

Management Science Editorial Statement August 2018

Effective September 1, 2018, Brian Bushee will be joining Suraj Srinivasan as a co-departmental editor for the accounting track at Management Science (MS). We would like to thank Shiva Rajgopal, who is stepping down due to increased administrative commitments, for all of his work in increasing the number of submissions and quality of publications during the last three years.

We wanted to take this opportunity to encourage you to consider submitting your work to MS. Our goal is to position MS as a competitive top-tier outlet for accounting-related papers. In addition to mainstream work, we particularly welcome submissions of papers that fit into one or more of these categories:

- **Examine issues important to managers and practitioners;** i.e., would a manager, investor, consultant, regulator, etc. find the paper relevant and timely?
- **Explore new data sets, new theories, and new phenomena,** without an overriding concern about perfect identification strategies or eliminating all possible sources of endogeneity.
- **Span the intersection of accounting and other fields,** such as risk management, data science, strategy, operations, finance, entrepreneurship, healthcare, marketing, etc.
- **Use whatever methodology is best suited to the research question,** be it archival, big data, experimental, theoretical, field surveys, interviews, or clinical/small sample.
- **Embrace multi-method approaches,** such as integrating mathematical theory with archival data analysis or combining survey, interview, and experimental evidence.

We believe that MS provides the following benefits to authors submitting their work:

- **MS is viewed as a top-tier journal at most schools.** We surveyed 86 senior accounting faculty at 44 top schools that write over 480 tenure letters per year. Their answers indicated that MS is viewed as an “A” journal at the school level at a majority of institutions (68% said MS is perceived as an “A” journal). When writing tenure letters, 51% of the respondents said they would count MS as an A for Top 10 schools, increasing to 75% for Top 11-25 and 85% for Top 26-50 schools (please contact us if you would like to see the full survey results). Our goal is to further improve these numbers.
- **We require fewer rounds to reach a decision.** While we strive to minimize the turnaround time on each round, the more important factor in speeding up the review process is to reduce the number of rounds. Our policy is to only use reviewers for two rounds. Thus, in almost all cases, authors will receive a minor revision or reject decision after submitting their first revision. We will also desk reject papers, providing a faster decision for papers that are unlikely to be published in MS.

- **We aim to provide clear guidance in our R&R decision letters.** Berk, Harvey and Hirshleifer (2015) (<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2547191>) suggest clearly separating review comments into (i) items that must be addressed to make the paper publishable; and (ii) items that don't impact the publishability of the paper but are just suggestions. We will emphasize (i) instead of (ii) in providing R&R guidance. Once we believe in the paper, we will work with you to make it a better product.
- **We welcome authors' suggestions on reviewers and associate editors for their submissions.** We recognize that authors often have a good sense for who might provide the best assessment and guidance on their specific papers. While we cannot always honor these suggestions due to workload or conflict issues, we try to use the suggestions whenever possible to provide expert advice on the paper.
- **MS offers a Fast Track process for short papers with original, high-quality, and high-impact research.** These papers should be no more than 5,000 words (about 16 double-spaced pages). They will undergo faster review, with decisions to accept with modest revisions or reject in no more than four weeks. Please feel free to contact us about whether a paper may be appropriate Fast Track before submitting.

We hope you will support our effort to provide a competitive top-tier alternative for accounting-related papers by submitting your work and by reviewing manuscripts for the journal.

Brian Bushee
Suraj Srinivasan

Management Science Survey Results 1 June 2018

Methodology

- We emailed 100 professors at 47 schools.
- By primary topic area, there were 78 Financial, 11 Managerial, 6 Tax, and 5 Audit.
- By primary method, there were 75 Archival (WRDS) Data, 12 Experimental or Field Data, and 13 Analytical
- All professors were senior, tenured faculty that were likely to have had committee and letter writer experience in the tenure process.
- We did not ask about perceptions of *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *Journal of Accounting Research*, or *The Accounting Review*. These journals are universally considered “A” journals in accounting.

