The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at
www.emeraldinsight.com/0951-3574.htm

The composition of editorial boards in accounting: a UK perspective

Tony Brinn and Michael John Jones
Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Received 18 September 2003
Revised 4 March 2005,
5 January 2006
Accepted 5 April 2006

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this research is to examine the composition of the editorial boards of 60 academic accounting journals with a particular focus on the university affiliations of editorial board members. The role of *ad hoc* reviewers is then analysed.

Design/methodology/approach – A detailed content analysis of the members of the 60 editorial boards was conducted. The authors concentrated on UK universities and journals, but also provide some data on non-UK schools and journals.

Findings – There were six main findings. First, editorial appointments were normally held by nationals of the country where the journal was published. Second, US academics had a significant presence on all boards. Third, there was a lack of penetration of UK academics, particularly on US or high quality boards. Fourth, overseas academics were present in significant numbers on UK boards. Fifth, editorial board appointments tended to be concentrated in a limited number of institutions and individuals. Sixth, journals, particularly generalist journals, used reviewers extensively.

Practical implications – This research will inform the debate about the degree of influence which UK academics have on journal research agendas and on the international stage. The findings show that journal editorial boards do not capture all high ranking institutions and individuals. Editors could consider widening the scope of their editorial board opportunities.

Originality/value – This is the first comprehensive study into the editorial boards of accounting journals. It shows the presence of an editorial board elite.

Keywords Boards of directors, Serials, Accounting, Academic staff

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Recent years have seen an upsurge in efforts to quantify and measure various aspects of the performance of universities. This process has focused on initiatives to measure both the quantity and quality of two key outputs: teaching and research. In the UK, Research Assessment Exercises (RAEs), in particular, have affected the nature of academic accounting research in a fundamental way by establishing criteria for

Michael John Jones would like to thank the participants at the 2003 Gregynog Colloquium, especially Jane Broadbent and Richard Laughlin. This paper has also benefited from the help and advice of John Richard Edwards and Mahmoud Ezzamel. Finally, the paper has benefited considerably from the helpful advice of two external reviewers.

The second author would like to dedicate this paper to the memory of Tony Brinn. The paper was in the middle of the review process when he died. Tony provided the basic data analysis on the paper and the second author has had to check and reconstitute the data and, at times, this was difficult due to the lack of a clear audit trail. Although there may be minor inaccuracies, Michael John Jones has no reason to doubt the basic accuracy of the tale which is told.

Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal
Vol. 21 No. 1, 2008
pp. 5-35

0951-3574
DOI 10.1108/09513570810842304

assessing the research performance of university departments[1]. These criteria centre on measures of research excellence such as publications. However, other indicators include factors such as research income and number of PhD students. There is also a rather nebulous concept of a department's reputation. Part of this may be seen as a department's national and international profile. Editorial board membership is one potential key component of this reputation. Editors may in their selection of board members attempt to signal quality and status as well as seeking a balanced board in terms of gender, expertise, nationality and research interests[2]. Editorial board membership is often seen as an important indicator of individual academics' long-term research reputation. "Thus, selection as an editor or member of an editorial board is a considerable honor that reflects one's standing in the profession . . . " (Kaufman, 1984, p. 1190). Editorial board members play an important role within academia, for example, in reviewing papers. "Because of the importance, it appears reasonable that these positions are held by persons who have the confidence and trust of their colleagues" (Kaufman, 1984, p.1190). Given the importance of publishing in academic journals, the influential role which editorial boards can play has important repercussions, not only on individual careers and reputations but also on departmental reputation and funding[3].

Editorial board membership may be important for several reasons. First, editorial boards often represent large collections of intellectual research capital on which journal editors can draw. The editorial boards of journals potentially represent a coherent collection of individuals who exert influence over the publication decision and "acceptable" types of research. Or, as Mittermaier (1991, p. 22) states: "They also exert considerable influence over the type of manuscripts that are accepted for publication". Second, editorial board members frequently, but not universally, act as reviewers effectively working with the journal editors to provide the key quality screen necessary for publication. Editorial board members potentially have substantial influence on the output performance of accounting academics. Potential publishers' submission decisions will also be influenced by the past decisions of reviewers. Journal editors, however, will have the final say. Third, board membership is generally considered to carry status for the academics involved, particularly for high quality journals. This may enhance an individual's personal prestige and also, by association, the reputation of their institutions. In the UK, for example, reputational factors may influence opinions of RAE panels and thus board memberships may also have funding implications for departments. This is especially true with the latest RAE which formally recognises the importance of reputation by introducing the concept of research esteem. In the guidelines to the Accounting and Finance sub-panel, editorships and participation on editorial boards is specifically mentioned as an indicator of peer esteem and national and international reputation (VOA 35, Accounting and Finance, 2005). Fourth, editorial board members may act as gatekeepers controlling the entry of researchers to an area of research (Crane, 1967; Gilliland and Cortina, 1997). Consciously, or unconsciously, board members may prefer old to new paradigms, and favour established rather than up-and-coming researchers.

Finally, editorial board members may be consulted about research agendas or the strategic direction of the journal. This allows them to guide research in preferred directions, to promote particular topics, or to favour certain methodologies. This is clearly exemplified by special or themed editions of journals and by editorial

statements about topics and approaches currently deemed important. These signal research areas and methods that the journal wishes to encourage and effectively discourages research effort in other areas.

The gatekeeping and agenda setting roles of editorial boards thus arguably give editorial board members a position of considerable power and influence in the academic world. Their positions, generally legitimated through their research achievements, allow them to exercise a decision-making function. In theory, editorial boards are normally assumed to represent those accounting academics appointed on the basis that they have contributed most to the development of knowledge in their field. After studying seven leading journals, Beattie and Ryan (1989, p. 276) concluded that "Editorial board members are much more heavily cited than other researchers". Some researchers have viewed editorial board members as constituting a small group of individuals active within a discipline (Mittermaier, 1991; Williams and Rodgers, 1995; Rodgers and Williams, 1996; Lee, 1997). They thus play a key role in the self-regulation of academic accounting society. They represent the top of the academic hierarchy and are at the top of the pyramid of power (Kornhauser, 1961). As such, they can be termed as "elites" (Lukes, 1974; Putnam, 1976).

Editorial board membership is not, however, a costless activity to academics. If done assiduously, editorial board membership may involve the tasks of reviewing papers and attending editorial board meetings. In some cases, therefore, it may incur unseen duties that the assiduous publisher may seek to avoid. As well as being a status totem, therefore, editorial board membership is potentia+lly burdensome and a test of academic citizenship[4]. It may also be the necessary quid pro quo for publishing. You cannot expect other authors to review your work, if you are not prepared to review theirs.

To date, little explicit attention has been given to editorial board memberships despite such appointments being generally regarded as representing evidence of significant scholarship and research achievement by individual academics. More particularly, we know little of the representation which UK academics and UK universities have on the editorial boards of accounting journals both within and outside the UK. Furthermore, we have scant knowledge about the presence or absence of elitism on these editorial boards.

The objective of this research is to contribute data on patterns of editorial board membership of UK accounting academics and journals. Specifically, we examine the composition and concentration of individuals and institutions on editorial boards in academic accounting journals. The research contributes to our knowledge of an important institutional and organisational aspect of accounting academia.

The remainder of this paper consists of four sections followed by a conclusion. In the next section, we present the limited literature on editorial board membership. A description of the methods used in this study then follows. We next present our results. Our discussion, including the limitations of this research, is then presented.

Literature review

Although there is a wide literature that examines the rankings of accounting journals and the productivity of individual accounting academics[5], the literature on editorial board membership in accounting and the cognate area of finance is limited. The sparse literature is all USA oriented. Only two articles have examined the editorial board

membership of accounting journals (Mittermaier, 1991; Lee, 1997). In addition, Williams and Rodgers (1995) look at editorial board elites on one particular journal, *The Accounting Review*, while Kaufman (1984) looks at editorial board members on finance journals. None of this prior research specifically focuses on UK journals or UK academics. Much of this research is framed within the need to identify and determine research elites.

Mittermaier (1991) covers 13 journal editorial boards (including the UK journal *Accounting, Organizations and Society*) for 1979, 1983, 1987 and 1990. She determines that a small number of schools dominated the editorial boards among both faculty and degree institutions. There was less diversity in the number of schools represented in Mithermaier's top two or three most prestigious journals. In other words, the higher the perceived quality of the journal, the more elitist. Lee (1997, p. 13) purposefully studied the presence of elites on the editorial boards of six journals (including two UK journals, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* and *Accounting and Business Research*). His argument is based on the view that academic communities are stratified, hierarchical and elitist. As such, Lee draws on earlier work by Whiteley (1984, 1986) and Bourdieu (1988). Whiteley (1986), for example, shows the critical role which a relatively small number of graduate programs played in the hierarchical stratification of financial economics, while Bourdieu (1988, p. 84) comments: "Academic capital is obtained by holding a position ensuring domination of other positions". Lee's (1997) study itself found a dominating USA elite in three USA journals (*The Accounting Review, Journal of Accounting Research* and *Journal of Accounting and Economics*). However, this elite was not so dominant on the two UK journals *(Accounting, Organizations and Society*; *Accounting and Business Research*), or in the Australian journal studied, *Abacus*. Overall, however, Lee's research is consistent with Williams and Rodgers (1995) and Rodgers and Williams (1996) about the presence of a dominating USA elite. "Fields are hierarchical, controlled by an elite whose reputations are established by the quality and quantity of scholarly output they produce. Elite status affords individuals the power to control the access to media through which a field's knowledge is disseminated; elites control reputations and the ability to participate in the knowledge production process of the field" (Rodgers and Williams, 1996, p. 52). For example, Williams and Rodgers (1995) show that individuals with degrees from widely recognised institutions consistently dominate *The Accounting Review*'s editorial board from 1967-1991. Moreover, Lee (1995, 1999) shows how the American Accounting Association has shaped the USA academic accounting research profession.

