

# *Special Report*

## **Tedious**

### **An Investigative Series on CoB Faculty Research Credentials**

USMNEWS.net hears from readers from time to time, and one theme that has come across over the past three years pertains to the research records of CoB accounting professors Stanley Clark and Charles Jordan. Their heavily co-authored research profiles have been described as being overly represented by tedious studies of accounting standards amendments, and that much of their work is repetitive/redundant, perhaps in an effort to "pump up" their respective research credentials. That being said, the recent research on Google Scholar cites afforded USMNEWS.net reporters an opportunity to do at least a cursory examination of the records of Clark and Jordan. Some of the findings are reported below.

"Stock-Based Compensation Expenses under SFAS No. 123: Is it Material and How is it . . ."

CE Jordan

SB Ulsteen

*Journal of Business & Economic Perspectives, 1998*

#### **Cited By:**

"SFAS No. 123's Earnings Effect: Was it as Significant as Expected?"

SJ Clark

CE Jordan

GR Pate

Allied Academies presentation, 2001

This first exhibit is interesting. Two articles on SFAS No. 123, the first being published in a journal by Jordan and Ulsteen. The second looks close to the first, though it was written by Clark, Jordan and the CoB's Gwen Pate. Assuming continued writing on SFAS No. 123 passes the "smell test," at least two questions are raised: (1) Why wasn't Ulsteen involved in the second paper, given that he/she joined Jordan on the first? (2) Why was the second a conference paper? Relatedly, isn't academic research supposed to progress from conference to journal, and not the other way around?

"Accounting for Contributions under SFAS No. 116"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

HL Keasler

*Ohio CPA Journal, 1993*

"Accounting for Asset Impairment under SFAS No. 121"

SJ Clark

CE Jordan

*Ohio CPA Journal, 1996*

"SFAS 124: Accounting for Investments by Not-for-Profit Entities"

SJ Clark

CE Jordan

*National Public Accountant, 1997*

"FAS 128: Did it Make a Difference in Reporting EPS?"

CE Jordan

KK McNeely

SJ Clark

*Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance, 2002*

"SFAS No. 131 Results in Increased Segment Reporting for Banks"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

JC Sanders

*Bank Accounting & Finance, 2002*

With the panel above, we see that Clark and Jordan surround two analyses of SFAS No. 123 (panel 1 above) with separate analyses of SFAS Nos. 116, 121, 124, 128, and 131. This certainly supports the "tedious" comments.

"An Examination of Audit Reporting for Accounting Principles Changes"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

*Journal of Applied Business Research, 1996*

**Cited By:**

"Is it Time to Revise the Changes in Accounting Principle Reporting Guidelines under SAS No. 58?"

CE Jordan

WR Smith

SJ Clark

Allied Academies conference, 1998

"Audit Report Modifications for Changes in Accounting Principles: Are Auditors too Enthusiastic?"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

WR Smith

*Academy of Accounting & Financial Studies Journal, 1997*

**Cited By:**

"Is it Time to Revise the Changes in Accounting Principle Reporting Guidelines under SAS No. 58?"

CE Jordan

WR Smith

SJ Clark

Allied Academies conference, 1998

The panel above is interesting due to its circularity and its progression from academic journal (1996 and 1997) to academic conference (1998). Its authors - Clark, Jordan and CoB accountant Robert Smith - also make some interesting

choices vis-à-vis author ordering. Finally, the 1996 and 1997 articles look quite similar, to say the least.

"Earnings Management under SFAS No. 115: Evidence from the Insurance Industry"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

WR Smith

*Journal of Applied Business Research*, 1998

**Cited By:**

"Big Bath Earnings Management: The Case of Goodwill Impairment under SFAS No. 142"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

*Journal of Applied Business Research*, 2004

"Preliminary Evidence of SFAS No. 130's Effects on Gains Trading in the Insurance Industry"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

MH Anderson

*Journal of Applied Business Research*, 2002

The panel above adds analyses of SFAS Nos. 115, 130 and 142 to previous ones, creating a string of analyses encompassing SFAS Nos. 115, 116, 121, 124, 128, 130, 131 and 142.

"Comprehensive Income: How is it Being Reported and What are its Effects?"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

*Journal of Applied Business Research*, 2002

**Cited By:**

"Preliminary Evidence of SFAS No. 130's Effects on Gains Trading in the Insurance Industry"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

MH Anderson

*Journal of Applied Business Research*, 2002

"Using Goodwill Impairment to Effect Earnings Management during SFAS No. 142's Year of . . ."

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

CE Vann

*Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 2007

The final study in the panel just above mentions the phrase "Goodwill Impairment," which can also be found in the panel preceding it (in the study appearing in *JABR*, 2004). These two studies appear excessively redundant/repetitive. Finally, the sheer number of publications involving Clark and Jordan that appear in the *Journal of Applied Business Research* is more than disconcerting.

"Evidence on the Level of Corporate America's Participation in the Earnings Game"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

*National Accounting Journal*, 2003

**Cited By:**

"Unusual Digital Patterns in EPS: Evidence on the Association between Earnings Management and Company Characteristics"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

MM Anderson

*Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 2008

"Company Characteristics and the use of SFAS No. 143 to Effect Earnings Management"

CE Jordan

SJ Clark

MA Waldron

*Academy of Accounting & Financial Studies Journal*, 2007

The two studies above that cite the 2003 article look very similar to each other, to say the least. The first of these involves CoB accountant Mary *Morgan* Anderson, who makes her initial appearance in this report. Also, the inclusion of an analysis of SFAS No. 143 increases the analyses string to SFAS Nos. 115, 116, 121, 124, 128, 130, 131, 142 and 143.

Though USMNEWS.net op-ed contributors may, in the future, comment on the details of this report, USMNEWS.net readers are, of course, left to draw their own conclusions.