Responses

- As of 1 June 2018, we received responses from 86 faculty (86%) at 44 schools (93.6%)
- Based on the respondents estimates, they write a combined total of over 480 tenure letters per year, with an average (median) of 6.1 (5).
- Around 10% of the respondents did not provide direct answers to the questions. They either provided a narrative description of journal perceptions or stated that quality matters more than outlet. Many that did answer the questions also provided narrative comments; these appear in Appendix 2.
- Although we did not ask for these perceptions, 16 respondents volunteered that the quality of the paper would trump its publication outlet in the perception of the paper and 13 respondents stated that journal perceptions differ by research area (e.g., MS has a higher perception for Managerial than Financial). These responses are likely lower bounds on these opinions since we did not prompt for these assessments.

Executive Summary

- At the department level, *Review of Accounting Studies* (RAST) has a higher perception (42% perceive it is as an “A”) than *Management Science* (MS) (38%) and *Contemporary Accounting Research* (CAR) (27%).
- At the school level, MS has a higher perception (68% “A”) than RAST (39%) and CAR (27%).
- These results are similar when only using one observation per school. Interestingly, there is often disagreement among people from the same school about these journal perceptions (even when there is a list).
- The likelihood of letter writers considering MS an A increases for lower-tier schools: 51% are willing to count it as an A for Top 10 schools, increasing to 75% (Top 11-25), 85% (Top 26-50), and 90% (All other).
- Half of schools report a journal list (50%). Another 16% had mixed responses on whether there was a journal list (suggesting it was used more informally at such schools), and the remaining 34% reported that they had no journal list.
- In cross-sectional analysis, perceptions of MS are higher among respondents at schools with journal lists and among researchers using field or experimental data.
- We received some unsolicited positive narrative comments about the upward trajectory of MS; about MS being a good outlet for papers that bridge disciplines; and about MS being rated higher for papers in fields that are under-served by the top three journals.

Results for Questions 1 and 2:

- How do you think your **department/school** would generally categorize the following journals when discussing a tenure case? Please type A, A-, or B+ after each one.
- Individual responses:

	Department						School					
	CAR		MS		RAST		CAR		MS		RAST	
A	21	26.9%	29	37.7%	33	42.3%	21	26.6%	54	68.4%	31	39.2%
A/A-	2	2.6%	6	7.8%	2	2.6%	3	3.8%	4	5.1%	3	3.8%
A-	37	47.4%	34	44.2%	39	50.0%	38	48.1%	17	21.5%	41	51.9%
A-/B+	3	3.8%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%
B+	12	15.4%	6	7.8%	3	3.8%	13	16.5%	4	5.1%	3	3.8%
B+/B	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
B	3	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Subtotal	78	100.0%	77	100.0%	78	100.0%	79	100.0%	79	100.0%	79	100.0%
No Ans	8		9		8		7		7		7	
Total	86		86		86		86		86		86	

- One response per school (we used the average response when they differed):

	Department						School					
	CAR		MS		RAST		CAR		MS		RAST	
A	12	27.3%	14	31.8%	18	40.9%	10	22.7%	28	63.6%	15	34.1%
A/A-	6	13.6%	5	11.4%	6	13.6%	8	18.2%	6	13.6%	9	20.5%
A-	14	31.8%	20	45.5%	17	38.6%	15	34.1%	7	15.9%	17	38.6%
A-/B+	7	15.9%	2	4.5%	3	6.8%	6	13.6%	2	4.5%	3	6.8%
B+	4	9.1%	3	6.8%	0	0.0%	4	9.1%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%
B+/B	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
B	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	44	100.0%	44	100.0%	44	100.0%	44	100.0%	44	100.0%	44	100.0%

- An interesting aspect of this data is that different respondents from the same school often had different answers to the questions. Part of this difference is likely due to the unclear definitions of "A", "A-", etc. But, part of it also seemed to derive differences in personal opinions. We asked for six assessments; these tables show the number of schools with different levels of agreements and the mean percent of agreement partitioned by whether the school has a journal list.