Finally, Kaufman (1984) looks at editorial board representation on 10 finance journals. Kaufman specifically excluded accounting journals and the *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* because it was British. Kaufman's (1984) findings were that five of his top six schools were private universities. Only one foreign school, the Canadian University of British Columbia, was included among the top ten in any group. Editorial board membership was found to be concentrated in a limited number of universities.

Methods

Previous studies on journal quality ranking and refereed accounting journals were used to generate a list of refereed English-language accounting journals (Ballas and Theoharakis (2003); Brinn *et al.* (1996); Zeff (1996); Brown and Huefner (1994)). We

focused on English-language journals as English has become the medium of international scholarship. This list was then supplemented by including some relatively new and less well-known journals to give as comprehensive a listing as possible of major refereed accounting journals. We did not include journals that were purely finance-oriented, tax journals, journals with very limited circulation, general business-related journals or journals without a majority academic representation on their editorial boards. However, we did include all journals that accept accounting articles, even if they had a bias towards finance[6]. This yielded a total of 60 journals. A full listing of these in alphabetical order by nationality is given in Table I. Editorial board membership lists for the beginning of 1999 were obtained from the relevant edition of the journal.

From this information, we recorded the identity of the board members and their institutional affiliation as indicated by the journal[7]. We classified the board members into one of five categories according to the location of their institution: UK, USA, Australia, Canada (the big four) or other. Although institutional affiliation does not necessarily reflect the individual's nationality and training it does represent the best indication of the current research environment within which the individual works.

Journals were classified using the location of the journal editorship as the criterion. This resulted in 36 USA journals, 12 UK journals, eight Australian journals, one Canadian journal and three other journals (one each from Hong Kong, New Zealand and Denmark)[8]. The nationality of each journal was usually clear. In a small number of cases a conflict existed between location of journal editorship and place of publication. In such cases, we used journal editorship to determine journal nationality. Journal editorship is normally a good measure of national orientation. However, some journals such as *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, Critical Perspectives in Accounting* and *Advances in Public Interest Accounting* may have a UK orientation even though they are not based in the UK.

In addition, certain journals were classified as high quality. Identification of high quality journals is not an exact science. While there is general acceptance as to the most prestigious journals, the next tier "quality" journals are often debatable (Gray *et al.*, 2002). The precise ranking of journals is also difficult[9]. Given the UK perspective of this paper, we used the most recent peer review ranking of journals by UK academics (Lowe and Locke, 2005) and then also a peer review ranking by Ballas and Theoharakis (2003) of European and Australian academics to identify high quality journals. The top ten journals reported in these studies were classified as high quality. These journals are listed in Table II.

Several different descriptors were used for editorial boards (for example editorial advisory board, associate editors and editorial review board). There were also considerable differences in the size of the boards of different journals. Both the descriptors and the differing board sizes may indicate differing roles for the boards or may simply reflect either the breadth of the journal or the scale of its operation. In some cases, the board may represent a group of permanent reviewers with perhaps relatively little other input to the journal. In other cases, the smaller boards may strongly influence editorial policy. As these differences could not readily be identified we have effectively treated all board memberships as being equivalent. If the role of editorial boards does differ across journals, we may, however, not be comparing like with like.

Table I.
Editorial board members: representation by nationality of journal in 1999

	UK		USA		Australia		Canada		Other		Total
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
UK journals											
Accounting, Business and Financial History	10	50.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	4	20.0	20
Accounting and Business Research	29	56.8	11	21.6	5	9.8	3	5.9	3	5.9	51
Accounting Education	15	29.4	9	17.6	5	9.8	1	2.0	21	41.2	51
Accounting, Organizations and Society	7	15.6	26	57.7	3	6.7	3	6.7	6	13.3	45
British Accounting Review	43	74.2	7	12.2	3	5.1	2	3.4	3	5.1	58
Financial Accountability and Management	18	42.9	8	19.0	4	9.5	1	2.4	11	26.2	42
International Journal of Auditing	13	36.1	12	33.3	4	11.1	1	2.8	6	16.7	36
Journal of Applied Accounting Research	12	70.6	3	17.6	0	0	0	0	2	11.8	17
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	14	60.9	5	21.8	1	4.3	1	4.3	2	8.7	23
Management Accounting Research	14	31.8	7	15.9	2	4.5	1	2.3	20	45.5	44
Public Money and Management	7	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Research in Third World Accounting	5	45.5	2	18.1	0	0	0	0	4	36.4	11
Total	187	46.3	94	23.2	28	6.9	14	3.4	82	20.2	405
Number of individuals	125	41.7	82	25.5	23	7.1	11	3.4	71	22.3	312
Concentration ratio (%)		66.8		87.2		82.1		78.6		86.6	77.0
USA journals											
Accounting Educators' Journal	0	0	85	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Accounting Enquiries	1	4.5	17	77.3	1	4.5	1	4.5	2	9.1	22
Accounting Historians Journal	3	7.0	29	67.4	5	11.6	3	7.0	3	7.0	43
Accounting Horizons	0	0	55	91.6	1	1.7	0	0	4	6.7	60
Accounting, Management and Information Technology	5	13.2	19	50.0	1	2.6	2	5.3	11	28.9	38
Advances in Accounting	0	0	106	97.2	0	0	3	2.8	0	0	109
Advances in Accounting Information Systems	0	0	19	95.0	1	5.0	0	0	0	0	20
Advances in International Accounting	2	12.5	13	81.2	0	0	1	6.3	0	0	16
Advances in Management Accounting	1	2.9	31	88.5	0	0	1	2.9	2	5.7	35
Advances in Public Interest Accounting	5	29.4	8	47.1	3	17.6	1	5.9	0	0	17
Advances in Quantitative Analysis of Finance and Accounting	0	0	23	92.0	0	0	1	4.0	1	4.0	25
Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory	0	0	28	87.5	1	3.1	3	9.4	0	0	32

(*continued*)

Table I.

	UK		USA		Australia		Canada		Other		Total
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
Behavioral Research in Accounting	0	0	32	94.1	2	5.9	0	0	0	0	34
Critical Perspectives on Accounting	9	24.3	17	46.0	4	10.8	3	8.1	4	10.8	37
Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management	1	2.8	27	75.0	1	2.8	1	2.8	6	16.6	36
International Journal of Accounting	2	3.1	31	47.7	2	3.1	1	1.5	29	44.6	65
Issues in Accounting Education	3	3.7	76	92.7	1	1.2	1	1.2	1	1.2	82
Journal of Accounting and Computers	0	0	8	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Journal of Accounting and Economics	0	0	29	93.5	0	0	2	6.5	0	0	31
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy	4	6.3	52	82.6	2	3.2	1	1.6	4	6.3	63
Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance	0	0	27	84.3	0	0	2	6.3	3	9.4	32
Journal of Accounting Education	1	1.8	52	94.6	1	1.8	0	0	1	1.8	55
Journal of Accounting Literature	0	0	12	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Journal of Accounting Research	0	0	35	92.1	0	0	2	5.3	1	2.6	38
Journal of Financial Statement Analysis	0	0	13	92.9	0	0	0	0	1	7.1	14
Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation	2	4.4	34	75.6	2	4.4	4	8.9	3	6.7	45
Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting	1	3.2	20	66.8	2	6.7	0	0	7	23.3	30
Journal of Management Accounting Research	0	0	40	90.9	1	2.3	2	4.5	1	2.3	44
Petroleum Accounting and Financial Management	0	0	11	91.7	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	12
Research in Accounting Regulation	1	4.2	20	83.3	1	4.2	0	0	2	8.3	24
Research in Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting	2	9.1	14	63.7	1	4.5	0	0	5	22.7	22
Research on Accounting Ethics	0	0	54	96.4	0	0	2	3.6	0	0	56
Review of Accounting Studies	0	0	37	90.3	0	0	1	2.4	3	7.3	41
Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting	1	2.5	38	95.0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	40
The Accounting Review	0	0	74	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
The Southern Collegiate Accountant	0	0	24	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Total	44	3.1	1210	85.1	34	2.4	38	2.7	95	6.7	1,421
Number of individuals	39	4.2	820	82.4	25	2.5	27	2.7	82	8.2	993
Concentration ratio (%)	88.6		67.8		73.5		71.1		86.3		69.9

(*continued*)

Table I.

