Jones, M. J., & Dhanani, A. (2017). Editorial Boards of Accounting Journals: Gender Diversity and Internationalism. Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 30(5). https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2014-1785

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
10.1108/AAAJ-08-2014-1785

Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Emerald at http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2014-1785. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms

Editorial Boards of Accounting Journals:
Gender Diversity and Internationalisation

Abstract

Purpose: Editorial boards of academic journals represent a key institutional mechanism in the governance and functioning of the academic community. Board members play an important role in knowledge production and development of the discipline. This study examines the diversity characteristics of boards of accounting journals.

Design: Drawing on a diversity framework that distinguishes between societal diversity and value of diversity, the paper examines two board characteristics: gender diversity and internationalisation. Moreover, it examines the influence of three journal and two editor characteristics on board diversity and analyses trends over time.

Findings: On gender, overall board trends appear to reflect both societal diversity and value of diversity: boards reflect the gender profile of senior academics. Further, female board representation has improved over time, is consistent across different countries, and 'gendered' sub-disciplines attract a relatively higher female board representation. However, inequities persist at the highest level: women are under-represented as editors and on boards of higher ranked journals. On internationalisation, once again overall trends broadly reflect societal diversity and value at diversity. However, boards of UK and Australian and 2* and 3* journals are significantly more international than their US and 4* counterparts, respectively. Further, the representation of international scholars has witnessed a modest rise over time. Finally, editor gender and change in editor play an intervening role in the gender and international characteristics of boards, respectively.

Originality: Drawing on the diversity framework, this study is the first to comprehensively examine gender diversity and internationalisation of accounting boards.

Key words:
diversity, editorial boards, gender, internationalisation

Article Classification: Research paper

Editorial Boards of Accounting Journals:
Gender Diversity and Internationalisation

Introduction

"Strength lies in differences, not in similarities" Stephen Covey, as quoted in Walter, E., (2014)

Editorial boards of academic journals represent a key institutional mechanism in the governance and functioning of the self-regulated academic community. They play a critical and powerful role in the context of academic research by determining what is 'good' and 'legitimate' research that is worthy of publication and who, in turn, is published. This self-governing facility, perhaps more than any other, sets academia apart from all other professions as value is constructed through peer judgement and not market dynamics (Bedeian *et al.*, 2009). What is particularly intriguing is that appointment to membership is usually by invitation and selection processes and board activities take place largely independently of external scrutiny (Lee, 1997). Despite their importance in determining the trajectory of future research, in accounting, there is little research to date into the development and social character of editorial boards. In particular, research into the diversity of editorial boards is lacking. This is surprising given recent interests in equality and diversity in society and academia particularly in the accounting profession.

Editorial board members exercise considerable power in the reproduction of knowledge and the determination of its future direction. Editorial boards play a key leadership role in the journal's research agenda, helping editors to determine the direction and scope of the journal and its future strategy and policy. As reviewers, individual board members also play a crucial role in ensuring that the manuscripts submitted make an original and significant contribution to knowledge and are of a suitable quality. Moreover, editorial boards serve a highly visible signalling function to the wider academic world (Brinn and Jones, 2007, 2008). Comprising a set of well-respected and well-qualified scholars, they confer authority and legitimacy (Lindsey, 1976), and help to determine the ranking of journals. For example, editorial board quality is an important screening mechanism for journal selection in the influential Thomson ISI Index. Ultimately, editorial boards influence what becomes regarded as legitimate research (Lee, 1997; Parker, 2007).

For individual faculty, editorial board members through their review processes play an important role in influencing the publication outputs of individual scholars and career progression (Parker, 2007; Brinn and Jones, 2008). Refereed publications are becoming increasingly important for career progression globally, in part driven by governmental performance evaluation research frameworks (Guthrie and Parker, 2014).

Prior studies into editorial boards of (US) accounting journals have mainly inquired into board elitism (Williams and Rodgers, 1995; Lee, 1997 and Fogarty and Liao, 2009); and the scholarly achievements of board members (Lowe and Van Fleet, 2009). Research into gender diversity and internationalisation of accounting boards has attracted limited attention (exceptions Carnegie *et al.*, 2003 and Brinn and Jones 2008). This contrasts with research into management journal boards, for example, where board characteristics have been extensively examined (Svensson, Slatten and Tronveil 2007; Ozbilgin 2004; Metz and Harzing 2009, 2012; Murphy and Zhu 2012). Moreover, on gender, Carnegie *et al.*, (2003) reporting a lag in female board membership as compared to female authorship, examined accounting history journals. Similarly, on internationalisation, Brinn and Jones (2008) who reported parochial journal tendencies and a failure of UK scholars to feature on US journal boards, looked at this dimension from a UK perspective. Both studies also only used descriptive statistics for their data analysis.

The objective of this study is to offer a comprehensive examination of editorial board composition of accounting journals. The paper uses a diversity lens to understand and examine board composition and a draws on a theoretical framework of diversity. It assesses two diversity characteristics, namely female representation and board internationalisation, of the boards of 50 accounting journals. Diversity has become an increasingly important agenda in Western society. It has been motivated by a variety of different but related perspectives (Shore *et al.,* 2009; Zanoni *et al.,* 2010). We group these perspectives into societal diversity and value of diversity. Societal diversity is situated in the social justice / egalitarianism context and calls for organisations and institutions to reflect the diversity characteristics of the societies they operate in, while the value of diversity views diversity as inherently positive, adding value to organisational/institutional activities. We argue in this paper that both perspectives have important implications for editorial boards of academic journals. Board diversity ensures that the journals operate responsibly and ethically, exercising equal opportunity, and encourage intellectual openness that nurtures and promotes innovative thinking (Carnegie *et al.,* 2003; Parker 2007).

We specifically examine the proportionate representation of female and international scholars on the journal boards and investigate the role of three journal characteristics (journal nationality, journal ranking and journal specialism), and two editor characteristics (a change in editor and presence of a female editor) on gender diversity and internationalisation to better understand factors that shape board diversity. Further, we compare gender diversity and internationalisation across two time frames to determine the extent to which editorial boards reflect important changes facing the discipline, the university sector and society, more generally. To our knowledge, this is the first study in accounting that comprehensively examines editorial board diversity practices.

Overall, this study contributes to the wider research that examines the way in which the accounting research community is socially constructed (Lee, 1997; Locke and Lowe, 2008; Beattie and Goodacre, 2012) and sheds light into the governance of accounting academia (e.g. Khalifa and Quatrrone, 2008) and diversity. Gender has been extensively explored in the accounting profession (Broadbent and Kirkham, 2008; Khalifa, 2013) and accounting research (Kuasirikun, 2011). By contrast, fewer studies have examined gender in accounting academia and emphasis has been at faculty level (Rama *et al.,* 1997; Buckless *et al.,* 1998; Collins *et al.* 1998; Beattie and Goodacre, 2012). This study contributes to the wider gender focus in the accounting academy through its emphasis on editorial board membership. Research into international scholarship in accounting is also limited. Carnegie *et al.,* (2003) and Jones and Roberts (2005) noted parochial tendencies in publishing patterns particularly amongst American journals where journals hosted mainly American authors. More recently, Beattie and Smith (2012) looked into the internationalisation of the accounting academic community in the UK.

At a practical level, in line with developments into equality and diversity, the results, we believe, will be of interest to the accounting faculty in general, and journal editors and publishers, more specifically. Given the importance of editorial boards and the independent nature of the selection of board members, journal editors bear an important responsibility for the social character of their boards. Similarly, academic publishers are starting to promote equality and diversity as part of their corporate social responsibility agendas.

The remainder of this paper consists of five sections. In section two, we present a framework on diversity. We expand on its implications for the social character of editorial boards of accounting journals and develop formal hypotheses in relation to gender diversity and internationalisation. In sections three and four, we present our methods and findings respectively. Finally, in section five, we present our discussions and conclusions.

Diversity and Accounting Academia

There is a general trend in society towards enhanced diversity and the concept has, in recent years, become an important theme in accounting and management research (Hopwood, 1987; Bishop and Boden, 2008; Komori, 2008 and Khalifa, 2013). Diversity captures multiple dimensions (including gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, internationalisation and disability) and has been motivated by a variety of different but related perspectives (Shore *et al.*, 2009). We group these perspectives into two strands: societal diversity and value of diversity.

Societal Diversity

Societal diversity is based on the view that institutions in a society such as editorial boards of academic journals *should* reflect that society's inherent diversity (Ely 1995; Zanoni *et al.*, 2010). There is a moral expectation that institutions and organisations will mimic societal diversity as a social and collective good. This perspective is formulated around the notion that minority communities *should* be granted the same opportunities (Ely 1995). As such, it has an egalitarian objective and endeavours to narrow social inequities in organisations. Many Western countries have introduced aspects of societal diversity through legislation and some institutions also voluntarily engage in it. Together with symbolising their commitment to socially responsible behaviours, institutions convey positive signals to society and a general message of progressive leadership, which may enhance organisational reputation and public image and provide a business value of diversity (Rhode and Packel, 2010).

On gender, universities in many Western countries operate as public sector institutions and are expected to reflect government agendas such as equality and diversity. In the UK, for example, government priorities on gender diversity commenced in the 1970s and have since been updated in the Equalities Act 2010 which includes a separate Public Sector Equality Duty document. Moreover, as educational establishments, universities play a powerful role in shaping society and contributing towards a just and stable society as part of their teaching, research and outreach activities (Brennan, 2008; Metz and Harzing, 2009). Accounting research has itself contributed extensively to discussions of social justice and egalitarianism. Equality and diversity practices should be embedded into the culture of universities and occupy a pivotal role in university life. Accounting journal boards, in turn, should, be gender representative from a societal, moral perspective. There is a similar case for board internationalisation. As the number of scholars in different countries (international scholars) grow, it seems morally appropriate to enhance international scholar representation on boards of accounting journals.