	Number	Journal List	Mean Pct Agree
Only one response	17	Yes	82.6%
Agree on 6 of 6	6	Maybe	50.0%
Agree on 5 of 6	3	No	67.9%
Agree on 4 of 6	6		
Agree on 3 of 6	4		
Agree on 2 of 6	5		
Agree on 1 of 6	0		
Agree on 0 of 6	4		
	44		

Results for Question 3:

- As a tenure letter writer, if you were asked to count the number of A publications on someone's vita, for which of the following categories of schools would you consider Management Science to be an A publication in your count? Please type Y or N after each one.
- Individual responses:

	Top 10		Top 11-25		Top 25-50		All other	
Yes	39	50.6%	59	74.7%	67	84.8%	71	89.9%
Maybe	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	3	3.8%	1	1.3%
No	37	48.1%	20	25.3%	9	11.4%	7	8.9%
Subtotal	77	100.0%	79	100.0%	79	100.0%	79	100.0%
No Ans	9		7		7		7	
Total	86		86		86		86	

Results for Question 4:

- Does your school use a "journal list" to assess journal quality? Y or N
- One response per school (if different, coded as "Maybe"):

	List	
Yes	22	50.0%
Maybe	7	15.9%
No	15	34.1%
Total	44	100.0%

Regression Analysis:

- An obvious question is whether some groups view MS more highly than others do. A problem with doing a series of simple partitions is that they are unlikely to be independent in the small sample of the survey. Thus, to attempt to partial out the effects, we did a simple linear probability model with a series of indicators for whether the journal was perceived to be an “A” journal (e.g. DMS_A = 1 if respondent perceived MS to be an A, 0 otherwise). Results were similar with continuous measures of journal perceptions.
- First, we included indicators for main topic area of the respondent (DTAX, DMGR, DAUD, with Financial as the omitted group), along with indicators for whether the respondent thought the school used a journal list (DLIST), for whether the respondent writes more than the median (4) number of letters (DHILETT), and for whether the respondent voluntarily added that “quality matters” or “we read the papers” (DQUAL).
- Here are the results for whether the **DEPARTMENT** considers the journal an A (t-stats are in parentheses):

	DCAR_A		DMS_A		DRAST_A	
Intercept	0.215	(2.425)	0.311	(3.025)	0.246	(2.472)
DTAX	-0.059	(-0.284)	0.015	(0.064)	-0.104	(-0.449)
DMGR	-0.055	(-0.369)	0.043	(0.247)	-0.111	(-0.660)
DAUD	-0.250	(-1.105)	0.136	(0.518)	-0.227	(-0.894)
DLIST	0.247	(2.521)	0.114	(1.005)	0.260	(2.364)
DHILETT	-0.061	(-0.609)	-0.019	(-0.165)	0.101	(0.894)
DQUAL	-0.169	(-1.187)	0.042	(0.255)	0.103	(0.644)

- Very few coefficients are significant. Descriptively, Audit and Managerial researchers were more likely to say their departments viewed MS as an A than Financial researchers (omitted group). Schools with journal lists are more likely to view each of these journals as an A.
- Here are the results for whether the **SCHOOL** considers the journal an A (t-stats are in parentheses):

	DCAR_A		DMS_A		DRAST_A	
Intercept	0.219	(2.475)	0.630	(6.716)	0.261	(2.651)
DTAX	0.119	(0.580)	-0.106	(-0.484)	-0.071	(-0.313)
DMGR	-0.165	(-1.108)	0.031	(0.196)	-0.19	(-1.146)
DAUD	-0.256	(-1.133)	0.127	(0.530)	0.085	(0.338)
DLIST	0.241	(2.462)	0.235	(2.258)	0.275	(2.523)
DHILETT	-0.084	(-0.838)	-0.223	(-2.095)	-0.031	(-0.280)
DQUAL	-0.081	(-0.566)	0.172	(1.138)	0.162	(1.024)

- Note that the Intercept for MS is much higher than in the department results (consistent with the univariates). Otherwise, the results are similar, with the DLIST coefficient having a much higher t-stat for MS. Also, high letter writers (DHILETT) are less likely to consider MS an A.
- Those who added comments about the “quality” of the paper mattering the most are slightly more likely to think that MS would be viewed as an A at the school level (though not significant). This is consistent with MS being an A in other fields, making it more likely that a high quality Accounting paper in MS is also considered A.