	UK		USA		Australia		Canada		Other		Total
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
Australian journals											
Abacus	5	15.1	4	12.1	20	60.7	0	0	4	12.1	33
Accounting and Finance	1	3.2	13	41.9	13	41.9	0	0	4	13.0	31
Accounting, Accountability and Performance	6	24.0	1	4.0	16	64.0	0	0	2	8	25
Accounting, Auditing & Accountablity Journal	20	41.6	13	27.1	9	18.7	2	4.2	4	8.4	48
Accounting Forum	11	24.4	11	24.4	17	37.8	2	4.4	4	9.0	45
Accounting History	5	18.5	6	22.2	7	25.9	1	3.7	8	29.7	27
Accounting Research Journal	0	0.0	1	3.7	24	88.9	0	0.0	2	7.4	27
Australian Accounting Review	0	0.0	1	5.3	16	84.2	0	0	2	10.5	19
Total	48	18.8	50	19.6	122	47.8	5	2.0	30	11.8	255
Number of individuals	37	18.7	37	20.3	77	42.3	4	2.2	30	16.5	185
Concentration ratio (%)		77.1		74.0		63.1		80.0		100	72.5
Canadian journals											
Contemporary Accounting Research	0	0	28	54.9	0	0	22	43.1	1	2.0	51
Other journals											
Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting (Hong Kong)	1	3.6	11	39.2	4	14.3	4	14.3	8	28.6	28
European Accounting Review (Denmark)	3	13.6	1	4.6	0	0	0	0	18	81.8	22
Pacific Accounting Review (New Zealand)	5	13.2	13	34.2	4	10.5	2	5.3	14	36.8	38
Total	9	10.2	25	28.4	8	9.1	6	6.8	40	45.5	88
Number of individuals	9	9.6	22	26.5	7	8.4	6	7.2	40	48.3	84
Concentration ratio (%)		100		88		87.5		100		100	95.4
Grand total	288	12.0	1407	63.4	192	8.6	85	3.8	248	11.2	2,220
Number of individuals	148	11.6	881	64.1	110	8.0	46	3.3	179	13.0	1,364
Concentration ratio (%)		51.4		62.6		57.3		54.1		72.2	61.4

Note: The number of individuals does not always sum because the same individual may occasionally be recorded on multiple journals

	UK *N*	USA *N*	Australia *N*	Canada *N*	Other *N*	Total *N*
UK						
Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal (AUS)	20	13	9	2	4	48
Accounting and Business Research (UK)	29	11	5	3	3	51
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting (UK)	14	5	1	1	2	23
Accounting, Organizations and Society (UK)	7	26	3	3	6	45
Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory (USA)	0	28	1	3	0	32
Journal of Accounting and Economics (USA)	0	29	0	2	0	31
Journal of Accounting Research (USA)	0	35	0	2	1	38
The Accounting Review (USA)	0	74	0	0	0	74
Contemporary Accounting Research (CAN)	0	28	0	22	1	51
Journal of Management Accounting Research (USA)	0	40	1	2	1	44
Total	70	289	20	40	18	437
Percentage	16.0	66.1	4.6	9.2	4.1	100
Europe						
Accounting and Business Research (UK)	29	11	5	3	3	51
Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal (AUS)	20	13	9	2	4	48
Management Accounting Research (UK)	14	7	2	1	20	44
Accounting, Organizations and Society (UK)	7	26	3	3	6	45
European Accounting Review (DEN)	3	1	0	0	18	22
Journal of Accounting Research (USA)	0	35	0	2	1	38
The Accounting Review (USA)	0	74	0	0	0	74
Journal of Accounting and Economics (USA)	0	29	0	2	0	31
Accounting Horizons (USA)	0	55	1	0	4	60
Contemporary Accounting Research (CAN)	0	28	0	22	1	51
Total	73	279	20	35	57	464
Percentage	15.7	60.1	4.3	7.6	12.3	100
Australia/New Zealand						
Accounting and Business Research (UK)	29	11	5	3	3	51
Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal (AUS)	20	13	9	2	4	48
Accounting, Organizations and Society (UK)	7	26	3	3	6	45
Abacus (Aus)	5	4	20	0	4	33
Accounting and Finance (AUS)	1	13	13	0	4	31
The Accounting Review (USA)	0	74	0	0	0	74
Journal of Accounting Research (USA)	0	35	0	2	1	38
Journal of Accounting and Economics (USA)	0	29	0	2	0	31
Contemporary Accounting Research (CAN)	0	28	0	22	1	51
Accounting Horizons (USA)	0	55	1	0	4	60
Total	62	288	51	34	27	462
Percentage	13.4	62.3	11.0	7.4	5.9	100

Notes: High quality UK journals are the top ten Accounting journals identified by peer review of UK academics reported in Lowe and Locke (2005); High quality Europe and Australia/New Zealand are the top ten accounting journals identified by peer review of European and Australian academics, respectively, in Ballas and Theoharakis (2003)

Table II.
High quality journals ranked by number of UK, European and Australian/New Zealand academics – breakdown of editorial board by nationality in 1999

Results

Table I lists the journals alphabetically by nationality of the university to which the board member was affiliated. There were 2,220 board memberships across 60 editorial boards. The majority of both the journals and the journal board members came from the USA (36 journals; 1,407 US board memberships on all boards). The UK then followed (12 journals; 288 UK board memberships on all boards). Australia came next (8 journals; 192 board memberships on all boards), followed by Canada (one journal; 85 board memberships on all boards). There were three other journals and 248 memberships from "other" countries on all boards. The average number of members on each journal's editorial board was 37.1. The largest board was *Advances in Accounting* with 109 members; the smallest was *Public Money and Management* with seven academic board members.

Table I shows that academics from the same countries as the journals were generally the largest group on those journals. UK academics, for instance, formed the largest group (46.3 per cent) on UK journal boards. In addition, UK academics also provided 18.8 per cent of board members on Australian journals. Their presence on USA journals, however, was small (3.1 per cent), but was better on other overseas journals (10.2 per cent). No UK academic was a member of the Canadian *Contemporary Accounting Research*. In the USA, the dominance by home country academics was even more pronounced with 85.1 per cent of USA journal board members coming from USA institutions. USA academics also had a significant presence on all other countries' journals. Australian academics were present in large numbers only on Australian journals (47.8 per cent). Most Canadian academics were found on North American boards. However, they only constituted 2.7 per cent of USA boards.

Four countries thus dominated editorial board membership: UK, USA, Australia and Canada (the "big four"). Unsurprisingly, English speaking institutions dominated these journals – all of which are published in English [10]. It is probable that non-English speaking academics will publish less in English-language accounting journals. After all English-language academic journal publications require a high level of technical and specialised English reading and writing skills. This privileges English speakers. Western, Anglo-Saxon refereeing standards may also not be the norm in other countries. English language journals may also be less interested in research based on data or topics of interest in non-English speaking countries. In the same way USA journals are generally not interested in publishing research based on data or topics of interest in non-English speaking countries[11]. The remaining 248 board memberships came from other countries with no individual country outside the "big four" providing more than 1.3 per cent of the total editorial board population[12]. Collectively, the rest of the world provided only 11.2 per cent of the editorial board memberships. Academics from countries outside the "big four" were most likely to be represented on other journals (45.5 per cent) and on UK journals (20.2 per cent) [13].

We investigated the number of individuals with board memberships for each country to establish any national patterns. We divided the number of individuals by the total board memberships to obtain a concentration ratio. The higher the percentage the more diffuse board membership[14]. Thus, 100 per cent would mean that no individual held more than 1 board membership. Overall, the UK board membership is most concentrated with a ratio of 51.4 per cent. In other words, on average each individual UK academic held about two board memberships. An interesting pattern

arises. Board membership is most concentrated on the boards of one's home country. Thus, UK board membership is most concentrated in the UK (66.8 per cent), USA board membership is most concentrated in the USA (67.8 per cent) and Australian board membership most concentrated in Australia (63.1 per cent). It thus seems that multiple board memberships accrue on an individual's national boards. By contrast, the concentration ratio for US academics serving on UK boards is 87.2 per cent and for UK academics serving on US boards it is 88.6 per cent. This last result is the most diffuse of any national representation on the big three countries (UK, USA and Australia).

Table III ranks the 60 journals according to UK national representation. UK academics had majority representation on six journals, all of them UK. Only one journal (*Public Money and Management*) had 100 per cent UK membership. Interestingly, in surveys of journal rankings this journal is ranked very low. Five more UK journals had 50 per cent or more UK membership (*British Accounting Review, Journal of Applied Accounting Research, Journal of Business Finance and Accounting, Accounting and Business Research* and *Accounting, Business and Financial History*). For the next four journals UK academics, although not constituting more than 50 per cent of the board, constituted the biggest group. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, an Australian journal, was the only non-UK journal on which UK academics represented the largest grouping. However, by having such a large proportion of UK academics (41.6 per cent) this journal is perhaps signalling its wider non-Australian orientation. The three UK journals where UK academics did not constitute the single largest group were *Management Accounting Research, Accounting Education* and *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. Whereas the first two journals had as the largest group of academics outside the big four countries, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* drew the majority of its editorial board (57.7 per cent) from the USA. This may signal part of a wider objective to penetrate US readership or to import a high quality reputation[15]. Certainly, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* is the only UK journal with a majority US representation. For all other non-UK journals, UK academics represented a minority grouping. At the bottom of the table, 37 journals had less than 10 per cent UK representation with 22 having none. Of these 37 journals, 32 were USA (the exceptions are the *Asia Pacific Journal of Accounting, Australian Accounting Review, Accounting and Finance, Accounting Research Journal* and *Contemporary Accounting Research*). *European Accounting Review* journal presents a distinct profile. Only 13.6 per cent of editorial board members were from the UK, with only 4.6 per cent coming from the USA.

In Table II, we show ten high quality academic journals ranked by UK, European and Antipodean academics. Seven of the journals were common to all three groups (*Accounting and Business Research*, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *Accounting Organizations and Society*, *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *Journal of Accounting Research* and *The Accounting Review*). Overall, the patterns of board representation are pretty similar. The largest group on these boards was USA academics (66.1 per cent UK group; 60.1 per cent European group; 62.3 per cent Australian/New Zealand group). UK academics featured next (16.0 per cent UK group; 15.7 per cent European group and 13.4 per cent Australian/New Zealand groups).