Counter to the discourse of societal diversity, inequalities continue to exist in society and accounting along various dimensions such as gender and internationalisation. Several theories have been proposed to explain such inequities such as the status characteristics theory and networking theory (Shore *et al.*, 2009). Status characteristics theory proposes that individuals belonging to low status groups need to demonstrate higher levels of ability than those in higher status groups to be viewed as equal (Bianchi, 2010). Thus, while all board members are expected to be experts in their field with proven records of scholarly achievements, female (international) members as the lower status group may (be expected to) demonstrate higher levels of achievements than their male (domestic) counterparts.

In terms of networking theory, both men and women tend to engage in homophily, building networks of their own gender (McPherson *et al.*, 2001). While women recognize this tendency and take remedial action to improve male representation in female networks, men's networks include few women (Torres and Huffman, 2002). Moreover, the business literature argues that although women are socially better networkers, they struggle to transfer these skills to a

professional context. For journal boards, where membership is by invitation, informal networks play a very important role. To the extent that women find it harder to network professionally and networks tend to be homophilous, fewer female scholars may be invited to join journal boards.

On internationalisation, parochialism and elitism have been highlighted as two key features of Western academia (Williams and Rodgers, 1995; Lee, 1997; and Jones and Roberts, 2005). Homophilous tendencies of social networking and elitist tendencies stemming from status characteristics theory may help to explain why journal editors prefer to network within their own established groups than with international scholars. Moreover, in the field of management, Burgess and Shaw (2010) and Murphy and Zhu (2012) express elitist tendencies in terms of the power imbalances between the West and the rest, a phenomenon that Lal (2004) describes as a form of academic neo-colonialism. Murphy and Zhu (2012) note the Western dominance in knowledge production has compelled international scholars to examine topics that Western audiences are attracted to, using theoretical frameworks that they are familiar with, and discouraged them from examining issues, concerns and topics most important to them through frameworks best suited to their contexts. While accounting research lacks a detailed analysis of Western academic dominance, Carnegie *et al.*, (2003) and Jones and Roberts (2005) allude to such tendencies as reflected in the location of authors and the accounting contexts examined.

Value of Diversity

The value of diversity notion builds on the idea that diversity is inherently positive and enhances organisational performance. Several theories, often with roots in sociology and social psychology, seek to explain this commercial value of diversity (see Shore *et al.*, 2009). Greater diversity provides a different skill mix that is believed to create constructive conflict that ultimately leads to better organisational outcomes through individual contributions and collective interactions (Florida and Gates, 2001; Carter *et al.*, 2003). Diverse groups are believed to express a wider set of viewpoints and counterpoints; generate greater information and input into decision making through their broader network of relationships; and demonstrate enhanced problem solving capabilities (Eagly, 2013).

There has been a long standing discussion about the need and merits of diversification in accounting research (Lukka and Kasanen 1996; Hopwood 2008; Khalifa and Quattrone, 2008; Chapman 2012; Guthrie and Parker, 2014). This literature identifies accounting as a complex social phenomenon that needs to be broadly defined and examined from multiple research perspectives and approaches. From a board perspective, Chapman (2012) places responsibility upon journal editors to appoint members who are formally trained and equipped to deal with such diversity. Parker (2007) reflects upon the social character of such boards, the need for diverse and balanced boards based on gender, geographical location, age and academic seniority to secure a wide range of specialisms.

For journal boards, there is a business case for female and international representation from the value of diversity perspective. Research evidence, albeit from other disciplines (science, economics, management), indicates that men and women develop expertise in different areas of a discipline; favour different methodologies; and adopt significantly different behaviours in research and review processes (Addis and Villa, 2003; Amrein *et al.*, 2011; King *et al.*, 2011). Further, heterogenous groups publish higher quality research in higher ranked journals and with higher citation levels (by 34%) as compared to homogenous, male dominated groups (Campbell *et al.*, 2013). Similarly, research into gender in the accounting profession suggests that men and women adopt different attitudes towards their work and engage in different specialisms (Komori 2008; Khalifa, 2013). Consequently, gender diversity on editorial boards of accounting journals is

likely to result in the publication of a wider range of research topics through more vibrant and different theoretical lenses and methodological approaches (Carnegie *et al.*, 2003; Parker, 2007).

International diversity also offers commercial value. Internationalisation in accounting has two core aspects (Lukka and Kasanen, 1996). First is globalisation as witnessed through the international harmonization of financial accounting standards through the International Financial Reporting Standards and other activities such as the Global Reporting Initiative and integrated reporting. Moreover, there is a globalisation of research assessment exercises predicated on publications in international journals. Second is the ever increasing recognition of the role and influence of the sociocultural and political specificities of different geographical localities (for example culture, values, ideologies) in shaping accounting practices (see for example, Gallhofer and Haslam, 2006; Kuasirikun, 2011; Kamla and Rammal, 2013). Board diversity nurtures such a breadth of research through a heterogeneous pool of talent, 'local' expertise, methodological expertise and ideologies. Prior research suggests that the accounting community is segmented by geography. Lukka and Kasanen (1996), Panozzo (1997) and Ballas and Theoharakis (2003) noted that accounting research is locally focused and appears to be clustered around geographical borders with North Americans nurturing a positivist research tradition and European academics being more diverse. Geographical homogeneity and shared appetite for research topics, paradigms and methodologies may narrow the definition of accounting research and in turn curtail innovation (Lee, 1997; Guthrie and Parker, 2014). Further, Nisonger (2002) proposed that board internationalisation may create value through the recruitment of eminent international scholars who can enhance reputational capital and signal journal status to potential subscribers, authors and researchers.

Overall, the discussion above suggests that editorial boards should be diverse and makes a case for gender diversity and internationalisation. The societal diversity perspective encourages responsible and ethical journal behaviours while the value at diversity literature encourages broader and innovative production of knowledge. Ultimately, outcomes of the two perspectives are enmeshed and societal diversity practices may create value effects while the pursuit of value diversity may contribute to and improve equality and fairness. In contrast to these theoretical positions, however, inequalities are persistent in society, the accounting profession and academia, and theories such as social characteristics theory, networking theory and elitism appear to play an intervening role (Rama *et al.*, 1997; Buckless *et al.*, 1998; Collins *et al.*, 1998; Carnegie *et al.*, 2003; Brinn and Jones 2008; Broadbent and Kirkham, 2008; Beattie and Goodacre, 2012). In this light, we predict that:

H1a: Women will be under-represented on boards of accounting journals;

H1bi: International scholars will be under-represented on boards of accounting journals; and

H1bii: International scholars from non-Western regions will be under-represented on boards of accounting journals.

In recognition that editorial board appointments are made from senior academic faculty, to test the hypotheses above, we examine the representation of women and international scholars on editorial boards relative to senior female and international / non-Western scholars in academia.

Within the general context of diversity, a variety of characteristics may influence board diversity. We examine the role of three journal characteristics, namely journal nationality, journal ranking and journal specialism and two editor characteristics, change in editor and editor gender and the passage of time on boards' diversity characteristics.

Journal Nationality

Research by Lee (1997) and Brinn and Jones (2008) suggests that there are three principle geographical domains of strong accounting academic communities: Australia, the UK and the US. Of these, the US academic profession is perhaps more mature given the longstanding importance of publication outputs for academic tenure.

On board diversity, in accordance with the societal diversity perspective, women and international scholars should be granted the same opportunities of board appointment, regardless of journal nationality. In practice, however, different social contexts may influence journal board characteristics. Specifically, on gender, North American universities recognised and sought to address gender issues amongst senior women as early as the mid-1990s (MIT, 1999). By contrast, in the UK, while the Equality Challenge Unit was established in 2001, its focus on gender in the humanities and social science disciplines did not commence until 2011. In Australia, while the higher education sector has been described as feminised with a higher female to male ratio of students and faculty, women, much like the UK and the US (pre-2000s) remain a minority in senior academic positions (Pyke, 2012). To our knowledge, there have been no developments to tackle this inequality at senior levels. To the extent that the demographic characteristics at senior levels in academia determine the pool of talent for board member selection, we expect that:

H2a: There is a difference between the representation of women on editorial boards from different geographical regions. In particular, the US is likely to have a higher proportionate representation of women than the UK or Australia.

On internationalism, the US academy has been dominated by a positivist/functionalist research approach while the UK and Australia, much like continental Europe, have embraced a more diverse agenda that includes a critical/interpretative orientation alongside positive research. Moreover, the US functionalist/positivist approach has been associated with parochialism and elitism in publishing patterns and board membership characteristics (Williams and Rodgers, 1995; Lee, 1997). Few non-US academics publish in US journals (Brinn *et al.*, 2001; Beattie and Goodacre, 2004; Jones and Roberts, 2005) or sit on the boards of these journals (Brinn and Jones 2008). By contrast, the more diverse research tradition in the UK and Australia is likely to be more supportive of international scholarship. Therefore, we propose:

H2b: There is a difference between the representation of international scholars on editorial boards from different geographical regions. In particular, the US is likely to have a lower proportionate representation than the UK or Australia.