- Next, we included indicators for main methodology of the respondent (DFIELD = 1 if uses field data or experimental data; DMATH = 1 if uses analytical models; the omitted group are researchers that use archival (WRDS) data).
- Here are the results for whether the **DEPARTMENT** considers the journal an A (t-stats are in parentheses):

	DCAR_A		DMS_A		DRAST_A	
Intercept	0.225	(2.502)	0.350	(3.447)	0.269	(2.672)
DFIELD	0.045	(0.308)	0.223	(1.342)	-0.164	(-0.992)
DMATH	-0.182	(-1.165)	-0.278	(-1.575)	-0.189	(-1.080)
DLIST	0.248	(2.558)	0.106	(0.972)	0.258	(2.378)
DHILETT	-0.095	(-0.944)	-0.058	(-0.510)	0.081	(0.722)
DQUAL	-0.187	(-1.348)	0.043	(0.276)	0.084	(0.540)

- Again, very few coefficients are significant. Descriptively, Field data (Analytical) researchers were more (less) likely to say their departments viewed MS as an A than WRDS data researchers, who are the omitted group.
- Here are the results for whether the **SCHOOL** considers the journal an A (t-stats are in parentheses):

	DCAR_A		DMS_A		DRAST_A	
Intercept	0.231	(2.549)	0.623	(6.551)	0.275	(2.749)
DFIELD	-0.075	(-0.507)	0.168	(1.079)	-0.123	(-0.747)
DMATH	-0.198	(-1.255)	-0.025	(-0.154)	-0.184	(-1.059)
DLIST	0.248	(2.542)	0.233	(2.271)	0.275	(2.555)
DHILETT	-0.107	(-1.053)	-0.231	(-2.175)	-0.033	(-0.295)
DQUAL	-0.080	(-0.569)	0.159	(1.083)	0.148	(0.958)

- Similar results with Field data researchers more likely to think that MS would be viewed as an A at the school level.
- Finally, we created a letter writer score (LW_SCORE) to measure perceptions of MS as a letter writer. LW_SCORE = 4 if the respondent would consider MS an A at all schools, = 3 if consider an A at all but the Top 10 schools; = 2 for all but the Top 25; = 1 for all but the Top 50; = 0 if never consider MS an A.

	LW_SCORE			LW_SCORE	
Intercept	1.559	(5.266)	Intercept	1.495	(5.122)
DTAX	0.065	(0.094)	DFIELD	1.442	(3.014)
DMGR	0.493	(0.985)	DMATH	0.197	(0.388)
DAUD	1.361	(1.797)	DLIST	1.017	(3.233)
DLIST	1.022	(3.116)	DHILETT	0.569	(1.742)
DHILETT	0.579	(1.725)	DQUAL	0.563	(1.251)
DQUAL	0.539	(1.131)			

- Audit and Field-based researchers are more likely to consider MS an A when writing letters, as are researchers from LIST schools.