If we focus first on the UK perspective, UK academics featured on only four of the 10 boards. Except for *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* where UK academics

	UK %	USA %	Australia %	Canada %	Other %
Public Money and Management (UK)	100.0	0	0	0	0
British Accounting Review (UK)	74.2	12.2	5.1	3.4	5.1
Journal of Applied Accounting Research (UK)	70.6	17.6	0	0	11.8
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting (UK)	60.9	21.8	4.3	4.3	8.7
Accounting and Business Research (UK)	56.8	21.6	9.8	5.9	5.9
Accounting, Business and Financial History (UK)	50.0	20.0	5.0	5.0	20.0
Research in Third World Accounting (UK)	45.5	18.1	0	0	36.4
Financial Accountability and Management (UK)	42.9	19.0	9.5	2.4	26.2
Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal (AUS)	41.6	27.1	18.7	4.2	8.4
International Journal of Auditing (UK)	36.1	33.3	11.1	2.8	16.7
Management Accounting Research (UK)	31.8	15.9	4.5	2.3	45.5
Accounting Education (UK)	29.4	17.6	9.8	2.0	41.2
Advances in Public Interest Accounting (USA)	29.4	47.1	17.6	5.9	0
Accounting Forum (AUS)	24.4	24.4	37.8	4.4	9.0
Critical Perspectives on Accounting (USA)	24.3	46.0	10.8	8.1	10.8
Accounting, Accountability and Performance (AUS)	24.0	4.0	64.0	0	8.0
Accounting History (AUS)	18.5	22.2	25.9	3.7	29.7
Accounting, Organizations and Society (UK)	15.6	57.7	6.7	6.7	13.3
Abacus (AUS)	15.1	12.1	60.7	0	12.1
European Accounting Review (O)	13.6	4.6	0	0	81.8
Accounting, Management and Information Technology (USA)	13.2	50.0	2.6	5.3	28.9
Pacific Accounting Review (O)	13.2	34.2	10.5	5.3	36.8
Advances in International Accounting (USA)	12.5	81.2	0	6.3	0
Research in Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting (USA)	9.1	63.7	4.5	0	22.7
Accounting Historians Journal (USA)	7.0	67.4	11.6	7.0	7.0
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy (USA)	6.3	82.6	3.2	1.6	6.3
Accounting Enquiries (USA)	4.5	77.3	4.5	4.5	9.1
Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation (USA)	4.4	75.6	4.4	8.9	6.7
Research in Accounting Regulation (USA)	4.2	83.3	4.2	0	8.3
Issues in Accounting Education (USA)	3.7	92.7	1.2	1.2	1.2
Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting (O)	3.6	39.2	14.3	14.3	28.6
Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting (USA)	3.2	66.8	6.7	0	23.3
Accounting and Finance (AUS)	3.2	41.9	41.9	0	13.0
International Journal of Accounting (USA)	3.1	47.7	3.1	1.5	44.6
Advances in Management Accounting (USA)	2.9	88.5	0	2.9	5.7
Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management (USA)	2.8	75.0	2.8	2.8	16.6
Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting (USA)	2.5	95.0	0	0	2.5
Journal of Accounting Education (USA)	1.8	94.5	1.8	0	1.8
Accounting Educators' Journal (USA)	0	100.0	0	0	0
Journal of Accounting and Computers (USA)	0	100.0	0	0	0
Journal of Accounting Literature (USA)	0	100.0	0	0	0
The Accounting Review (USA)	0	100.0	0	0	0
The Southern Collegiate Accountant (USA)	0	100.0	0	0	0

Table III.
Editorial boards: ranked by UK national representation in 1999

(*continued*)

	UK %	USA %	Australia %	Canada %	Other %
Advances in Accounting (USA)	0	97.2	0	2.8	0
Research on Accounting Ethics (USA)	0	96.4	0	3.6	0
Advances in Accounting Information Systems (USA)	0	95.0	5.0	0	0
Behavioral Research in Accounting (USA)	0	94.1	5.9	0	0
Journal of Accounting and Economics (USA)	0	93.5	0	6.5	0
Journal of Financial Statement Analysis (USA)	0	92.9	0	0	7.1
Journal of Accounting Research (USA)	0	92.1	0	5.3	2.6
Advances in Quantitative Analysis of Finance and Accounting (USA)	0	92.0	0	4.0	4.0
Petroleum Accounting and Financial Management (USA)	0	91.7	8.3	0	0
Accounting Horizons (USA)	0	91.6	1.7	0	6.7
Journal of Management Accounting Research (USA)	0	90.9	2.3	4.5	2.3
Review of Accounting Studies (USA)	0	90.3	0	2.4	7.3
Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory (USA)	0	87.5	3.1	9.4	0
Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance (USA)	0	84.3	0	6.3	9.4
Contemporary Accounting Research (CAN)	0	54.9	0	43.1	2.0
Australian Accounting Review (AUS)	0	5.3	84.2	0	10.5
Accounting Research Journal (AUS)	0	3.7	88.9	0	7.4
Mean unweighted for board size	15.10	59.22	10.30	3.50	11.87

Table III.

held 20 board members, no UK academics held editorial board appointments outside the UK. For the three UK journals, UK academics formed the majority of the boards of *Accounting and Business Research* (56.8 per cent) and *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* (60.9 per cent), but only 15.6 per cent of *Accounting, Organizations and Society*'s board. USA academics dominated the editorial boards of high quality journals. Only 13 out of 219 appointments on the five USA high quality boards were from outside the USA. USA academics constituted 35.3 per cent of the boards of the three UK journals, not that much less than the UK (42 per cent). USA academics, in particular, dominated *Accounting, Organizations and Society* providing 26 of its 45 (58 per cent) board members. USA academics therefore seemed effective at achieving appointments on high quality journals outside their own national arena. By contrast, for UK academics, there was a strong home country bias.

The Europeans and Antipodeans have slightly different journal rankings. The Europeans include *Management Accounting Research*, *European Accounting Review* and *Accounting Horizons* in their top 10; while the Antipodeans include *Abacus*, *Accounting and Finance* and *Accounting Horizons*. However, the overall patterns are remarkably persistent. First, USA academics dominate these highly-rated boards. Second, UK academics are notable by their absence on many boards: they are not present on five of either the European or Antipodean top 10.

Table IV examines the UK academic institutions with representation on all editorial boards. The *British Accounting Review Research Register 2000* lists 110 institutions in 1999. Of these 110 institutions, 63 academic institutions had 288 representatives on the 60 editorial boards. Of these, 187 were on UK journals, 44 on US journals, 48 on Australian journals and nine on other journals. There was a very high degree of concentration. A total of 47 institutions had no representation at all. Ten institutions held

Table IV.
All UK universities ranked by total number of editorial board members in 1999

	All		UK		USA		Australia		Other	
	N	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff
Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	24	8	12	6	3	3	8	5	1	1
Edinburgh	18	6	13	6	1	1	4	4	0	0
London School of Economics	18	12	16	12	2	2	0	0	0	0
Exeter	14	4	8	4	2	2	3	2	1	1
Lancaster University	14	7	10	6	2	2	2	2	0	0
Sheffield University	14	5	6	4	3	3	5	3	0	0
Dundee	13	4	6	3	2	2	4	3	1	1
Cardiff, Wales	10	6	7	6	1	1	2	1	0	0
Essex	10	3	5	3	2	2	3	2	0	0
Birmingham	8	5	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0
Southampton University	7	2	5	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
Strathclyde	7	5	1	1	4	4	2	2	0	0
Warwick	7	5	3	3	2	2	2	2	0	0
Nottingham	6	6	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0
Aberystwyth, Wales	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cambridge	5	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	1	1
Glasgow	5	4	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	0
Heriot-Watt	5	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Manchester Business School	5	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
Oxford	5	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Aberdeen	4	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Bangor, Wales	4	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
Bath	4	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Glasgow Caledonian University	4	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1
Hull	4	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Leeds	4	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
London, Royal Holloway	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0
Reading	4	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
UMIST	4	3	0	0	3	3	1	1	0	0
Bristol	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
De Montfort University	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Loughborough	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Open University	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

(*continued*)

	All		UK		USA		Australia		Other	
	N	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff	*N*	No. of staff
Queens, Belfast	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
Bradford	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Brunel University	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cranfield	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Durham	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Glamorgan	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leicester	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stirling	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
West of England	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aston	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
City University	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Derby	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Anglia	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Imperial College	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Keele	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Kent at Canterbury	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
King's College, London	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liverpool	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
London Business School	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manchester Metropolitan	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nene College	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northumbria at Newcastle	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oxford Brookes	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Portsmouth	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robert Gordon University	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sheffield Hallam	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Bank University	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southampton Institute of Higher Education	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surrey	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
York	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	288	148	187	125	44	39	48	37	9	9

Note: Totals for individuals do not always sum because of the same individual maybe occasionally recorded at more than one institution

Table IV.

half of all board memberships with 143 (49.7 per cent), while 20 constituted 200 (69.4 per cent). Indeed, three institutions alone constituted 60 (20.8 per cent) of the editorial board members (Manchester School of Accounting and Finance, Edinburgh and London School of Economics[16]. These four institutions generally also had the greatest number of individuals on editorial boards: London School of Economics (12), Manchester School of Accounting and Finance (8) and Edinburgh (6). However, Lancaster which ranked fifth equal overall had the third largest number of individuals (7).