Journal Ranking

Journal rankings have become increasingly popular in research evaluation exercises as a way of ranking individual and institutional research performance (Burgess and Shaw, 2010; Hoepner and Unerman, 2012). Based on societal diversity, gender diversity and internationalisation should be reflected across all journal boards, regardless of journal quality. However, to the extent that inequities exist on journal boards, status characteristics and networking theories may help to explain such inequalities. We propose that journal ranking may play an intervening role and shape the extent to which these theories influence diversity. Specifically, in accordance with Ozbilgin's (2009) view that 'white men' continue to dominate leadership and management positions including board membership, for higher ranked journals, we propose that the status characteristics theory and networking theory may be more pronounced purely because of the associated journal prestige. Female and international academics, the lower status groups, may be

required to demonstrate particularly higher academic achievements for higher ranked journals. Further, women and international scholars may find it more difficult to engage in informal networks at the higher levels and penetrate homophilous male and domestic networks.

Thus, we propose:

H3a: There is a difference between the representation of women on editorial boards of journals with different rankings. In particular, higher ranked journals will have a lower representation of women than lower ranked journals.

H3b: There is a difference between the representation of international scholars on editorial boards of journals with different rankings. In particular, higher ranked journals will have a lower representation of international academics than lower ranked journals.

Journal Specialism

Different specialisms of accounting may be gender sensitive and may attract men and women to a greater or lesser extent. Gender sensitivity is linked to the role that gender plays in influencing the type of research men and women engage in and the different paradigmatic and methodological stances they adopt Addis and Villa, 2003; Amrein *et al.,* 2011; King *et al.,* 2011). Ultimately, journal specialisms may serve to explain gender heterogeneity between journal boards.

Based on prior gender oriented studies or research of the different specialisms within accounting (Locke and Lowe, 2008; Link *et al.,* 2008; Eagly, 2013), we identify three groups which we believe may have gender implications. These are 'education', 'critical' and 'positivist'. In other areas of accounting we do not expect a gender effect and we classified as the associated journals as 'gender neutral'.

Education, in society in general, has traditionally been female dominated (United Nations Statistics Division, 2010). Even though this relationship weakens with student age, female academics are believed to be more engaged with teaching related activities (Link *et al.,* 2008). Research into accounting education, we propose, is therefore more likely to attract a relatively higher proportion of women. On the positivist – critical research continuum, positivist research in (financial) accounting is oriented more towards male dominated disciplines of economics and finance (National Science Foundation, 2012; van Staveren, 2014; Ceci *et al.,* 2014). In contrast, critical research that focuses on the effect of accounting phenomena on society may be more attractive to women. Eagly (2013), in the context of corporate boards, notes that women are more concerned with fairness and socially responsible behaviours while men tend to demonstrate a competitive, financial orientation. Thus, on journal specialism, recognising that the talent pool from which editors can select board members may be gendered by subject specialism, in accordance with societal diversity perspective, we suggest that:

H4a: There is a difference in the representation of women between journals specialising in different fields of accounting. In particular, we expect more women on education and critical journal boards and fewer on positivist journal boards. Female representation on general journal boards is expected to be between the two extremes.

On board internationalisation, we do not expect subject specific differences since the aims and scope of the journals in this study suggest that they are not oriented towards specific geographical regions, but are international in scope.

Time Dimension

Equality and diversity have become important agendas in recent years in Western societies including academia. Moreover, given the increasing recognition of the need for intellectual openness to foster development in the discipline (Lukka and Kasanen, 1996; Hopwood, 2008; Khalifa and Quattrone, 2008; Chapman, 2012), the value of diversity perspective would also suggest that the representation of female and international scholars will increase over time. However, given the continued dominance the Western academia, representation of non-Western scholars in Western journals will continue to be low.

We thus predict that gender diversity and internationalisation of boards (with the exception of non-Western representation) will improve over time across the different journals and across the different journal characteristics. Thus, on gender, we predict:

H5a: the representation of women on editorial boards of journals will have increased;
H5ai: the representation of women on editorial boards of journals from all geographical regions will have increased;
H5aii: the representation of women on editorial boards of journals across all journal ranking categories will have increased; and
H5aiii: the representation of women across 'gendered' journals specialisms will have increased.

On internationalisation, we predict that over time:
H5b: the representation of international scholars on editorial boards will have increased;
H5bi the representation of non-Western scholars on editorial boards will not have increased;
H5bii: the representation of international scholars on editorial boards of journals from all geographical regions will have increased; and
H5biii: the representation of international scholars on editorial boards of journals across all journal ranking categories will have increased.

Editor Characteristics

Finally, we examine the influence of two editor characteristics on board diversity practices: change in editorship and presence of a female editor. Editors play a key leadership role in academic journals and take responsibility for the compositions of their boards. When they identify, invite and appoint academics as board members, it is only natural that they consider wider academic and societal implications when reaching these decisions.

The literature in organisational theory shows that in corporate organisations, chief executive succession is often met with organisational change, strategic re-orientation and organisational reforms (Fondas and Wiersema, 1997). Continuing executives are, for example, likely to embrace the status quo because they attribute their success to existing policies as compared to new chief executives who have fewer vested interests in the status quo (Fondas and Wiersema, 1997 and Miller, 1993). Similarly, experienced executives may be content to leave things the way they are, having had ample opportunity to shape their organisations according to their wishes. In contrast, new executives may feel the need to make changes. Translating this to the context of academic journals, 'continuing' editors with established boards are more likely to make incremental changes to their board memberships whereas new editors may make more dramatic changes. Thus, we anticipate that:

H6a: a change in editorship will lead to more differences in board composition (representation of women and international scholars) as compared to editor continuation.

Finally, in accordance with network theory (McPherson *et al.,* 2001), even though Torres and Huffman (2002) argue that women are aware of their homophilous tendencies and attempt to rectify such patterns, male tendencies to exercise such behaviours may translate into significant differences in the board structures of male and female editors. Thus,

H6b: women's representation in editorial boards will be higher for journals that have a female editor.

Research Approach

To develop our journal sample, we used Brinn and Jones (2008) journal listing as it included all journals that focus on accounting research. The journals did not need to have the word 'accounting' in their title and could have a bias towards finance or business. At the same time, all journals that were purely finance-oriented, tax journals or general business-related were excluded. Journals without a majority academic representation on their editorial boards were also omitted given their practitioner-orientation. Brinn and Jones' (2008) listing was amended to ensure a matched sample for our two time periods (details below). In total 50 journals, a substantial number, were identified.

To compare board characteristics longitudinally, we chose two sample periods, 2009 (the most recent time period when the study was launched) and 1999. The 1999 period was selected to allow a decade between the two timeframes as change in editorial boards and editors is likely to be incremental and relatively slow (unless driven by a major change such a change in editorship or journal direction).

For the journals included in the study, editorial board membership data, (i.e. name, role (editor in chief, associate editor, board member etc.), and institutional affiliations), were collected from the mastheads of the first volume of the journals in 1999 and 2009. In instances where the relevant journals were not available, the publishers of the journals were contacted by email to secure the details. Board members were identified as male and female, often apparent from their first names. In instances where only initials for the members were available or the names were unfamiliar to the authors, the members' biographical details were accessed online to determine gender. In a small number of instances, this failed, for example, when the website details were in a foreign language and there was no individual photograph. In this instance, country-specific internet sites for names were accessed to classify gender.

Based on their institutional affiliations, members were grouped into different geographical categories including the UK, USA and Australia. Authors affiliated to more than one geographically diverse institution (for example in the UK and Australia) were assigned on a proportionate basis. On the one hand this approach potentially understates the international nature of academia as the academic community is internationally mobile. On the other hand, however, we felt that the individual scholar's current location would better reflect their research environment. Data for individual board members at a journal level were aggregated for all 50 journals.

Independent variables were classified as follows. Journal nationality, consistent with Lee (1997), Brinn and Jones (2008) and Metz and Harzing (2009), was classified using the location of the journal editorship. This usually resulted in a clear categorisation. This approach was deemed to be superior to publisher nationality as editors take responsibility for their board membership and even though publishers play an important role in the orientation of a journal, editors form a critical part of this process. Journal nationality was categorised as at the first time frame of the

study, 1999. This resulted in 29 US journals, 10 UK journals, seven Australian journals and four other journals (one each from Canada, Hong Kong, New Zealand and Europe). In only one case, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, was there a difference between journal nationality in 1999 and 2009, where an editorship for the journal crossed borders from the US to Canada. One of the two editors in 1999 retired from post by 2009 and was not replaced, and the second simply moved universities between the US and Canada.

To determine journal ranking, we used the Journal Quality Guide produced by the UK ABS (Harvey *et al.*, 2010). This ranking system, developed for use in the UK academic market, has been used in prior research (see, for example, Beattie and Goodacre, 2012) and has become the accepted system to which UK university managers and individual scholars work. Although much criticised and not necessarily accurate for all journals (Hoepner and Unerman, 2012), it provides proxy information of aggregate journal quality and maintains a level of objectivity in classification. The ABS defines 4* as world elite journals, 3* as journals with highly regarded research, 2* as journals with research of accepted standard and 1* as journals with modest contribution. Similar systems of ranking are operational elsewhere, for example, Australia. For journal specialism, recognising the three categories education, critical accounting and positivist research as gender sensitive, we populated these categories with journals that principally published research with the related orientation. All other journals were categorised as generalist.

Many journals comprised a team of editors. Thus, to capture change in editorship, we used three variants of editor change. These were 100% change, at least a 50% change (i.e., at least half the editors change) and finally, any change in multiple editorship. Results for the different versions were broadly similar and thus we present only the finding related to the 50% change in editorship. Finally, we defined presence of a female editor as at least a 50% female representation of the editorial team. Research into the influence of women on boards of corporate organisations suggests that nominal representation of women does little to influence policy and change and that a critical mass needs to be present (Waring, 2012).