Narrative comments:

- We did not solicit open-ended comments, but many respondents decided to supplement their answers with additional explanations. The full verbatim comments are listed in Appendix 2.
- Here are some of the themes that emerged from the comments:
 - A few people noted that MS has an upward trajectory in accounting and expressed the hope that MS would become a clear A journal for the discipline.
 - Some stated that MS was viewed as a good outlet for accounting papers that had implications for fields beyond accounting and for papers with field-based data.
 - Some people said that a vita full of MS papers (or CAR or RAST) would not be enough for tenure, but that one MS paper would “count” if it were “rounding out” a vita with many of the traditional top-three pubs.
 - Some people said that schools have lists by department. While MS is usually not on the Accounting department list, it is on the list for other departments, and that sometimes helps at the school level.
 - Some noted that there are field differences, whereby a management accounting paper in MS would be considered A but a financial accounting paper would not be. The reason is that the traditional top-three are perceived to have a bias toward financial accounting papers.
 - Many said that they do not care about the status of the journal, but instead read the papers to assess their quality (editorial comment: if only everyone thought like this!).
 - For the letter writer question, many said that they never count and/or they never change their impression of the journal based on the status of the school they are writing for.

Appendix 1: List of schools

Boston College
Boston University
Carnegie Mellon University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Dartmouth College
Duke University
Emory University
Harvard University
Indiana University Bloomington
INSEAD
London Business School
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
New York University
Northwestern University
Rice University
Stanford University
Temple University
The Ohio State University
The Pennsylvania State University
The University of British Columbia
The University of Chicago
The University of Georgia
The University of Iowa
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
The University of Texas at Austin
The University of Texas at Dallas
The University of Utah
UCLA
UC-San Diego
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Irvine
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Florida
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
University of Notre Dame
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
University of Southern California
University of Toronto
University of Washington-Seattle
Washington University
Yale University

Appendix 2: Narrative comments

General comments about MS:

- I have had a very positive experience with MS. I submitted a paper that used data from a single company to JFE and JAR with pretty poor quality reviews. The MS review was much more constructive and made very good suggestions that enabled significant improvements to the paper.
- I'll be curious to see what you come up with on Management Science. I've always thought of it as a top journal where you go if a paper has an accounting angle, but doesn't fit cleanly into a pure accounting journal.
- I love Management Science. I think they have been publishing really interesting articles in behavioral capital markets – esp in finance.
- MS being elevated to an A would be a good outcome. I vote for more competition among journals, esp. at the A level.
- MS is gaining fast and definitely getting close. I would love to see it join the ranks of clear A. I am glad to help if you think of a way I could.
- I view MS as the go-to outlet for questions that are not purely accounting, but have implications for other disciplines.
- With the last several years of highly accomplished folks being editors and serving as associate editors, I would seriously consider submitting papers to MS. Personally, I would be delighted to get my paper published in MS.

Department evaluations

- MS is not considered an accounting journal for P&T purposes. I don't think it would be difficult to make the case for at least A- categorization for an accounting paper in MS (with JAAF, JAPP, AJPT, etc.) on the margin, but it is not categorized as such.
- We do not have a list and don't have journal grades. That being said, a case with only publications on this list would be unlikely to make it through unless the faculty agree that the papers were exceptionally good regardless of outlet. Publications in these journals would be seem as a plus in addition to the top three accounting journals that are not mentioned in your email or stated on the list that we do not officially have.
- We don't categorize journals.
- We also read papers.
- We recognize three journals as top tier: TAR, JAR, JAE, and recognize that AOS, CAR, RAST are top tier at many schools and we would recognize them as top tier. Management Science is currently not on our "list" of top accounting journals. We did not include it in our list since it is pretty new and if we included it then people could argue for a whole host of journals to be included. I think without reading the paper, the general view would be that it as perhaps slightly below a top journal, so an A- journal.
- Because we have a lot of experimental people, and they don't get access to JAR and JAE, we formally consider CAR a A journal, for example. But then at the department or school level, when push comes to shove, the accepted understanding is that there IS a difference between the top 3 and the other journals we consider A.
- Management Science is B+, unless perhaps the work is really geared toward a management audience, as opposed to an accounting paper that couldn't get into one of the top three accounting journals, which many times is the case