Many of these individual institutional rankings are very much influenced by certain key individuals. For instance, at Manchester School of Accounting and Finance, which heads the list, 8 individuals are responsible for the 24 board memberships. Even more striking one individual often drives the overall results for certain institutions (see also Table V). Thus, at Manchester Business School Stark provides all five board memberships; while Tomkins, Gallhoffer, Broadbent and Nobes provide all four board memberships for Bath, Glasgow Caledonian, Royal Holloway and Reading, respectively. Finally, Ashton provides all three of Bristol's board memberships.

Ten universities also held more than half of the UK appointments on US boards (25 of the 44), while 20 institutions held 39 of the 44 USA appointments. Ten universities were responsible for approximately half of all UK journal appointments on UK boards (89 out of 187) and approximately one fifth of all appointments (89 out of 405) on UK boards (see also Table I). There is therefore evidence of a significant concentration of UK board memberships in a relatively small number of institutions. The old universities predominated. Of the 63 universities with editorial board representation, only 13 were new universities. The highest ranked new university, at joint 21st, is Glasgow Caledonian [17].

This concentration of editorial boards was equally pronounced if we concentrate on UK high quality journals. Ten institutions held 45 of the 70 high quality board representatives. Another ten held a further 14 (20.0 per cent) high quality appointments so that 84.3 per cent of all high quality appointments were held by 20 universities. Only three of the top 20 institutions did not hold any high quality appointments. Only 14 UK universities had more than one high quality editorial appointment among their staff and 11 of these were in the top 20. Again there is a high degree of concentration of journal involvement in a small number of universities.

We also examined those overseas universities whose members held UK editorial board appointments. In all, these constituted 218 editorial board appointments. Such appointments will partially influence the content and nature of research published in the UK. One-hundred-and-forty-seven different institutions were represented on UK boards. Of these, 84 were non-UK universities. More non-UK institutions than UK institutions were thus represented. It is noticeable that out of the top non-UK 20 institutions 12 were from the USA (see Table VI). Non-UK editorial board membership was more diffuse than UK membership. Of the non-UK universities, only 20 had three or more board members. New South Wales (Australia) and Southern California (USA) led the way with eight and six representatives, respectively. This was sufficient to place these universities in joint 5th and joint 8th places respectively in terms of total board appointments on UK journals. In total, these 20 non-UK universities held 76 appointments on UK boards corresponding to 18.7 per cent of all UK journal board appointments. Overall, overseas board memberships were less concentrated than for UK universities.

Individual	Institution	All board memberships *N*
Napier	Southampton	6
Sikka	Essex	6
Cooke	Exeter	5
Edwards	Wales, Cardiff	5
Ezzamel	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	5
Gray	Dundee	5
Hatherly	Edinburgh	5
Hopper	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	5
Humphrey	Sheffield University	5
Lapsley	Edinburgh	5
Otley	Lancaster University	5
Parker	Exeter	5
Stark	Manchester Business School	5
Broadbent	London, Royal Holloway	4
Gallhofer	Glasgow Caledonian University	4
Hopwood	Oxford	4
Innes	Dundee	4
Jones	Birmingham	4
McLeay	Wales, Bangor	4
Nobes	Reading	4
Owen	Sheffield University	4
Power	London School of Economics	4
Tomkins	Bath	4
Turley	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	4
Whittington	Cambridge	4
Armstrong	Sheffield University	3
Ashton	Bristol	3
Briston	Hull	3
Grinyer	Dundee	3
Gwilliam	Wales, Aberystwyth	3
Haslam	Heriot-Watt	3
Hoskin	Warwick, UMIST	3
Knights	Keele: Nottingham and UMIST	3
Laughlin	Essex: King's London	3
Likierman	LBS; Treasury	3
Llewellyn	Edinburgh	3
Macve	London School of Economics; Wales, Aberystwyth	3
Peasnell	Lancaster University	3
Sangster	Queens, Belfast; Open	3
Scapens	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	3
Tippett	Exeter, Aberystwyth	3
Walker	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	3
Wallace	King Fahd University; Wales, Cardiff	3
Arrington	Strathclyde	2
Berry	Nottingham	2
Bromwich	London School of Economics	2
Cooper	Strathclyde	2
Emmanuel	Glasgow	2
Jackson	Leicester	2

(*continued*)

Table V.
All UK individuals with more than one board memberships ranked by total number of editorial board memberships in 1999

Individual	Institution	All board memberships *N*
Miller	London School of Economics	2
Mitchell	Edinburgh	2
Moizer	Leeds	2
Pallot	Kent at Canterbury	2
Perrin	Exeter	2
Pike	Bradford	2
Pope	Lancaster	2
Porter	Cranfield	2
Roberts	Aberdeen	2
Sherer	Essex	2
Steele	Warwick	2
Strong	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	2
Walker	Edinburgh	2
Wilmott	UMIST	2

Table V.

University	UK board memberships	Overall ranking[a]
New South Wales (Australia)	8	5 =
Southern California (USA)	6	8 =
Adelaide (Australia)	4	15 =
Alabama (USA)	4	15 =
College of William and Mary (USA)	4	15 =
Copenhagen Business School (Denmark)	4	15 =
Pittsburgh (USA)	4	15 =
Rice University, Houston (USA)	4	15 =
Stanford University (USA)	4	15 =
Wisconsin, Madison (USA)	4	15 =
Illinois, Urbana Champaign (USA)	3	25 =
Michigan State University (USA)	3	26 =
Case Western Reserve University (USA)	3	26 =
Chicago (USA)	3	26 =
Alberta (Canada)	3	26 =
Cornell University (USA)	3	26 =
Queen's University, Canada (Canada)	3	26 =
King Fahd University (Saudi Arabia)	3	26 =
Stockholm School of Economics (Sweden)	3	26 =
Kobe University (Japan)	3	26 =

Note: [a] This column shows the overall ranking on UK journals including the UK universities listed in Table IV

Table VI.
Top 20 non-UK universities ranked by total number of editorial board memberships on UK journals in 1999

Table V lists all UK individuals with more than one board membership on the boards of all journals. Of the 288 board memberships held by UK academics 18.1 per cent were held by 10 individuals with a further 14.9 per cent held by the next 10 individuals. Approximately a third of all board memberships held by UK individuals were thus concentrated in 20 individuals. The same was true of high quality journals. No individual held more than two appointments on three UK high quality journals. This may reflect the fact that these journals have quite different characters with *Journal of*

Business Finance and Accounting specialising in finance, *Accounting and Business Research* in general accounting issues and *Accounting, Organizations and Society* in behavioural and organisational accounting. The specialisms required for success in these journals therefore appear to be too different to facilitate multiple appointments.

In Table VII, we list all individuals with more than one board membership on *UK* journals. Twenty-five individuals held three or more appointments on UK journals. These individuals held 81 out of 405 UK board appointments (20.0 per cent). A further 41 individuals held two editorial board appointments. Of the six individuals with four board memberships on the boards of UK journals, two were not based in the UK. David Cooper (although originally from the UK) was from Canada while Stephen Zeff was from the USA. Six of the next 19 individuals were also non-UK based. This mirrors our earlier findings of a significant non-UK presence on the boards of these journals.

We conducted some additional analysis to ascertain the role of *ad hoc* reviewers. We examined all the journals to establish the number of *ad hoc* reviewers in 1999. We found that twenty-two out of the 60 journals provided lists of *ad hoc* reviewers (see Table VIII)[18]. This Table thus provides some, if not a complete data set, on the use of *ad hoc* reviewers by journals. In total, there were 1,505 *ad hoc* appointments as opposed to 837 total board members on the 22 journals[19]. However, the way in which *ad hoc* reviewers were used varied greatly between journals. Some journals rely more heavily on *ad hoc* reviewers than normal board members. *Contemporary Accounting Research* (215 *ad hoc* reviewers; 51 board members, a ratio of 4.21), *Journal of Accounting and Economics* (128 *ad hoc* reviewers; 31 board members, a ratio of 4.1) and *European Accounting Review* (151 *ad hoc* reviewers; 22 board members, a ratio of 6.9) are the prime examples. By contrast, several journals rarely use *ad hoc* reviewers. The two best examples of this are the *Accounting Historians Journal* (7 *ad hoc* reviewers; 43 board members, a ratio of 0.16) and *Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting* (14 *ad hoc* reviewers; 30 board members, a ratio of 0.47). Overall, if there is a pattern, it appears to be that specialist journals such as *Accounting Education*, *Research in Third World Accounting*, *The Accounting Historians Journal* and *International Journal of Accounting* make less use of *ad hoc* reviewers than more general journals such as *British Accounting Review*, *The Accounting Review*, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *Contemporary Accounting Research* and the *European Accounting Review*[20]. Overall, 13 journals used more *ad hoc* reviewers than board members while 9 journals used fewer[21].

We also examined the question of whether there was a potential pool of unused experienced reviewers[22]. First, in Table VIII, we list the total number of *ad hoc* reviewers who do not feature on any of the 60 editorial boards. Overall, there were 852 unused reviewers. For some journals, there were substantial numbers. For instance, for *Contemporary Accounting Research* and *European Accounting* there were 117 and 94 unused reviewers.