Results

We present our descriptive analysis first. In Table I for both 1999 and 2009, we set out, arranged by country of journal, size, female and international membership. Our hypothesis analysis follows, supported by Tables 2 – 7.

Descriptive Analysis

Boards of 30 of the 50 journals increased in size and the mean size of the boards rose from 40.5 in 1999 to 43.8 in 2009. The biggest and smallest boards in 1999 were *Advances in Accounting* which had 108 members and *Public Money and Management*, with seven members. In 2009, however, the biggest board was *The Accounting Review* with 131 members and the smallest, *Advances in Public Interest Accounting* with four members. In terms of the percentage changes over time, the size of boards in five journals increased by over 100%.

<Insert Table 1 about here>

Membership levels in Australia, the UK and 'Other' destinations (including Canada) grew by 39%, 29% and 63%, respectively. This reflects the rising importance of publishing in academia across the globe. Interestingly, the US witnessed a fall in its membership from 1,296 members in 1999 to 1,176 members in 2009 (a 9% fall). This fall contributed to a general convergence of

board size across the different geographical regions. An examination of the changes in board sizes by subject specialism generated interesting findings which may in part explain this convergence[1].

Specifically, in the US, boards of positivist journals grew, while those of the sub-disciplines shrank. The latter included several subject specialisms including accounting history, education, management accounting, public sector accounting and critical accounting. Interestingly, changes in these specialist US journals were met by opposite trends in the equivalent journals in Australia and the UK. For example, in history, while board of the *Accounting Historian's Journal* (US) fell by almost 25%, those of *Accounting History* (Australia) and *Accounting Business and Financial History* (UK) (now *Accounting History Review*) grew by just over 25% in each case, and similarly, while the board size of *Journal of Management Accounting Research* (US) fell by 30%, that for *Management Accounting Research* (UK) grew by 34%. For education journals, the size of the three US journals fell by 34% on average while the board of *Accounting Education* (UK) grew by 40%, and in the public sector, board sizes of the two US journals fell by 23% and 76%, in the UK, boards of Financial Management and Accountability and Public Money and Management rose by 2% and 114%, respectively. Finally, for critical accounting research, the board of *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, the US/ Canadian journal, fell marginally, while those of *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* and *Accounting, Organizations and Society* rose by 54% and 27%, respectively. Overall, these findings suggest a further orientation of the US academic community towards positivist research (Panozzo, 1997; Locke and Lowe, 2008) and the encroachment of principally non-quantitative research by UK and Australian journals.

In terms of journal ranking, board sizes of 4* and 3* journals grew significantly: 4* (by 36% from 229 to 311 members) and 3* (by 24% from 722 to 894 members) while those of 2* journals remained constant and those of unranked journals fell (there were no 1* journals). These results correspond to the pressures internationally for academics to publish in quality journals.

On gender, the number (and proportion) of female academics as a whole increased from 331 (16%) in 1999 to 458 (21%) in 2009. In 1999, two UK journals (*Accounting, Business and Financial History* and *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting)* and one US journal (*Journal of Accounting Literature)* had no female representation. At the other end of the spectrum, *Australian Accounting Review, Accounting Historians' Journal, Accounting Review and Advances in Public Interest Accounting* had more than 30% representation. By 2009, two journals including the *Journal of Accounting Literature* still had no female representation while eight journals had over 30%. To further understand the change in female representation, we calculated a 'change in membership' ratio which we measured as the relative change in the proportion of female representation in 2009 as compared to 1999 (results not shown in table). A positive (negative) percentage depicted an overall rise (fall) in the representation of female membership after adjusting for board size. Thirty four of the 50 journals achieved positive percentage scores suggesting that the female representation from 1999 to 2009 had improved in the vast majority of cases.

On internationalisation, we examined the proportion of board members who were not from the country of the journal. The total number (proportion) of international scholars overall rose 615 (from 30%) in 1999 to 818 (37%) in 2009. In 1999, one UK journal (*Public Money and Management*) and two US journals (*Journal of Accounting Literature* and the prestigious *Accounting Review)* had no international representation and by 2009, this changed to four US journals, of which *Journal of Accounting Literature* continued to be one. *The Journal of Accounting Literature* thus proved to be an extreme outlier with no female or international members. Five journals (four US and one European) saw the representation of international

scholars as reflected in the 'change in membership' ratio more than double. For the four US journals, however, these rises reflected a relatively small proportionate representation in 1999. Therefore only the *European Accounting Review* saw a more genuine rise from 19% to 49%.

The next section presents the results on the formal hypotheses tested in the study. Proportionate representations on boards (i.e. the percentage) of female scholars and international scholars are used to test the hypotheses.

Hypotheses Analysis

Overall Board Diversity

In Table 2, we examined the trends in gender representation and internationalisation. In 1999, on average female academics and international scholars made-up 15.4% and 31.7% of boards, respectively. By 2009, internationalisation of boards had increased only marginally to 35.7% representation, while the representation of female academics had increased substantially to 21.1%. Representation of non-Western scholars was only 3.5% in 1999, rising to just 5% by 2009.

To test H1a (gender hypothesis), we set out to compare gender board level representation with senior faculty level representation. Unfortunately, there are no readily available databases with gender information about accounting academic faculty in the US, UK and Australia. This contrasts with the professional accountancy bodies such as the Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales in the UK which publicise a variety of demographic information about their members, including gender on an annual basis. To address this gap, we developed our own data set of gender characteristics of senior faculty and used the UK academic community as a case study. We collected gender and professoriate data about UK accounting academics from the British Accounting Review Register (a biennial publication) for 1998 and 2008 and determined the proportionate female representation at professoriate level against which we compared the board gender data. We also used the UK professoriate data as a proxy for professoriate data across all geographic regions and statistically compared these results to those of editorial board data for all 50 journals. We used the two measures because they complement each other. Comparing the UK professoriate data to UK journal board characteristics overlooks the fact that that women on editorial boards of UK journals may not have been only from the UK and that UK female professors may have had appointments on international boards (there is a possibility that the two will cancel each other out). Similarly, gender representation in UK professoriate may misrepresent the picture elsewhere; for example, the US has in recent years witnessed a drive to improve gender equality at higher levels.

The results using the two approaches (Panel Ai and Aii) refute H1a for both timeframes, 1999 and 2009. A comparison of UK journal data to UK professoriate for both time frames suggests that the proportion of female board members parallels the proportion of female professors. For example, for 2009, 17.4% of professors at UK institutions and 17.2% of the boards of UK accounting journals were female. The 1999 data in which the UK data was used as a proxy for professoriate representation (Table 2, Panel Aii) as a whole interestingly showed that contrary to expectations female academics were statistically significantly over-represented on editorial boards. By 2009, this trend narrowed and the differences were no longer statistically significant.

Overall, while the results contravene hypothesis H1a, they support the societal diversity perspective where female appointments to boards reflect the gender characteristics of the wider academic pool. These results are consistent with the idea that editors may be seeking to achieve a

balanced board. They oppose those of gender inequities reported in prior research of the accounting academy.

For board internationalisation (H1bi and Hb1ii), identifying senior international accounting scholars globally against whom to compare representation of the group at board level was even more problematic than identifying female senior scholars. We therefore relied on proxy data as used in prior research. While some authors such as Murphy and Zhu (2012) Burgess and Shaw (2010) have compared the representation of international scholars on journal boards to the world population, others such as have Metz and Harzing (2009) have adopted a less generalist slant and used author information to proxy for the international characteristic of the academe. We took the latter approach on the basis that authorships in journals offer a reasonable basis from which board members may be selected and boards should reflect the nature of their 'client' group in terms of both societal diversity and value at diversity. We therefore collected details of the home-international profile of authors in all the issues of the sample journals for the two time periods concerned. As with classification of editorial board members, authors were classified as home if they came from the same country as the editor (which also defined the nationality of the journal) and international if they came from a country other than that of the editor. Further, following Metz and Harzing (2009), we collected author information on a lagged basis, collecting author data for 1989 and 1999 against which to assess board representation for 1999 and 2009, respectively. This lagged approach served two related purposes. First, author information may not capture academic seniority and the lagged period allowed for the development of junior academics to more senior levels. Second, the relationship between characteristics of board members and journal authors is bi-directional. Here the lagged approach controlled for the effect of the profile of board membership on that of journal authors and instead inquired into the influence of author profiles on those of board members. Given the resource intensiveness of this task, we collected data from 25 of the 50 journals, selected randomly. This led to a categorisation of 5,757 authors for the two sample periods.

<Insert Table 2 here>

The results are reported in Table 2, Panel B. Once again, in contrast to the predicted hypotheses (H1bi and H1bii), international scholars and non-Western scholars, respectively, were not under-represented on accounting boards. Instead, the international characteristics of journal boards for both attributes reflected the international profile of authors publishing in them. For example, in 2009, the proportion of international scholars on boards was 35.7% as compared to 40.8% in the academy ($p = 0.101$). These results support the societal diversity perspective in so far as journal authorship represents the society from which board members are selected. They may also reflect the value of diversity perspective as the accounting academy is increasingly recognising the value of international diversity (Khalifa and Quatrone 2008; Chapman, 2012). It should, however, be noted that the comparative data used here to assess board representation (international profiles of journal authors) do not necessarily capture the demographics of the global accounting community and may therefore serve as a conservative measure of its international characteristic. As a consequence, a journal exhibiting a home bias or Western dominance in both its board membership and authorship practices would appear as having a reasonable representation of international scholars at board level. In this sense, our approach does not capture the wider issues of inequities and biases that may exist in the academe. For example, it does not address the markedly low representation of non-Western scholars on the editorial boards or authorship classifications of accounting journals.

