included in each of the given factors.

**Table 2: Factor Loadings for Work Values Present
in Current Career**

<i>Lifestyle</i> ($\alpha= 0.85$)	
Freedom of expression	.55
Flexibility to set my own work hours	.68
Time to spend with family	.78
Little stress	.57
Autonomy	.56
Enjoyable occupation	.55
Flexibility to take time off	.81
Desirable lifestyle	.80
<i>Financial Security</i> ($\alpha= 0.76$)	
Financial rewards	.77
Opportunity for additional income	.85
High earnings potential	.58
<i>Motivators</i> ($\alpha= 0.72$)	
Opportunity to express myself creatively	.50
Great deal of variety	.56
Challenging tasks	.63
Opportunity to help people	.64
Opportunity to learn new things	.72
<i>Nature of Work</i> ($\alpha= 0.72$)	
Opportunity to engage in problem-solving	.75
Opportunity to make decisions	.74
<i>Work Roles</i> ($\alpha= 0.79$)	
Cooperative co-workers	.55
Well-defined job expectations	.88
Clearly-defined job responsibilities	.87
<i>Recognition</i> ($\alpha= 0.78$)	
Recognition for a job well done	.59
Opportunity for advancement	.75
Opportunity to work for a prestigious organization	.69
Opportunity to achieve personal goals	.50
Prestige	.72

Note: This table includes standardized Cronbach's alphas for each factor and the factor loadings for each item included in each of the given factors.

Table 3: Factor Loadings for Work-Related Abilities

Management abilities ($\alpha = 0.91$)	
Plan work for others	.64
Supervise work of others	.73
Recruit employees	.72
Listen to and to interpret requests	.66
Conduct audits	.42
Assess performance of others	.74
Serve clients/customers	.60
Interpret and communicate information	.44
Exercise leadership	.73
Allocate human resources	.78
Participate as a member of a team/committee	.55
Delegate	.69
Make decisions	.52
Training abilities ($\alpha = 0.86$)	
Teach/train others	.72
Monitor and correct performance	.39
Make oral presentations	.49
Design learning experiences for others	.72
Effectively convey knowledge to others	.81
Stimulate learning	.73
Explain theory to others	.61
Explain complex procedures to others	.61
Technology abilities ($\alpha = 0.84$)	
Use computers to process information	.81
Maintain and troubleshoot technology	.75
Select technology	.71
Apply technology to tasks	.72
Research abilities ($\alpha = 0.89$)	
Design research studies	.83
Write research papers	.83
Conduct independent research	.85
Apply statistical procedures to research questions	.79
Analytical abilities ($\alpha = 0.73$)	
Solve problems	.67
Acquire and evaluate information	.63
Understand technical written materials	.62
Work with little or no supervision	.48
Apply knowledge	.61
Accounting abilities ($\alpha = 0.96$)	
Prepare balance sheets	.92
Prepare profit and loss statements	.91

Note: This table includes standardized Cronbach's alphas for each factor and the factor loadings for each item included in each of the given factors.

**Table 4: Factor Loadings for Skills
Required by Job**

<i>Communication skills</i> ($\alpha = 0.63$)	
Written communication skills	.58
Oral communication skills	.84
Interpersonal skills	.68
 <i>Supervisory skills</i> ($\alpha = 0.81$)	
Listening skills	.61
Leadership skills	.86
Delegation skills	.83
Decision-making skills	.74
 <i>Thinking skills</i> ($\alpha = 0.78$)	
Critical thinking skills	.87
Analytical skills	.87
Creative skills	.49

Note: This table includes standardized Cronbach's alphas for each factor and the factor loadings for each item included in each of the given factors.

**Table 5: Work Values Factors — Influence on Career Choice
Panel A: ANCOVA Results**

<u>Source</u>	<u>Lifestyle</u>	<u>Motivators</u>	<u>Work Roles</u>	<u>Financial Security</u>	<u>Nature of Work</u>
Job Type	148.86 (0.000)	0.013 (0.909)	0.269 (0.605)	39.98 (0.000)	10.88 (0.001)
Tenure (covariate)	0.028 (0.867)	0.090 (0.765)	0.369 (0.544)	0.193 (0.661)	0.509 (0.476)
Model adj R ²	0.407	-0.009	-0.007	0.154	0.046

This panel presents ANCOVA results using each of the career choice factors from Table 1. The independent variable for this analysis is job type (accounting practitioner or accounting faculty) and the covariate is tenure (length of time in career).