In a second analysis, we focused only on UK academics. We listed all UK academics in the UK's British Accounting Research Register (2000) who had published refereed journals in our journal set (see Table IX). In total 257 staff had published at least one article. As a rough proxy for experience we took all those academics who had published more than two refereed journals over the period 1998 and 1999 (bottom four rows in Table IX). We chose two as Beattie and Goodacre (2004) demonstrate that the average output for a professor at an old university is one refereed article per year. We

Individual	Institution	All board memberships *N*
Cooke	Exeter	4
Hatherly	Edinburgh	4
Napier	Southampton	4
Otley	Lancaster	4
Power	London School of Economics, Aberystwyth	4
Zeff	Rice University	4
Ashton	Bristol	3
Briston	Hull	3
Cooper	Alberta	3
Ezzamel	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	3
Gwilliam	Aberystwyth, Wales	3
Innes	Dundee	3
Jones	Birmingham	3
Lapsley	Edinburgh	3
Lee	Alabama	3
Likierman	LBS; Treasury	3
Loft	Copenhagen Business School	3
Macve	London School of Economics; Wales, Aberystwyth	3
Nobes	Reading	3
Parker	Adelaide	3
Shields	Michigan State	3
Sikka	Essex	3
Stark	Manchester Business School	3
Tomkins	Bath	3
Wallace	College of William and Mary	3
Wallace	King Fahd University; Wales, Cardiff	3
Berry	Nottingham	2
Bromwich	London School of Economics	2
Brunsson	Stockholm School of Economics	2
Carmona	Madrid	2
Chenhall	Monash University	2
Chow	San Diego State	2
Edwards	Wales, Cardiff	2
Emmanuel	Glasgow	2
Firth	Colorado at Boulder; Norwegian School of Economics	2
Fogarty	Case Western Reserve	2
Gray	Dundee	2
Gul	City University of Hong Kong	2
Hopper	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	2
Hopwood	Oxford	2
Hove	Zimbabwe	2
Humphrey	Sheffield	2
Jackson	Leicester	2
Jaruga	Lodz, Poland	2
Jonsson	Gothenberg	2
Laughlin	Essex; Kings London	2
Llewellyn	Edinburgh	2
McLeay	Bangor, Wales	2

(*continued*)

Table VII.
All Individuals with more than one board membership on editorial boards of UK journals in 1999

Individual	Institution	All board memberships *N*
Mitchell	Edinburgh	2
Moizer	Leeds	2
O'Leary	Cork	2
Owen	Sheffield	2
Parker	Exeter	2
Peasnell	Lancaster	2
Porter	Cranfield	2
Richardson	Queen's University, Canada	2
Ruud	Norwegian School of Management; St Gallen, Switzerland	
Sangster	Open University; Queens	2
Solomon	Illinois, Urbana Champaign	2
Spicer	Auckland	2
Strong	Manchester	2
Tippett	Exeter, Aberystwyth	2
Trotman	New South Wales	2
Turley	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	2
Walker	Manchester School of Accounting and Finance	2
Whittington	Cambridge	2
Zimmer	Queensland	2

Table VII.

then looked at the 52 individuals with an output of two or more articles per year to see if any individuals either had no editorial board members across the 60 journals in our sample or had conducted no *ad hoc* reviews across the 22 journals for which we had *ad hoc* reviewer lists[23]. This enables us to see whether there existed a pool of experienced unused possible reviewers[24].

There is thus some evidence that there may be an unused and experienced UK pool of board members and/or *ad hoc* reviewers. Nine of the 52 staff with more than two publications had no board membership or *ad hoc* reviews. Twenty out of the 52 (52-32) staff were not on any editorial board and 18 of the 52 (52-34) staff had not conducted any *ad hoc* reviews. If the criteria are relaxed to publishing only two refereed articles then the pool of unused academics grows substantially. Thirty-three academics then have no board memberships or *ad hoc* reviews.

Discussion

Our results showed a home country bias in board appointments. For the big four countries, the journals of each country typically had academics from those countries as their largest grouping. The bias was strongest in the USA, with an absolute majority (85.1 per cent) of US academics. Other countries had their own nationals as their largest group (the UK: 46.3 per cent, Australia: 47.8 per cent). The exception was Canada where US academics contributed an absolute majority (54.9 per cent) with Canadians representing the second group (43.1 per cent). The home country bias for board membership in the USA means that the US academic network was national rather than international. By contrast, the academic networks in Australia, Canada and the UK looked more international than national. In Australia, Canada and the UK, the majority of board members were non-nationals.

	Total board members	Total *ad hoc* reviewers	Total ratio: *ad hoc* reviewers: board members	Total of *ad hoc* reviewers not on any of 60 editorial boards
UK journals				
Accounting Education	51	29	0.57	21
British Accounting Review	58	158	2.73	88
Research in Third World Accounting	11	5	0.45	3
Total	120	192	1.60	112
USA journals				
Accounting Enquiries	22	46	2.09	21
Accounting Historians Journal	43	7	0.16	5
Accounting Horizons	60	107	1.78	60
Advances in International Accounting	16	38	2.37	22
Advances in Public Interest Accounting	17	15	0.88	8
Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory	32	66	2.06	34
Behavioral Research in Accounting	34	72	2.11	42
International Journal of Accounting	65	56	0.86	30
Issues in Accounting Education	82	28	0.34	18
Journal of Accounting and Computers	8	5	0.63	4
Journal of Accounting and Economics	31	128	4.10	75
Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance	32	102	3.2	56
Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting	30	14	0.47	11
The Accounting Review	74	121	1.63	63
Total	546	805	1.47	449
Australian journals				
Accounting, Auditing & Accountablity Journal	48	102	2.12	58
Accounting Accountability and Performance	25	31	1.24	18
Accounting History	27	9	0.33	4
Total	98	142	1.44	80
Canadian journals				
Contemporary Accounting Research	51	215	4.21	117
Total	51	215	4.21	117
Other journals				
European Accounting Review (Denmark)	22	151	6.9	94
	22	151	6.9	94
Total memberships/appointments	837	1,505	1.79	852
Total individuals	635	1,252		

Table VIII.
Ad hoc reviewers: representation by nationality of journal in 1999

No. of refereed articles in our journal set	No of staff publishing in our journal set		Editorial board memberships		Number with *ad hoc* reviews		No board memberships or *ad hoc* reviews	
	No.	Total[a]	No.	Total[a]	No.	Total[a]	No.	Total[a]
1	145	257	24	75	36	99	97	130
2	60	112	19	51	29	63	24	33
3	25	52	13	32	15	34	5	9
4	18	27	11	19	10	19	4	4
5	6	9	5	8	6	9	0	0
6	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0

Note: [a] The total columns show the number of individuals who published at least the indicated number of refereed articles. Therefore, 257 individuals published at least one refereed article and 112 published at least two articles

Table IX.
UK academics publications and journal involvement in 1998 and 1999

US academics were important on the boards of practically all journals. They were the dominant group on US and Canadian journals, the second largest group on UK journals (23.2 per cent) and joint second on Australian journals (19.6 per cent). They were also the largest single identifiable group on other journals (26.5 per cent). As a result the USA clearly influences and drives accounting research worldwide. UK academics comprised the second largest group of editorial board members after the USA. However, it was a very distant second, with the USA comprising the majority of all board memberships (62.6 per cent).

One finding of this research is the relatively low participation rate of UK academics on boards generally, and in particular on overseas boards. In total, UK academics occupied only 187 of the 405 places on UK editorial boards. The UK thus imported 218 board members. By contrast, as only 187 UK appointments out of 288 in total were on UK journals, the UK thus exported 101 board members. Overall, therefore, the UK imported 117 board members more than it exported. It is noteworthy that UK academics (although they were the largest grouping 46.3 per cent), provided less than half of the UK journal board memberships. UK academics had a majority presence on very few journals. Only six journal boards had 50 per cent or more UK academics with seven more having more than 25 per cent. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, a UK journal, had less than a quarter of UK board members.

Outside the UK, UK academics were generally not heavily represented on editorial boards, although they contributed 18.8 per cent of Australian boards. Many journals in which UK academics might be expected to publish did not have substantial UK representation on their boards. A total of 22 journals had no UK representation. This exclusion of UK academics means that UK academics did not influence either journal strategy or the research content of the vast majority of accounting journals. It implies little intersection between the research agendas of these journals and that of UK authors. This provides an obstacle to publication in the vast majority of accounting journals.

A potentially worrying picture was also conveyed by the UK's lack of representation on high quality journals. On ten high quality journals, UK academics had only 70 of 437 editorial board memberships. On three UK high quality boards,

there were 119 places. Of these, 69 were occupied by non-UK academics. By contrast, only 20 of 318 places on the seven non-UK high quality editorial boards were occupied by UK academics. Notably, all of these were on *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. To a certain extent, this mirrors the difficulties encountered by UK academics in publishing in high quality journals. Of the 70 UK high quality board appointments 50 were on the three high quality UK journals. UK academics had a significant presence only on *Accounting and Business Research* (56.9 per cent) and *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* (60.9 per cent) and a minority presence (under 20 per cent) on *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. In the RAE-driven research environment, where so much emphasis is placed on producing work of international excellence the lack of significant presence on high quality journals is perhaps concerning. UK academics were totally excluded from six of the high quality journals. In particular, they had no representation at all on three top journals: *Journal of Accounting and Economics, Journal of Accounting Research* and *The Accounting Review*. While the failure to penetrate top ranked US journals may be understandable, there was remarkably little UK involvement even with the relatively lowly ranked US journals.