- We don't really have a ranking like this. But these in general would not be considered in the very top group. But one of these pubs here and there would help round out a cv but it wouldn't really 'count' as a top tier hit.
- As a department we probably would distinguish management accounting from financial. For management accounting, we would probably rate MS as an A since it is one of the major outlets for management accounting work. For financial accounting, we would probably rate all three journals as A- or B+ depending on the faculty member.
- In general we don't categorize like this but rather assess the candidate's overall scholarly contributions and prospects. However, if forced to give a letter grade i'd say that we'd give an "a" to all three of these journals.
- My sense is that the accounting community values MS significantly lower than other groups, say operations. In some areas, MS is viewed as an A. But I don't think this is the perception in accounting.
- CAR and RAST are on our list of A journals (along with TAR, JAR, and JAE). Mgmt Science is on the list of A journals for Op Mgmt and so it can count as an A for other disciplines. However, I think if someone had ONLY CAR or RAST or Mgmt Science, there would be concern. So while these journals are listed as A journals, I think they are implicitly discounted a bit.
- We don't care as much about the status of these journals. We read the papers in the packet.
- Management Science: Not sure yet as we don't have enough experience as authors, reviewers, associate editors, and/or members of internal review cases with publications in MS showing up in a significant way. MS approximately equal to RAST, with both somewhat above CAR.
- We focus much more on the impact of the paper than where it was published.
- My sense is that our group generally regards the following accounting journals (listed in no particular order) as high-quality: Accounting Review, Journal of Accounting and Economics, Journal of Accounting Research, Contemporary Accounting Research, Review of Accounting Studies, Management Science. A few might also include Accounting Organizations and Society. As you are no doubt aware, there are some subject-matter differences and other differences among these journals that could affect the relative ranking within the group of six journals. In addition, and as you know, Management Science is distinguished from the five accounting-only journals in that it is departmentalized (separated into subject-matter departments) and this characteristic may affect some assessments (it does not affect mine).
- Frankly, I am not sure we necessarily use these letter grades to classify these journals; the above answers reflect more my interpretations than any set of guidelines/rules I have seen
- Management Science: A- (i.e., below CAR or RAST) if it is an accounting, finance, or management case. In contrast, if it is an operations management case, then Management Science would be categorized as an A.
- And we focus on the quality of each paper (based on our assessment and that of letter writers), not the journal it was published in. Therefore my answers below are estimates of informal averages of assessments of papers in those journals.
- For context, we just redid our evaluation system this year. All three of the journals you mention above were ranked as "A-" for promotion. While we would consider them equivalent, we did discuss whether RAST should be an A, which we did not discuss with the others. In our prior list, MS was a B+, but it was unanimous among the committee that it is now an A-.
- MS is an A journal for one of our departments, so technically it is an A journal for all departments. For purposes of tenure, though, I suspect it would be considered less than A, particularly for marginal cases. For purposes of promotion to full, it would be considered an A journal.

- I personally believe Management Science is an A journal and I rank it close to RAST or slightly higher. Our school's list currently only has MS as an A journal for the IROM department, and MS does not appear on the list for accounting or for finance. I believe it should. We are probably a bit behind times.
- I think the move towards just saying a paper is good because it is published in a "top tier" accounting journal is problematic since many papers published in the top three are never cited.
- One qualifier I would add - while I rate the journals below as "As", the Department, the College, and myself as a letter writer, view The Accounting Review, Journal of Accounting Research, and Journal of Accounting and Economics as the "top three". It would be difficult for someone to get through the tenure process without at least one publication in the top 3.
- while we do have a list that the area uses, there is a heavy emphasis on reading papers to assess "author signature/theme" and quality rather than using number counts against a list (for example, a top 5 might not be valued if there is no theme or if it's not that good of a paper even though it's top 5).
- My responses to your questions are categorized into financial accounting (FA) and managerial accounting (MA), because these two groups use slightly different metrics.
- We do not count publications or assign "grades" to journals in the personnel review process. So, my responses below for the department and the school are based on my conjectures and do not reflect any actual procedure in place here.
- For what it is worth, I think there are relatively few MS papers in accounting that live up to the A reputation of MS in other disciplines. On average, the quality of papers I get at TAR (as an editor) is stronger, while the quality of the papers I get at CAR (as AE) and RAST (as a reviewer) seems more comparable to MS