Panel B: Group Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Accounting Faculty</u>		<u>Accounting Practitioners</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Lifestyle	4.1700	0.6393	2.9502	0.8142
Financial Security	2.7524	0.7659	3.4700	0.8519
Motivators	3.7141	0.7428	3.7313	0.7820
Nature of work	3.1250	0.8562	2.7461	0.7470
Work roles	2.4331	0.9606	2.5000	0.9475

This panel presents means and standard deviations of work values factors influencing career choice for accounting faculty and accounting practitioners.

**Table 6: Work Values Factors — Present in Current Career
Panel A: ANCOVA Results**

<u>Source</u>	<u>Lifestyle</u>	<u>Motivators</u>	<u>Work Roles</u>	<u>Financial Security</u>	<u>Nature of Work</u>	<u>Recognition</u>
Job Type	40.900	9.138	6.930	23.743	16.860	5.690
	(0.000)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.018)
Tenure	1.313	2.461	3.177	0.333	0.889	0.706
(covariate)	(0.253)	(0.118)	(0.076)	(0.565)	(0.347)	(0.402)
Model adj R ²	0.167	0.050	0.030	0.098	0.075	0.024

This table presents ANCOVA results using each of the factors present in current career from Table 2. The independent variable for this analysis is job type (accounting practitioner or accounting faculty) and the covariate is tenure (length of time in career).

Panel B: Group Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Accounting Faculty</u>		<u>Accounting Practitioners</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Lifestyle	3.8334	0.6890	3.2099	0.7097
Financial Security	2.8732	0.9859	3.5455	0.8535
Motivators	4.0278	0.5474	3.7830	0.6963
Nature of work	3.7324	0.8561	4.2500	0.7731
Work roles	3.0610	0.9433	3.3599	0.7833
Recognition	3.2239	0.7977	3.5250	0.7094

This panel presents means and standard deviations of work values factors present in the current careers of accounting faculty and accounting practitioners.

**Table 7: Abilities Possessed Factors
Panel A: ANCOVA Results**

<u>Source</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Accounting</u>	<u>Training</u>	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Analytical</u>
Job Type	11.645 (0.000)	51.804 (0.000)	3.139 (0.078)	53.148 (0.000)	13.423 (0.000)	2.608 (0.108)
Tenure (covariate)	0.870 (0.352)	11.407 (0.001)	0.141 (0.707)	0.116 (0.733)	3.275 (0.072)	0.812 (0.369)
Model adj R ²	0.042	0.198	0.005	0.195	0.073	0.005

This table presents ANCOVA results using each of the abilities factors from Table 3. The independent variable for this analysis is job type (accounting practitioner or accounting faculty) and the covariate is tenure (length of time in career).

Panel B: Group Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Accounting Faculty</u>		<u>Accounting Practitioners</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Management	4.0995	0.5952	4.3311	0.4686
Training	4.5201	0.4113	4.0397	0.5734
Technology	3.7162	0.7149	4.1289	0.6632
Research	4.0540	0.8541	3.2870	0.8318
Analytical	4.5718	0.3687	4.6467	0.3445
Accounting	4.7324	0.5576	4.8556	0.3912

This panel presents means and standard deviations of abilities possessed factors for accounting faculty and accounting practitioners.

**Table 8: Skills Required Factors
Panel A: ANCOVA Results**

<u>Source</u>	<u>Communication</u>	<u>Thinking</u>	<u>Supervisory</u>
Job Type	20.981 (0.000)	4.026 (0.046)	17.029 (0.000)
Tenure (covariate)	0.136 (0.713)	0.031 (0.861)	5.090 (0.025)
Model adj R ²	0.082	0.010	0.074

This table presents ANCOVA results using each of the skills required factors from Table 4. The independent variable for this analysis is job type (accounting practitioner or accounting faculty) and the covariate is tenure (length of time in career).

Panel B: Group Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Accounting Faculty</u>		<u>Accounting Practitioners</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Communication	4.7700	0.3080	4.5074	0.5028
Thinking	4.4765	0.5332	4.3259	0.5428
Supervisory	4.0082	0.7172	4.3361	0.5673

This panel presents means and standard deviations of skills required factors of accounting faculty and accounting practitioners.