Board Diversity by Journal Nationality

For H2a and H2b, we compared board characteristics by journal nationality (Table 3). As per our expectations for H2a, the US exhibited higher female representation for 1999 and 2009 at 16.7% and 23.1%, respectively. Interestingly, however, despite Australia and the UK having a similar career trajectory for female academics, female representation on boards of UK journals was lower for both time frames (11.5% and 17.2%, respectively). The differences in gender representation between the different geographical regions were, however, marginal and statistically insignificant, refuting H2a. Overall, these results suggest that female scholars have a similar opportunity of board appointment across all journal nationalities.

<Insert Table 3 here>

In contrast to the results for gender diversity, the position for international scholars by journal nationality was markedly different. The results for both 1999 and 2009 show a large statistically significant variation in board representation at the 1% level, as predicted. For both time periods, while US boards exhibited approximately 20% representation of international scholars, Australia and the UK had more than twice as many scholars (50% in UK and 51% in Australia in 2009). These results confirm those reported in Brinn and Jones (2008) with formal statistical analysis and highlight the continuing trend in parochialism in the US into the 21st century. International scholars have a much lower chance of being appointed to US boards compared to those of Australia and the UK. These results link back to the homophilous (networking theory) and elitist tendencies (status characteristics theory) amongst American academics discussed earlier (Lee, 1997). This is true not only for the top US universities but also more broadly for the US as compared to the rest. It is interesting to reflect on the diversity statement of the American Association of Accounting that the diversity of its membership 'creates a fertile environment for collaboration and innovation'. This at a time when diversity has become a global phenomenon and the mantra that the business literature preaches is '*If you do not intentionally include, you unintentionally exclude*', raises the intriguing questions of how the Association defines diversity and views innovation and the consequences of these perceptions for the future of the discipline.

We also assessed US dominance by looking at the nature of board appointments of US academics as compared to those of academics elsewhere. Here we examined the 'importing' and 'exporting' of academics of the three key geographical regions and the board appointments of US academics as international scholars as compared to those from elsewhere. Table 4 presents the results. Panel A indicates that US exporting activities paralleled their importing activities for both time frames. These practices differed markedly to those of Australia and the UK, where exporting levels were only a fraction of importing activity (results statistically significant at the 1% level). Panel B which compares the exporting activities of the US to those elsewhere for non-US journals generated interesting results. In 1999, US representation on boards paralleled that from other geographical regions (combined). By 2009, however, international scholars from non-US destinations took a lead and exhibited a statistically significantly larger representation than US academics (at the 5% level). These results indicate that board internationalisation of non-US journals is increasingly supported by non-US academics.

Studies of the accounting academy have often discussed the geographical divide between the US and the rest and within this, dominance and parochialism of US academia. Here, we witness an interesting trend in non-US journals. In 1999, US scholars played a prominent role on boards of non-US journals but by 2009, these journals were less reliant on US academics. Combined with our earlier observations that the US is becoming more oriented towards positivist research and that specialisms such as history, management accounting, education and the public sector are gaining prominence in the UK and Australia, these results suggest that the geographical divide between the US and the rest continues to exist and may even be getting stronger with a shift in balance of the core features.

<Insert Table 4 here>

Board Diversity and Journal Ranking

In Table 5, we examined gender diversity and internationalisation by journal ranking (H3a and H3b). Our expectation was that highly ranked journals would have a lower representation of the lower status groups. Our results for gender (H3a) show that 3* and 4* journal exhibited lower female representation at journal boards as compared to the lower ranked journals (2* and unclassified) for both the time periods 1999 and 2009. These differences across the four journal categories were, however, not statistically significant, suggesting that female academics have similar opportunities for board appointment across the different qualities of journals. However, when gender representation for the two higher ranked journals collectively was compared to that of the two lower ranked journals (combined) (Table 5, Panel Aii), these results are reversed for both time frames. The proportionate representation of women on the higher ranked journals was statistically significantly lower than those for the lower ranked journals for both time periods. Therefore, at the very highest level of accounting academia an under-representation of female academics is apparent.

<Insert Table 5 here>

The results for H3b indicate that international scholars had differing propensity for appointment based on journal ranking. International scholars had a lower representation on the boards of 4* journals than on 3* and 2* journals for both time periods (Table 5, Panel B). For 2009, these results were statistically significant (at the 5% level). While international scholars made up approximately 20% of the 4* journal boards, they constituted over 40% of boards of 3* and 2* journals. The difference in proportionate levels across the different ranks actually widened over time with the representation of international scholars across the journal ranking becoming significantly different in 2009. These results suggest that international scholars have fewer opportunities in the highest ranked journals. In part, this result may be led by the nationality of the 4* journals which was predominantly US. International scholar representation for journals not classified by the ABS were relatively low and not dissimilar to those of the 4* journals. Overall, however, at the highest level of academia, there seems to be a dominance of the American male, academic.

Board Gender Diversity and Journal Specialism

In Table 6, we looked at the proportionate representation of female scholars on journal boards across three different potentially gender-sensitive specialisms (positive, critical accounting education) and one generalist, gender neutral, classification. As anticipated (H4a), boards of critical journals and education journals comprised a higher proportion of women (19% and 24% for 1999 and 20% and 34% for 2009, respectively), while boards of positivist journals had a lower representation (6% for 1999, rising to 15% for 2009). Proportionate representation in generalist journals lay between the gender sensitive specialisms. Results on proportionate female representation for the period 1999 were statistically significant across the four different specialisms at the 5% level as expected. Interestingly, however, for 2009, these differences were no longer statistically significant, refuting H4a. The primary factors driving this change appear to be related to the female representation on boards of positivist journals and critical accounting. While the proportionate representation of women on these two groups of journals rose, the increase for critical accounting journals was marginal whereas the proportionate representation of

women in positivist journals more than doubled. In this area gender inequalities therefore narrowed and H4a was consequently supported in 1999 but not for 2009.

<Insert Table 6 here>

Time Dimension

Overall, on average (H5a – H5aiii), the proportion of female board members increased significantly across the 50 journals between 1999 and 2009 (Table, Panel A) (significant at the 5% level). This trend mirrored the change in female professoriate. The overall board results were replicated across the three key journal nationalities (though not the 'other' category) (Table 3), across the four journal rankings examined (Table 4), and with the exception of critical accounting, also across the different sub-disciplines examined (Table 6) at significance levels of 1% - 10%. With critical accounting, there was a rise in proportionate representation, but the results were statistically insignificant. Overall, the results, once again, appear to be aligned with the societal diversity and value of diversity perspectives and these trends are reflected across different countries, rankings and specialisms.

The rise in the representation of international scholars on journals between 1999 and 2009 was modest (Tables 2 – 6, Panels B). International scholar representation for the total journal sample rose by 4%, from 32% to 36% and a similar trend was apparent for the representation of non-Western scholars. These latter results are noted despite the increasing significance of emerging economies. Accounting journals in this sense have been insular. Analysis by journal characteristics generated mixed results. UK journals exhibited a statistically significant rise in the representation of international scholars, and on journal ranking, while 2* and 3* journals saw significant rises over time, leading, worlds class journals (4*) actually witnessed a marginal decline.

Editor Characteristics

<Insert Table 7 about here>

Finally, we looked at the influence of editor characteristics (change in editor and female editorship) on board composition (Table 7). Our expectation was that an editorial change would lead to a significant change in both diversity characteristics. Reporting on the results for an at least 50% change in editors, contrary to expectations, we found that editor change did not statistically significantly influence gender, although boards with change in editorship had a marginally higher female representation. Positive mean scores for the change in membership ratio for both continuing and new editors suggests that over time all editors raised the proportion of female members with new editors being very marginally more female friendly. By contrast, on internationalism, we found editorial change significantly increased the representation of international scholars (at the 1% level). The factors driving gender diversity and internationalisation of boards appeared to differ.

Our final hypothesis sought to examine the effect of the presence of female editorship on the gender diversity of boards. For this, we compared the proportionate representation of women on boards with female and male editors. First, however, surprisingly, only six journals in 1999 (12%) and seven (14%) in 2009 were led by female editors (i.e. had at least 50% female editor representation). Moreover, while the mean female representation at the editorial level closely paralleled that for the professoriate in the UK (used as a proxy for senior academic profiles internationally) (mean of 10.4% versus 10.3%, respectively) in 1999, by 2009, it statistically significantly lagged behind with a mean score of 11% as compared to 17.4% (significance at 10%

level, results not tabled)[2]. These results contradict our earlier findings on gender equality at the highest level of board editorship. They may reflect the fact that members are generally invited to join editorial boards while appointments to editorship are more reflective of a willingness to put oneself forward, which men appear to be better at (King *et al.,* 2011; Beattie and Goodacre, 2012).

Testing for H6b, the results between the two categories of male and female editorship for board gender diversity were statistically significantly different for both time periods. In 1999 and 2009, 25.8% and 32.8%, respectively, were female under a female editor but only 13.9% and 19.2%, respectively, under male editorship (results statistically significant at 1% and 10% levels, respectively). Consistent with networking theory, the results suggest that female editors appoint more women and similarly male editors appoint more men as the two groups adopt homophilous behaviours. Finally, the ratio that measured the change in the proportionate representation of women over time was higher under a female editorship (74.2% as against 67.4%) although these results were statistically insignificant. Given the importance of the gender diversity of editorships in influencing the gender diversity of boards, the failure to keep up the proportionate representation of women in the academy at the editorship level as seen in 2009 may have long term implications for gender diversity for boards more generally.