Various reasons can be suggested for the lack of overseas board memberships particularly in the USA. First, the areas and methods addressed by UK academics may not be considered mainstream enough or of sufficient interest and popularity to a US audience. This may reflect the historical tendency for UK academics to follow different research traditions and paradigms to the USA. In addition, UK academics typically use UK not US data which may not appeal to, or be seen as relevant to, a US audience. Second, many UK academics lack the kind of formal training in statistics and methodology that is part of USA doctoral programmes. Third, there is a physical separation and relatively low level of interaction between the academic communities in the USA and the UK. This militates against forming the networks required for achieving a mutual understanding of different research agendas. Finally, UK academics may find it too difficult to penetrate the US research environment and target their efforts where they are more likely to be successful (see, for instance, Brinn *et al.*, 2001). Whatever the reason, UK academics were excluded from agenda-setting on those journals which they themselves ranked as important.

On a more positive note, UK boards were clearly much more international than US boards. This may reflect the need for journals, particularly those outside the USA, to create an international profile. Of the 405 places on UK journals, 218 were occupied by non-UK academics: Americans (94 appointments), Australians (28 appointments) Canadians (14 appointments) and others (82 appointments). There are several potential reasons for this. First, the UK academic accounting community may not possess the breadth of knowledge or methodological expertise which UK journal editors require. Second, editors may perceive that overseas academics signal high quality and thus raise the perception of a journal's quality. Irrespective of the reasons, however, UK journals are likely to be less parochial as a consequence. Moreover, their responsiveness to transnational and international research will be enhanced.

There was evidence of elitism in editorial board representation[25]. The distribution of board memberships was notably concentrated in relatively few institutions. To some

extent this is understandable, as strong researchers may cluster in better-known institutions. Ten UK institutions accounted for 143 (49.7 per cent) of the 288 appointments held by UK academics. Twenty constituted 200 (69.4 per cent). Appointments to high quality journals are even more concentrated, with ten UK institutions accounting for 45 of 70 (64.3 per cent) and 20 UK institutions accounting for 59 of 70 (84.3 per cent). There were 110 UK accounting departments as per the *British Accounting Review Research Register 2000*. Thus, a small number of UK institutions dominated the UK appointments to UK boards. This signals the presence of a UK elite. This elite would appear to dominate UK research just as the US elite has been argued to dominate US research (Lee, 1997; Mittermaier, 1991). There is thus considerable concentration of power into a relatively few institutions. There is, thus, a strong, dominating UK research elite. It would be interesting to see if this elite has become more dominant over time. For example, in the UK, the Research Assessment Exercises may have concentrated research funds which, in turn, may have led to an increasing concentration of researchers. Over time, this may result in an increasing concentration in board appointments.

Prior research into the concentration of published research articles confirms our finding on the concentration of editorial board membership. Borokhovich *et al.* (1996) find, for example, in finance that 40 of 601 US academic institutions accounted for over 50 per cent of all articles published by 16 leading journals from 1989 through 1993. Klemkosky and Tuttle (1977) also report research concentration in financial research with six institutions accounting for 25 per cent of the total published pages. In accounting, Heck *et al.* (1990) show that graduates of the top 30 US doctoral programs publish 36 per cent of articles in 24 accounting journals.

Individual board membership was also highly concentrated. Ten individuals held 52 of 288 appointments (18.1 per cent). In Brown *et al.*'s (2007) study 1,489 faculty were recorded in the *British Accounting Review Research Register 2000*. Of these 475 were senior staff and 211 were professors. However, the vast majority of UK faculty did not hold editorial board appointments. Forty-one individuals held three or more appointments, accounting for 163 of the 288 editorial board appointments. These 39 individuals thus constituted about 2.6 per cent of UK faculty, but contributed 53.6 per cent of editorial board appointments. As at the institutional level, there is the presence of a research elite, but it is much more concentrated. A relatively few powerful individuals, therefore, held the majority of UK appointments. Indeed, many UK institutions relied upon a small number of (or indeed a single) individuals for most of their editorial board representation.

This concentration of academics on editorial boards, if it is reflected in a heavy burden of manuscript review, can cause problems for both those particular academics and the journals. For individual academics, considerable time and resources will be devoted to reviewing papers. Zeff (1996), for example, cites several accounting academics who claim to have reviewed upwards of 30 manuscripts per year. If it takes, for example, half a day to review a research article this will take 15 days of a senior academic's time. For individual journals, if academics are overloaded with reviews, it will mean that either the quality of the reviews will suffer or there will be a slower turnaround in reviews.

The presence of eight out of the top 25 individuals on UK journals from overseas, in part, may mitigate the concentration of UK research. It also counters parochial elitism

by introducing non-nationals onto UK boards thus signalling an eclectic, inclusive and multinational approach. However, it is interesting that three of these seven individuals were British in origin: Cooper (Alberta), Lee (Alabama) and Loft (Copenhagen). Some non-UK universities apparently had more influence on UK journals than major UK institutions, with New South Wales ranked 6th for total UK board members and Southern California joint eighth. These overseas board members may prove advocates for the journals in their home countries. They also signal the "internationalism" of UK research.

The extent to which board membership is concentrated has implications for the sensitivity of institutions to the departure of individual staff members. Universities with board memberships concentrated in relatively few staff, for instance, could find that the departure of a handful of individuals could eliminate much of the institution's involvement in editorial boards. There are also implications for the recognition of research achievement. Only a relatively small number of individuals' research achievements appear to be recognised in terms of editorial board appointments. Many journals such as the *European Accounting Review* or *Contemporary Accounting Research* appear to use *ad hoc* reviewers more than board members in their reviewing. Consequently, many active reviewers may not hold places on editorial boards. Their contributions may not, therefore, be fully appreciated – especially when journals do not list them.

The role of *ad hoc* reviewing itself is extremely important. The majority of journals use more *ad hoc* reviewers than board members to review their journal articles. Across the 22 editorial boards surveyed, 1,252 *ad hoc* reviewers were used, but only 635 board members. There is also some limited evidence to show that some UK experienced authors are not currently included on editorial boards or used as *ad hoc* reviewers. There thus may be a pool of underutilised talent.

There are several limitations to this study. First, the results essentially represent a snapshot of a single year. This may hide trends over time. This is particularly true given the rapid proliferation of research journals in the past twenty years (Zeff, 1996). Second, this analysis is specifically restricted to accounting. We explicitly omitted finance journals. In the UK, accounting and finance overlap substantially more than in some countries, particularly the USA. Moreover, UK accounting academics often publish in a wide range of interdisciplinary journals (e.g. business and management journals, operations research, and corporate governance). This study does not capture any accounting academics that may feature on such journals.

Conclusions

This paper looked at the editorial board members of 60 accounting journals in 1999. The results suggest that the degree of influence which UK academics had on journal research agendas through their involvement with editorial boards may be very limited particularly outside the UK. There were six main findings. First, there was a home country bias. Editorial board appointments were generally held by the nationals of the country where the journal was published. Second, USA academics had a significant presence on almost all editorial boards and dominated most of them. Third, there was a striking lack of penetration by UK academics on editorial boards, particularly on USA or high quality boards. Fourth, by contrast, UK

journals benefited from a significant input from overseas academics, particularly USA academics. This may enhance the quality of these editorial boards and may also signal an international agenda. We identified the key overseas universities and individuals that had a strong connection with UK journals and by implication with publishing in the UK. Fifth, particularly in terms of individual representation we found evidence of elitism. Editorial boards were concentrated in a limited number of institutions and individuals. Sixth, journals, particularly generalist journals, use *ad hoc* reviewers extensively. There may also be a pool of unused *ad hoc* reviewers. Overall, our research suggests that the UK presence on editorial boards was predominantly on those which UK peer review journal evaluation studies rate as of lesser quality and was mostly on UK or Australian editorial boards. Moreover, editorial board membership was elitist. If editorial board appointments are based on research quality, then many high-ranking institutions and individuals within those institutions would prima facie merit such appointments. UK journal editors might, therefore, consider widening the scope of their editorial appointments to avoid a narrow base for UK research.

This study provides a snapshot of editorial board membership at one point in time. It would, however, be potentially interesting to investigate the way in which board membership changes over time. It would be useful, for example, to know if UK academics are becoming relatively more or less well-represented on journal boards, particularly those of higher quality journals. This would establish whether editorial board concentration, particularly institutional representation, has changed over time. It would also establish whether the mixture of nationalities publishing over time has changed. Second, there is a need to widen the study to include finance journals and other interdisciplinary journals. This will provide a more comprehensive picture of editorial board representation among the broader accounting and finance faculty. Third, an in-depth study into the extent, nature and usage of *ad hoc* reviewers particularly in relation to current board members would be useful. Finally, there is a need to conduct more wide-ranging research into the role and purpose of editorial boards. For example, there are a raft of issues such as the selection of review board members, the accountability of journals to submitters, readers, subscribers and members, and basic refereeing statistics which would prove a useful insight into the nature of editorial boards.

Notes

1. In the UK the RAEs have formalised this process by ranking university departments' research performance over five year cycles.
2. Editors are concerned to fill their pagination budgets with the best quality articles. They will also be pressurised by publishers to create an international profile for their journals especially when these are based outside North America. We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for this point.
3. It is important to realise that different journals use their editorial boards in different ways. Some journals use editorial board members as reviewers while others rely more on *ad hoc* reviewers. There are thus active and inactive board members. In particular, the pool of reviewers and the panel of editorial board members although overlapping for most journals is not necessarily synonymous.