School evaluations:

- Three As in our department area plus one business school A will get you tenure in accounting; four business As but no Accounting As will not. In this sense, the three journals are equivalent for school level P&T decisions in that with three Accounting As (JAE, JAR, TAR), they will get you to the bar. MS counts as a department A for management but not for other disciplines.
- because of our strong Operations Management group, and the fact that MS is multi-disciplinary so Marketing and others are aware of it, I think it is a pretty easy sell here. Hence it might easily be considered an A journal without much discussion
- Since we have experimental researchers on our faculty, our journal list includes the "top 6" (but it is pretty much the top 3 and then the next 3 in terms of how we rate them). Having said that, we count TAR, JAR, JAE, RAST, CAR, and AOS as "A" journals, but we are cognizant of the fact that the top 3 journals are clearly better in quality. We would have a hard time tenuring someone without any top 3 publications and stronger records include more in the top 3 than in the next 3. Also, Management Science isn't on our journal list. However, it is on the "A" list for other departments. Thus, it would still count for an accounting candidate being considered for P&T.
- CAR and RAST would be recognized as I stated above, as top tier. Management Science is viewed as top tier in many groups (management, information systems, operations management) but is viewed as below top tier in Finance and since we are closest to Finance in terms of discipline, people at the school would probably view it as A-.
- Management Science (A, at least until a P&T committee member or outside letter writer noted that Management Science is rarely the first (or second) choice of an author for accounting paper submissions)

- And if one of these got a lot of citations or was judged by the group/school to be a very good paper, it would increase the weight (for lack of a better word)
- It is possible that someone outside accounting would be more familiar with ms than with car or rast; however the accounting committee members would explain how accountants view the various journals
- We generally read papers and papers published in the journals below have been positively mentioned regardless of outlet. So in that sense, we don't rate or count them. Having said that, they would all be viewed as second tier as far as the journal is concerned. See above.
- The reason we have very limited accounting and finance journals in the A list is to make sure that the tenure candidates have a meaningful number of publications in those journals rather than have all of their publications in journals just below that. Whether that number is 4 or whatever for top-3 depends on the entire package and the research focus.
- MS somewhat above RAST somewhat above CAR
- I am aware that Management Science is a highly-regarded journal across several areas of the School; for example, some non-accounting faculty members of the School are involved with Management Science as editors or editorial board members. With regard to accounting-only journals, there is probably divergence of views within the School about the relative ranking of the five accounting journals in the group of journals I listed in response to your question 1.
- Management Science Perhaps as an A; I have seen this dichotomy between the department's perception and the school's perception for this journal in a few other schools as well.
- MGMT SCI rates A, because of its overall, non-accounting, reputation; so other departments respect it
- This is the trickiest. P&T committee thinks very highly of MS; is aware that accounting at MS is not quite that high and depends on accounting group's input, generally ends up treating MS as an A- for accounting. But there is willingness to consider it an A if we were to insist. We don't because external letter-writers in accounting mostly do not treat MS as an A.
- One question that I can answer unambiguously is that we do not have an official journal list. But of course, the top journals (e.g., top 3 or top 5) are well known. In addition, our Promotion and Tenure committee may rate a paper differently than the general journal reputation based on the committee's own read of the paper.
- I think CAR and RAST are viewed as top 5 but not top 3. I haven't seen any cases with MS though in our internal accounting cases so far.
- Outside accounting, my impression is MS is often viewed as a top journal from the cases in other areas that I saw when I was on our P&T committee.
- Overall, the way we think about journals here is based on whether it is top 3 in its field or not. So at the school level we benefit from the perception that Management Science is top 3 in Ops and Marketing and is therefore viewed as a top three publication (people do not separate between the field areas for Management Science which provides us a positive externality benefit). Given this, the department would likely give the benefit of the doubt and rank it an A, but most likely only if it is a one off publication. In other words, all publications or majority of publications in Management Science is unlikely to get one tenure in Accounting.
- This school wide perception is also important when comparing it to CAR or RAST, which are clearly accounting journals and are viewed as in the next three group. So while publication in these might be viewed more positively by the accounting community, Management Science is likely to have more weight in the School level tenure decision (again only a one off basis).
- For an accounting case, the school would follow our lead on the rankings. That is, all would be treated as A-. However, our view is that rankings of journals matter less for promotion decisions