Discussion and Conclusions

Editorial boards are an extremely important institutional mechanism in accounting and offer a rich and interesting context in which to study the social characteristics of the accounting academic community. This paper has contributed to the limited research in this area by examining the composition of editorial board membership for 50 accounting journals. The study was set in the context of an increasing emphasis on equality and diversity in society, the changing nature of academia as reflected by the increasing focus on academic research globally; and the recognition of the need for intellectual openness to foster a wide discourse on subjects of interest to the academy. Drawing on a broad diversity framework to motivate our hypotheses, we examined six core hypotheses relating to gender diversity and internationalisation of accounting boards.

On gender, the board composition of accounting journals, on the whole, appears to reflect both societal diversity and value of diversity and in contrast to expectation, gender inequity is broadly absent. Consistent with societal diversity, gender diversity of boards was broadly reflective of the gender profile of senior academics and in accordance with the value of diversity perspective, sub-disciplines that were considered to be gender sensitive attracted a relatively higher proportion of female academics on boards. Moreover, female academics had broadly similar opportunities across all geographical regions and in recognition of the changing gender profile of the academy, female board representation improved over time, regardless of journal nationality, ranking or specialism. While continuing editors and new editors were equally likely to retain and recruit female academics onto journal boards, the gender character of editorship influenced the gender character of boards in accordance with networking theory and tendencies of men and women to engage in homophilous behaviours.

Overall, our results on gender support gender diversity in boards of accounting journals, and contradict evidence from prior accounting research which has noted that women's careers suffer from inequality in the academic community (Rama *et al.,* 1997; Collins *et al.,* 1998; Broadbent and Kirkham, 2008; Beattie and Goodacre, 2012). Together, these results suggest once women reach senior positions, they appear to have the same opportunities as their male colleagues for journal board appointments. These results differ from those of Carnegie *et al.,* (2003) and Metz

and Harzing (2009, 2012) who reported an under-representation of women on boards in the history and management journals, respectively.

At the very highest level, however, we noted interesting exceptions to gender equality. Relatively few journals had a significant (at least a 50%) female editor representation. Relatedly, women were statistically significantly under-represented as editors. Further, female scholars were statistically significantly under-represented on the boards of higher ranked journals (3* and 4* journals) as compared to those of lower ranked journals (2* and unranked). Finally, while we found that, in the UK, editorial board representation mirrored the profile of senior UK academics, UK gender diversity (marginally) lagged behind that of Australia and the US for both 1999 and 2009. These results raise the intriguing question of whether US and Australian boards actually have a greater proportion of women in professorial posts than in the UK or whether they are over-represented on editorial boards as compared to their professorial representation.

Our results on board internationalisation, like gender, also suggest that boards overall reflect societal diversity and in contrast to expectation, international scholar inequity is broadly absent. Specifically, the representation of international scholars and non-Western scholars on boards of accounting journals reflected the (lagged) international scholar and non-Western scholar profile of authors publishing in these journals. However, changes in the proportionate representation of international scholars, contrary to expectations, did not change significantly over time. These results perhaps reflect the slow change in the international profile of author. Further, change in editorship improved the international diversity of boards.

An analysis of internationalisation trends by journal characteristics generated interesting results. Consistent with Beattie and Goodacre (2004) and Brinn and Jones (2008), US journals continue to exhibit parochialism. Their boards comprised significantly fewer international scholars than the UK and Australia in both 1999 and 2009. In 2009, just over 20% of US boards comprised international scholars as compared to approximately 50% of boards in Australian and UK journals. US boards also demonstrated a marginal reduction in international scholar representation over time. Further, 4* journals, made up principally of US journals, exhibited significantly lower representation of international scholars as compared to 3* and 2* ranked journals and a marginal fall in their representation over time.

Finally, US dominance was apparent in the relatively high levels of exporting versus importing as compared to the UK and Australia. Interestingly, however, the US academy is losing edge in the international market; in 1999, the proportion of US academics on the boards of UK, Australian and 'other' journals were much the same as those of other international academics. By 2009, it was statistically significantly lower, implying that the international profile of non-US journals was increasingly represented by non-US scholars. Combined with the more descriptive observations that there appears to be a further positivist turn and a move away from specialisms such as management accounting, critical accounting and history in US accounting research, these results suggest that the traditional divide between the US and elsewhere (Panozzo 1997; Ballas and Theoharakis, 2003) continues but is placed in a slightly different context.

Overall, for both gender diversity and internationalisation, we find that on average, boards of accounting journals reflected broader societal trends of the academy for both the time periods examined. A more fine grained analysis, inquiring into the role of various journal and editor characteristics revealed interesting results with inequities apparent for both female scholars and international scholars. The highest ranked, US journals exhibited a particular conservatism with a lacking in diversity for both characteristics – gender and international.

As with all research, our study has some limitations. These particularly concern our data on the gender and international profiles of the accounting academy. For example, in the absence of mechanisms to capture gender data in the profession, we developed our own database on UK academics, which is naturally restrictive. Similarly, we developed a data set to capture the international orientation of the accounting academy against which to assess editorial board trends. Our approach here which used author profiles as a proxy for the accounting community may constitute a conservative measure. Finally, on board membership data, as board members were assigned a home / international label relative to the journal nationality based on their university location, we may have misstated the levels of representation of international scholars on journal boards given international mobility in academia.

Our results, we believe, offer fertile ground for future research into the board membership of accounting journals and accounting academia more generally. Future research may explore qualitatively how / why gender diversity, absent in boards of management journals, has materialised in accounting. Moreover, an examination of multiple board appointments and continuing levels of service would be interesting to establish the gurus and eminent contributors to the field and whether a particular elite dominates boards of accounting journals. More generally for the profession, on developing the hypotheses for this study, we often borrowed from other disciplines to decipher how, in accordance with the value of diversity perspective, academic profiles may influence developments in the field. Future research may study such patterns in accounting. Recent years have witnessed a rise in female academics and non-Western academics working at Western universities and research may look into the value implications of such diversity. It may also investigate the wider consequences of non-Western scholars working in western academia. Finally, research may also look into career progression of women in the UK as compared to that in the US and Australia as our results suggest that there may be comparatively fewer women in senior academic positions in the UK.

Notes

[1] We would like to thank one of the reviewers for alluding us to this fine grained analysis.
[2] The number of editors was clearly far smaller than the number of board member. However, several journals had multiple editors and the mean % score for female representation refers to the average score of the% of female academics operating as editors.

References

Addis, E. and Villa, P. (2003), "The editorial boards of Italian economics journals: women, gender and social networking", *Feminist Economics,* Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 75 – 91.

Amrein K, Langmann A., Fahrleitner-Pammer A, Pieber T.R. and Zollner-Schwetz I. (2011), "Women underrepresented on editorial boards of 60 major medical journals", *Gender Medicine*, Vol. 8 No. 6, pp. 378-387.

Harvey, C., Kelly, A., Morris, H. and Rawlinson, M. (2010). (ABS) (2010), *The Association of Business Schools academic journal quality guide* (version 4), London: Association of Business Schools.

Ballas, A & Theoharakis, V. (2003), "Exploring diversity in accounting through faculty journal perceptions", *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 619-644.

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

Beattie, V. and Goodacre, A. (2012), "Publication records of faculty promoted to professor: evidence from the uk accounting and finance academic community", *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 197-231.

Beattie, V. and Smith, S. (2012), *Today's PhD. students: is there a future generation of accounting academics or are they a dying breed? A UK perspective*, Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland

Bedeian, A. G., Van Fleet, D. D. and Hyman, H. H. (2009), "Scientific achievement and editorial board membership", *Organizational Research Methods,* Vol. 12, pp. 211-238.

Bianchi, A. (2010), "Status characteristics/expectation states theory". In J. Levine, & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of group processes & intergroup relations.* (pp. 845-849). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

Bishop, M. and Boden, R. (2008), "Disabling accounting", *Critical Perspectives in Accounting* Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 1 – 16.

Brennan J. (2008), "Higher Education and Social Change", *Higher Education,* Vol. 56, pp. 381–393

Brinn, A. and Jones, M.J. (2007), "Editorial boards in accounting: the power and the glory", *Accounting Forum*, Vol. 31, pp. 1–25.

Brinn, A. and Jones, M.J. (2008), "The composition of editorial boards in accounting: a UK perspective", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 5–35.

Brinn, T., Jones, M. and Pendlebury, M. (2001), "Why do UK accounting and finance academics not publish in top us journals?", *The British Accounting Review,* Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 223-232

British Accounting Review Research Register (2000), C. Helliar, E.A.Monk and Gray, R. (eds.), Elsevier, Oxford.

British Accounting Review Research Register (2008), C. Helliar, E.A.Monk and Hannah, G. (eds.), Elsevier, Oxford.

Broadbent, J. and Kirkham, L. M. (2008), "Glass ceilings, glass cliffs or new worlds? Revisiting gender and accounting", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 465- 474.

Buckless, F., Ravenscroft, S. and Baldwin, A. (1998). "Educational qualifications and gender: Accounting for women as adjuncts". *Advances in Public Interest Accounting*, Vol. 9, pp. 133-

Burgess, T.F. and Shaw, N.E. (2010), "Editorial board membership of management and business journals: a social network analysis of the financial times 40", *British Journal of Management,* Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 627-648.

Campbell L.G., Mehtani S., Dozier M.E. and Rinehart J. (2013), "Gender-heterogeneous working groups produce higher quality science". *PLoS ONE* Vol, 8 No. 10, pp. 1 - 6.

Carnegie. G, Mcwaters. S. and Potter. B. (2003), "The interface of accounting and gender in specialist accounting history journals in the English language", *Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 186-207.