4. We are grateful to an unknown reviewer for pointing out to us that editorial board membership carries costs as well as benefits to individual academics.
5. See, for example, Howard and Nikolai (1983), Hull and Wright (1990), Brown and Huefner (1994), Zivney *et al.* (1995), Brinn *et al.* (1996), Ballas and Theoharakis (2003), Lowe and Locke (2005).
6. Thus, we included *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* and *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*.
7. The main focus of our study was the national affiliation of academic faculty. We thus analysed only academic board members. In fact, there were only 96 non-academics on the 60 editorial boards in comparison with 2,220 academic appointments. We are unable to provide an accurate breakdown of the national affiliations of these 96 non-academic appointments, given a lack of available data. We thus excluded them from our analysis.
8. Whereas the "big four" categories are relatively closed, the "other" category is by its nature much more fluid. It is, for example, unknown how many UK or US academics serve on the boards of non-English language journals.
9. Journal ranking studies are potentially useful and widely used. However, like all such methodologies they have their limitations. Milne (2000), for example, questions the theoretical validity of some attempts to generate universal journal rankings. Also when evaluating particular rankings one must appreciate that the perspective from which the ranking is taken (for example, nationality or research interest) is important.
10. *Contemporary Accounting Research* presents the full article in English, but has an extended abstract in French.
11. We thank an anonymous reviewer for this point.
12. The board members from the other category are based in the following countries ordered by number of members: New Zealand 29; Japan 24; Hong Kong 19; Sweden 16; France 16; Denmark 13; Netherlands 11; Singapore 10; Germany 9; Norway 9; Saudi Arabia 8; Belgium 7; Spain 8; Switzerland 7; Taiwan 6; Austria 5; China 5; Finland 5; Ireland 4; Israel 4; Poland 4; Italy 4; Egypt 3; Nigeria 3; Brazil 2; India 2; Korea 2; Turkey 2; Zimbabwe 2; Bahrain 1; Botswana 1; Bulgaria 1; Hungary 1; Jordan 1; Mexico 1; New Guinea 1; Samoa 1; South Africa 1.
13. The board members on UK journals from the "other" category are based in the following countries: Japan 9; Sweden 7; Denmark 5; Netherlands 5; New Zealand 5; Spain 5; Belgium 4; France 4; Germany 4; Norway 3; Hong Kong 3; Ireland 3; Saudi Arabia 3; Italy 2; Nigeria 2; Poland 2; Singapore 2; Switzerland 2; Zimbabwe 2; Austria 1; China 1; Egypt 1; Finland 1; India 1; Turkey 1; Botswana 1; Bulgaria 1; Hungary 1; South Africa 1.
14. Thus, for the UK there were 288 board memberships held by 148 different individuals ($148 \div 288 = 51.4$ per cent).
15. This is also true of other non-UK journals, particularly, the Australian journal *Accounting and Finance*, the Canadian journal *Contemporary Accounting Research*, the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting*, and the *Pacific Accounting Review*.
16. The three Manchester institutions (Manchester School of Accounting and Finance, Manchester Business School and UMIST) have now merged to become Manchester Business School.
17. In the UK, the university sector is often divided into old universities and new universities. The new universities generally constitute the old polytechnics, which became universities as a result of government legislation in 1992.
18. Not all journals provide a list of any *ad hoc* reviewers they use. This limited set of *ad hoc*s obviously constrains the subsequent analysis of *ad hoc* reviewers. The journals that list their

ad hoc reviewers are not necessarily representative of those that do not. In the authors' opinion it is good editorial practice to recognise the role played by *ad hoc* reviewers.

19. These data only show the numbers of *ad hoc* reviewers. They do not, for example, indicate the numbers of papers each *ad hoc* reviewer reviewed.
20. This is not universally true. *Advances in International Accounting* (ratio 2.37), *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory* (ratio 2.06) and *Behavorial Research in Accounting* (ratio 2.11) are all specialist journals which use twice as many *ad hoc* reviewers as board members to review journal articles.
21. Quite why some journals use more *ad hoc* reviewers than others is uncertain and would prove a useful avenue of research. However, it may stem from a journal's editorial policy, result from the size of the editorial board or the volume of submitted manuscripts.
22. We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this line of enquiry.
23. Our data is inevitably somewhat patchy. We do not capture editorial board memberships or *ad hoc* reviewers on non-accounting journals, especially finance journals. In addition, our *ad hoc* reviewer list covers only 22 journals.
24. It is also impossible to know whether the unused reviewers may have declined editorial board appointments or are new entrants to the profession. In addition, there are often long lead times for appointment to board membership.
25. In a sense, there is a circularity. The most prolific publishers normally become part of the editorial board elite. The elite is thus involved in controlling and influencing itself.

References

Ballas, A. and Theoharakis, V. (2003), "Exploring diversity in accounting through faculty journal perceptions", *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 20, pp. 619-44.

Beattie, V.A. and Goodacre, A. (2004), "Publishing patterns within the UK accounting and finance academic community", *British Accounting Review*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 7-44.

Beattie, V.A. and Ryan, J.R. (1989), "Performance indices and related measures of journal perception in accounting", *British Accounting Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 267-78.

Bourdieu, P. (1988), *Homo Academicus*, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Borokhovich, K.A., Bricker, R.J., Brunarski, K.R. and Simkins, B.J. (1996), "Finance research productivity and influence", *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 1691-717.

Brinn, A., Jones, M.J. and Pendlebury, M. (1996), "UK accountants' perception of research journal quality", *Accounting and Business Research*, Summer, pp. 265-78.

Brinn, A., Jones, M.J. and Pendlebury, M. (2001), "Why do UK accounting and finance faculty not publish in top US journals", *British Accounting Review*, June, pp. 223-32.

Brown, L.D. and Huefner, R.S. (1994), "The familiarity with and perceived quality of accounting journals: views of senior accounting faculty in leading US MBA programs", *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Summer, pp. 223-50.

Brown, R., Jones, M. and Steele, T. (2007), "Still flickering at the margins of existence? Publishing patterns and themes in accounting and finance research over the last two decades", *British Accounting Review*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 125-51.

Crane, D. (1967), "The gatekeepers of science: some factors affecting the selection of articles for scientific journals", *American Sociologist*, Vol. 3, pp. 195-201.

Gilliland, S.W. and Cortina, J.M. (1997), "Reviewer and editor decision making in the journal review process", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 427-52.

Gray, R., Guthrie, J. and Parker, L. (2002), "Rites of passage and the self-immolation of academic accounting labour: an essay exploring exclusivity versus mutuality in accounting scholarship", *Accounting Forum*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 1-30.

Heck, J.L., Jensen, R.E. and Cooley, P.L. (1990), "An analysis of contributions to accounting journals. Part 1: the agreggate performances", *International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 25, pp. 202-17.

Howard, T.P. and Nikolai, L.A. (1983), "Attitude measurement and perceptions of accounting faculty publication outlets", *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp. 765-76.

Hull, R.P. and Wright, F.B. (1990), "Faculty perceptions of journal quality: an update", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 77-98.

Kaufman, G.G. (1984), "Rankings of finance departments by faculty representation on editorial boards of professional journals: a note", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 1189-97.

Klemkosky, R.C. and Tuttle, D.L. (1977), "The institutional source and concentration of financial research", *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 901-7.

Kornhauser, W. (1961), "Power elites or 'veto groups'", in Bendix, R.R. and Lipset, S.M. (Eds), *Class Status and Power*, 2nd ed., Routledge and Ryan, London, pp. 210-18, (reprinted in Scott, J. (1990), *The Sociology of Elites*, Edward Elgar, Hook).

Lee, T.A. (1995), "Shaping the US academic accounting research profession: the American Accounting Association and the construction of a professional elite", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 6, pp. 241-61.

Lee, T.A. (1997), "The editorial gatekeepers of the accounting academy", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 11-30.

Lee, T.A. (1999), "Anatomy of a professional elite: the Executive Committee of the American Accounting Association 1916-1996", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 10, pp. 247-64.

Lowe, A. and Locke, J. (2005), "Perceptions of journal quality and research paradigm: results of a web-based survey of British accounting academics", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 30, pp. 81-98.

Lukes, S. (1974), *Power: A Radical View*, Macmillan Press, London.

Milne, M. (2000), "Toward the end of academic freedom, diversity judgement and accountability: a critique of Cassar and Holmes (1999), Journal Yardsticks", *Accounting, Accountability and Performance*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 99-116.

Mittermaier, L.J. (1991), "Representation in the editorial boards of academic accounting journals: an analysis of accounting faculties and doctoral programs", *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 221-38.

Putnam, R.D. (1976), *The Comparative Study of Political Elites*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Rodgers, J.L. and Williams, P.F. (1996), "Patterns of research productivity and knowledge creation at The Accounting Review: 1967-1993", *The Accounting Historian's Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 51-88.

VOA 35 Accounting and Finance (2005), available at: www.rae.ac.uk/pubs/2005/04

Whitley, R.D. (1984), *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*, Oxford University Press, Toronto.

Whitley, R.D. (1986), "The transformation of business finance into financial economics: the roles of academic expansion and changes in US capital markets", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 171-92.

Williams, P.F. and Rodgers, J.L. (1995), "*The Accounting Review* and the production of accounting knowledge", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 6, pp. 263-87.

Zeff, S.A. (1996), "A story of academic research journals in accounting", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 158-77.

Zivney, T., Bertin, W. and Gavin, T. (1995), "A comprehensive examination of accounting faculty publishing", *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 1-25.

Corresponding author
Michael John Jones can be contacted at: JonesM12@cardiff.ac.uk