than for annual reviews. At promotion time we have a large, diverse group of people reading the work in detail and providing feedback. Thus, we believe that it is entirely possible a publication in one of these journals would be deemed as "top quality" in some cases.

Letter writer comments:

- At the margin I would consider Management Science an A journal if it is the last piece of the puzzle (M = maybe; if forced, I would say N for top 25-50 school). If it is an Accounting paper in MS and related to other work in packet, I would give candidate the benefit of the doubt. But MS is still regarded as a journal that accounting researchers turn to after CAR and RAST, so it gets a bit down-weighted in my assessment.
- I would not presume to classify what constitutes an A journal at another school unless I was provided with their list. I might reference external journal lists such as the financial times list that includes all three of these journals.
- Top 10 school: Y (with the caveat that you probably shouldn't have more than 1 and at most 2 from this journal)
- I don't change my categorization of journals depending on the quality of the school asking for a letter. If I am pushed to categorize CAR, RAST, and Management Science then I wouldn't categorize any of them as an A journal for any school for which I would write a letter.
- there is a list consisting of six journals as stated above, but we use the list as guidance and so I think we would want maybe three in the top three, and a total of about 6 or 7 papers overall that are in top journals, so the remaining papers could come from AOS, CAR, RAST and other top journals such as Management Science. I think if someone only had CAR, RAST and Management Science, people could question the quality and so a stronger case would have to be made about the impact of the papers.
- I try to avoid counting A publications, though sometimes comment that Management Science is a top journal, particularly when writing for lower-ranked schools.
- The issue here isn't the school, it's simply that I don't consider Management Science to be an "A" publication for accountants. If the question is whether I would give tenure candidates in accounting some credit for Management Science publications, the answer is certainly "yes", but I wouldn't count it as much as TAR, JAE, or JAR at any school. Even authors at a No. 25 school will generally send a paper to TAR, JAE, and JAR before Management Science.
- For a person in management accounting, I would consider a MS article to be an A publication at any school. For financial accounting, I would rate it as an A for any school below the top 20, and an A- for schools in the top 20.
- All MS and not JAR/JAE/TARs would cause me to discount the MS as an A. However, if it's part of portfolio, it would be counted as an A.
- I never count it as an A publication regardless of school. The journal quality should be irrespective of the school one is writing for.
- Not officially. But it is implicit, and often explicit in outside letters. We usually refer to top 3 and second 3 and others.
- Some Top-25 Business Schools have relatively low research standards and the perception of Management Science can vary substantially between a school and a department.
- I view JAE, JAR, and TAR as superior accounting journals than MS
- I have not been explicitly asked to make this count. My analysis of Management Science or a paper published in Management Science would not vary based on the ranking of the school asking me the question.

- but I would want to see some in TAR, and/or JAR and/or JAE; not just all in CAR, MS or RAST (and JFE, RFS, JF also count as A's
- As I try not to count A publications, my answer below is a wild guess.
- my responses to this question are predicated on the premise of the question, that I am a tenure letter writer simply being asked to count A publications, rather than qualitatively assessing papers' contributions. In that role, I use my school's journal categorizations.
- I never talk of "A" journals per se unless it's not a very good school where their evaluations are likely simplistic counts mainly.
- Some of this is contingent on the rest of the record. If someone had 7 clear A's and one management science and my reading of the MS was that it is high quality, I would likely suggest be viewed as an A (I have in the past) even at the top schools. At all schools I would report it as a quality journal.