Carter, D. and D'Souza, F., Simkins, B. J. and Simpson, W. G. (2010), "The gender and ethnic diversity of us boards and board committees and firm financial performance", *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, Vol. 18, pp. 396–414.

Carter, D., Simkins, B. and Simpson, W. (2003), "Corporate governance, board diversity, and firm value", *Financial Review*, Vol. 38, pp. 33-53.

Ceci, S., Ginther, D., Kahn, S. and Williams, W. (2014), "Women in Academic Science: A Changing Landscape", *Psychological Science in the Public Interes*t, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 75 – 141.

Chapman, C.S. (2012), "Framing the issue of research quality in a context of research diversity", *Accounting Horizons,* Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 821-831

Collins, A. B., B. K. Parrish and D. L. (1998), "Gender and the tenure track: Some survey evidence", *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 13, pp. 277-299.

Eagly A. (2013), *Women as leaders: leadership style versus leaders' values and attitudes*, Research Symposium Gender and Work, HBS. [accessed online January 2014]

Ely R., (1995), "The role of dominant identity ad experience in organisational work on diversity", in Jackson S., Ruderman M. *Diversity in Work Teams,* Washington, American Psychological Association

Florida , R. and G. Gates . (2001), *Technology and Tolerance: The Importance of Diversity to High-Technology Growth* . Washington, DC : The Brookings Institution .

Fogarty T. and Liao C. (2009), "Blessed are the gatekeepers: a longitudinal study of the editorial boards of the accounting review", *Issues in Accounting Education*: Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 299-318.

Fondas, N. and Wiersema, N. (1997), "Changing of the Guard: the Influence of CEO Socialization on Strategic Change", *Journal of Management Studies,* Vol. 34 No. 4, pp, 561–584.

Gallhofer, S. and Haslam, J. (2006), "The accounting-globalisation interrelation: overview with a focus on the neglected dimension of emancipatory potentiality", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 17, pp. 903-934.

Guthrie, J. and Parker, L. (2014), "The global accounting academic: what counts!", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 2 – 14.

Hoepner, A. and Unerman, J. (2012), "Explicit and implicit subject bias in the ABS journal quality guide", *Accounting Education*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 3-15.

Hopwood, A.G. (2008), "Changing pressures on the research process: on trying to research in an age when curiosity is not enough", *The European Accounting Review*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 87-96.

Jones, M.J. and Roberts, R. (2005), "International publishing patterns: an investigation of leading UK and US. accounting and finance journals", *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 1107-40.

Kamla, R. and Rammal, H. (2013), "Social reporting by Islamic banks: does social justice matter?", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 911 – 945.

Khalifa, R. (2013), "Intra-Professional Hierarchies: the gendering of accounting specialisms in UK accountancy", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 8, pp.1212 – 1245.

Khalifa, R. and Quattrone, P. (2008), "The governance of accounting academia: issues for a debate", *European Accounting Review*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 65-86.

King, M., Correll, S., Jacquet, J., Bergstrom, C. and West, J. (2011), Men set their own cites high: Gender and self-citation across fields and over time, Eigenfactor.org http://www.eigenfactor.org/gender/self-citation/SelfCitation.pdf [Accessed December 2014]

Komori, N. (2008), "Towards the feminization of accounting practice: lessons from the experiences of Japanese women in the accounting profession", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 507-538.

Kuasirikun, N. (2011), "The portrayal of gender in annual reports in Thailand", *Critical Perspectives of Accounting*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 53 - 78.

Lal, V. (2004), 'Home Truths and McData', *Little Magazine Vol.* 4–5: 68–74.

Mavin, S., Bryans, P. and Waring, T. (2004) 'Unlearning Gender Blindness', *Management* Lee, T., (1997), "The editorial gatekeepers of the accounting academic academy", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 11 – 30.

Lindsey, D. (1976), "Distinction, achievement and editorial board membership", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 31 No. 11, pp. 799 – 804.

Link, A.N., Swann, C.A. and Bozeman, B. (2008). "A time allocation study of university faculty", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 363-374.

Locke, J. and Lowe, A . (2008), "Evidence and implications of multiple paradigms in accounting knowledge production", *European Accounting Review*, Vol. 17 No.1, pp. 161-191.

Lowe, D. J., and Van Fleet, D.D. (2009), "Scholarly achievement and accounting journal editorial board membership", *Journal of Accounting Education*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 197-209.

Lukka, K. and Kasanen, E. (1996), "Is accounting a global or a local discipline? evidence from major research journals", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 21 No. 7-8, pp. 755-773.

McPherson M., Smith-Lovin, .L. and Cook. J., (2001), "Birds of a feather: homophily in social networks", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 27, pp. 415 – 44.

Metz, I. and Harzing, A.W. (2009), "Gender diversity in editorial boards of management journals", *The Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 540-557.

Metz, I. and Harzing, A.W. (2012), "An update of gender diversity in editorial boards: a longitudinal study of management journals", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 283-300.

Miller, D. (1993), "Some organizational consequences of CEO Succession", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 644 – 659.

MIT (1999), "A study on the status of women in science at MIT", *MIT Faculty Newsletter*, X1(4).

Murphy, J. and Zhu, J (2012), "Neo-Colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals", *Organisation,* Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 1 – 13.

National Science Board (2012) *Science and Engineering Indicators 2012* http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind12/c2/c2s3.htm#s3 [Accessed January 2015]

Nekhili, M. and Gatfaoui, H. (2013), "Are demographic attributes and firm characteristics drivers of gender diversity? Investigating women's positions on French boards of directors", *Journal of Business Ethics,* Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 227 – 249.

Nisonger, T. (2002), "The Relationship between international editorial board composition and citation measures in political science, business, and genetics journals", *Scientometrics,* Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 257-268

Ozbilgin, M. (2004), ""International" human resource management: academic parochialism in editorial boards of the "top" 22 journals on international human resource management", *Personnel Review,* Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 205-221

Ozbilgin, M. (2009), "From journal rankings to making sense of the world", *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 113-121.

Panozzo, F. (1997), "The making of the good academic accountant", *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* Vol 22 No. 5, pp. 447–80

Parker, L. (2007), "Developing research journals and qualitative inquiry: the role of the editorial board", *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management,* Vol. 4, pp. 168-182.

Pyke, J. (2012) Women, choice and promotion: why women are still a minority in the professoriate, LT Martin Institute, blog [accessed 12 January 2015] http://www.lhmartininstitute.edu.au/insights-blog/2012/03/80-women-choice-and-promotion-why-women-are-still-a-minority-in-the-professoriate

Rama, D.V., Raghunandan, K., Logan, L.B. and Barkman, B.V. (1997), "Gender differences in publications by promoted faculty", *Issues in Accounting Education,* Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 353 – 365.

Reiter, S. and Williams, P. F. (2002), "The structure and progressivity of accounting research: the crisis in the academy revisited", *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 575-607.

Rhode, D. and Packel, A (2010), *Diversity on corporate boards: how much difference does difference make?,* Rock Center for Corporate Governance at Stanford University Working Paper No. 89

Shore, L., Chung, B., Dean, M. Ehrhart, K., Jung, D., Randel, A., and Singh, G. (2009), "Diversity in organizations: where are we now and where are we going?", *Human Resource Management Review,* Vol. 19, pp. 117-133.

Svensson, G., Slattten, T. and Tronveil, B (2007), "'Ethnocentricity' in top journals of services management: authors, editorial review boards, editorial boards and editors", *Managing Service Quality,* Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 563 - 578.

Torres, L., and Huffman, M.L. (2002), "Social networks and job search outcomes among male and female professional, technical, and managerial workers", *Sociological Focus*, Vol. 35, pp. 25-42.

United Nations Statistics Division (2010), http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/indwm/ tab4e.htm (09.04.2010) [Accessed July 2013]

Urbancic, F. (2011), "The gatekeepers of business education research: an institutional analysis", *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 86, pp. 302 – 310.

van Staveren, I. (2014), "The Lehman sisters' hypothesis", *Cambridge Journal of Economics, advance access, http://cje.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2014/03/20/cje.beu010.full.pdf+html* [Accessed January 2015]

Walter, W. (2014) *Reaping the Benefits of Diversity for Modern Business Innovation*, http://www.ekaterinawalter.com/2014/01/reaping-the-benefits-of-diversity-for-modern-business-innovation/ [Accessed March 2015]

Waring, R. (2012) *Upside Down the Paradoxes on Gender in the 21st Century*

Williams, P.F. and Rodgers, J.L. (1995), "The accounting review and the production of accounting knowledge", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 263-287

Zanoni P, Janssens M, Benschop Y and Nkomo S. (2010), "Unpacking diversity, grasping inequality: Rethinking difference through critical perspectives", *Organization*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 1-21.

Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of the Editorial Boards of Accounting Journals (1999 – 2009)

Journal	Journal		Size			Female Membership				International Membership			
	Nation -ality	Ranking	'99	'09	Δ %	'99	'09	'99 %	'09 %	'99	'09	'99 %	'09 %
Panel A: Journal Level Analysis													
Abacus	Aus	3	32	46	44	1	4	3	9	13	22	41	48
Accounting and Business Research	UK	3	51	46	-10	2	2	4	4	22	19	43	41
Accounting and Finance	Aus	2	31	51	65	4	7	13	14	18	19	58	37
Accounting Education	UK	2	53	74	40	14	22	27	31	37	58	70	78
Accounting Educators' Journal	US	-	85	53	-38	17	22	20	42	1	3	1	6
Accounting Forum	Aus	3	45	44	-2	10	9	22	20	28	28	62	64
Accounting Historians' Journal	US	2	43	33	-23	14	5	33	15	14	20	33	61
Accounting History	Aus	2	27	34	26	2	11	7	32	19	26	70	76
Accounting Horizons	US	3	61	54	-11	14	25	23	46	5	3	8	6
Accounting Research Journal	Aus	-	27	20	-26	2	4	7	20	6	4	22	20
Accounting Review	US	4	74	131	77	25	40	34	31	0	5	0	4
Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal	Aus	3	48	74	54	11	16	23	22	39	58	81	78
Accounting, Business and Financial History	UK	2	21	28	33	0	3	0	11	10	15	48	54
Accounting, Management and Information Technology	US	2	38	37	-3	3	8	8	22	19	16	50	43
Accounting, Organisations and Society	UK	4	45	57	27	5	9	11	16	38	40	84	70
Advances in Accounting	US	-	108	44	-60	19	2	18	5	3	1	3	2

Notes:
Table records the size and diversity characteristics of each journal board.
The journal list is formulated alphabetically.
The female and international characteristics of the membership include the number in each of the two categories as at 1999 and 2009 and their percentage representation on the board. Data for change in size, female representation and international representation for individual geographical zones based on journal nationality and journal ranking is computed using the aggregate data for the respective characteristics. Thus for example, overall size change in Australian journals is computed as the total board membership for Australian journals in 2009 / that in 1999 x 100%. These measures differ to the mean percentage computations reported in Tables 2 – 6, which we use for the statistical analysis. The values here have been calculated as the mean averages for the chosen variable (size, gender representation, international scholar representation) based on the journals included in the analysis. The two computations sometimes differ because the individual journal board sizes used as denominators for the % computations differed.

	Journal		Size			Female Membership				International Membership			
	Nation -ality	Ranking	‘99	‘09	Δ %	‘99	‘09	’99 %	’09 %	‘99	‘09	’99 %	‘09%
Advances in International Accounting	US	2	17	18	6	5	4	29	22	4	7	24	39
Advances in Management Accounting	US	-	35	24	-31	3	5	9	21	4	4	11	17
Advances in Public Interest Accounting	US	-	17	4	-76	7	3	41	75	9	0	53	0
Asia Pacific Journal of Accounting	Other	-	29	31	7	2	0	7	0	17	17	59	55
Auditing a Journal of Theory and Practice	US	2	32	85	166	5	18	16	21	4	22	13	26
Australian Accounting Review	Aus	-	19	50	163	6	18	32	36	4	16	21	32
Behavioral Research in Accounting	US	3	34	26	-24	5	11	15	42	2	5	6	19
British Accounting Review	UK	3	58	63	9	8	9	14	14	15	21	26	33
Contemporary Accounting Research	Other	3	52	94	85	5	25	10	27	28	59	54	63
Critical Perspectives on Accounting	US	3	37	35	-5	8	8	22	23	20	21	54	60
European Accounting Review	Other	3	21	61	190	4	7	19	11	4	30	19	49
Financial Management and Accountability	UK	3	43	44	2	8	6	19	14	24	28	56	64
Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management	US	2	36	24	-33	2	4	6	17	9	12	25	50
International Journal of Accounting	US	3	65	75	15	11	17	18	23	34	38	52	51
International Journal of Auditing	US	2	37	41	11	6	6	16	15	25	28	68	68
Issues in Accounting Education	US	2	82	11	-87	21	3	26	27	4	0	5	0
Journal of Accounting and Economics	US	4	31	34	10	2	6	6	18	2	1	6	3

Notes:
Table records the size and diversity characteristics of each journal board.
The journal list is formulated alphabetically.
The female and international characteristics of the membership include the number in each of the two categories as at 1999 and 2009 and their percentage representation on the board. Data for change in size, female representation and international representation for individual geographical zones based on journal nationality and journal ranking is computed using the aggregate data for the respective characteristics. Thus for example, overall size change in Australian journals is computed as the total board membership for Australian journals in 2009 / that in 1999 x 100%. These measures differ to the mean percentage computations reported in Tables 2 – 6, which we use for the statistical analysis. The values here have been calculated as the mean averages for the chosen variable (size, gender representation, international scholar representation) based on the journals included in the analysis. The two computations sometimes differ because the individual journal board sizes used as denominators for the % computations differed.

	Journal		Size			Female Membership				International Membership			
	Nation -ality	Ranking	‘99	‘09	Δ %	‘99	‘09	’99 %	’09 %	‘99	‘09	’99 %	’09 %
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy	US	3	63	70	11	8	7	13	10	11	20	17	29
Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance	US	3	33	30	-9	2	6	6	20	5	1	15	3
Journal of Accounting Education	US	2	54	47	-13	12	16	22	34	3	12	6	26
Journal of Accounting Literature	US	3	12	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Journal of Accounting Research	US	4	38	42	11	4	6	11	14	3	3	8	7
Journal of Applied Accounting Research	UK	2	17	22	29	4	10	24	45	5	9	29	41
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	UK	3	23	60	161	0	2	0	3	9	27	39	45
Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation	US	2	45	44	-2	13	16	29	36	12	9	27	20
Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting	US	2	30	26	-13	3	3	10	12	10	7	33	27
Journal of Management Accounting Research	US	2	44	31	-30	5	4	11	13	4	9	9	29
Management Accounting Research	UK	3	44	59	34	1	12	2	20	30	40	68	68
Pacific Accounting Review	Other	-	38	42	11	10	10	27	24	22	22	58	52
Public Money and Management	UK	2	7	15	114	1	2	14	13	0	1	0	7
Research in Accounting Regulation	US	-	24	27	13	2	3	8	11	4	4	17	15
Research in Governmental and Non-Profit Accounting	US	-	22	17	-23	2	3	9	18	8	0	36	0
Research on Accounting Ethics	US	-	58	53	-9	9	13	16	25	4	2	7	4
Review of Accounting Studies	US	4	41	47	15	4	6	10	13	4	6	10	13

Notes:
Table records the size and diversity characteristics of each journal board.
The journal list is formulated alphabetically.
The female and international characteristics of the membership include the number in each of the two categories as at 1999 and 2009 and their percentage representation on the board. Data for change in size, female representation and international representation for individual geographical zones based on journal nationality and journal ranking is computed using the aggregate data for the respective characteristics. Thus for example, overall size change in Australian journals is computed as the total board membership for Australian journals in 2009 / that in 1999 x 100%. These measures differ to the mean percentage computations reported in Tables 2 – 6, which we use for the statistical analysis. The values here have been calculated as the mean averages for the chosen variable (size, gender representation, international scholar representation) based on the journals included in the analysis. The two computations sometimes differ because the individual journal board sizes used as denominators for the % computations differed.

	Journal		Size			Female Membership				International Membership			
	Nation -ality	Ranking	'99	'09	Δ %	'99	'09	'99 %	'09 %	'99	'09	'99 %	'09 %
Panel B: Country Analysis													
Australia			229	319	39	36	69	16	22	127	173	55	54
UK			362	468	29	43	77	12	16	190	258	52	55
US			1296	1176	-9	231	270	18	23	227	259	18	22
'Other'			140	228	63	21	42	15	18	71	128	51	56
Panel C: Analysis based on Journal Ranking													
4*			229	311	36	40	67	17	22	47	55	21	18
3*			722	894	24	98	166	14	19	289	420	40	47
2*			614	621	1	114	142	19	23	197	270	32	43
Unranked			462	365	-21	79	83	17	23	82	73	18	20
Panel D: Total Overall													
			2027	**2191**	**8**	**331**	**458**	**16**	**21**	**615**	**818**	**30**	**37**

Notes:
Table records the size and diversity characteristics of each journal board.
The journal list is formulated alphabetically.
The female and international characteristics of the membership include the number in each of the two categories as at 1999 and 2009 and their percentage representation on the board. Data for change in size, female representation and international representation for individual geographical zones based on journal nationality and journal ranking is computed using the aggregate data for the respective characteristics. Thus for example, overall size change in Australian journals is computed as the total board membership for Australian journals in 2009 / that in 1999 x 100%. These measures differ to the mean percentage computations reported in Tables 2 – 6, which we use for the statistical analysis. The values here have been calculated as the mean averages for the chosen variable (size, gender representation, international scholar representation) based on the journals included in the analysis. The two computations sometimes differ because the individual journal board sizes used as denominators for the % computations differed.

Table 2: Overall Diversity Characteristics of Boards of Accounting Journals

	Proportion of Female / International Scholars (%)							
	1999 Mean Std Dev	2009 Mean Std Dev					T value Significance	
Panel Ai: Comparison of Female Membership Trends with Professoriate Trends: comparing UK Gender Data to UK Journal Data (Independent Sample T Test)								
Editorial board	11.5 9.8	17.2 12.6					-2.086 (0.034)	
Female % in professoriate	10.3 23.7	17.4 25.4						
Independent Sample T Test	-0.166 (0.434)	0.023 (0.490)						
Panel Aii: Comparison of Female Membership Trends with Professoriate Trends: using UK Gender Data as a Proxy Gender Profile of the International Academic Community (Independent Sample T Test)								
Editorial board	15.4 9.8	21.1 13.6					-3.912 (0.000)	
Female % in professoriate	10.3 23.7	17.4 25.4						
Independent Sample T Test	-1.466 (0.075)	-0.955 (0.17)						
Panel B: Comparison of International Scholar Representation with Trends in Authorship Profile (Paired T test)(n = 25)[1,2]								
			Mean (n = 50)[1] Std Dev 1999		2009			
Editorial Board	31.7 27.7	35.7 26.0	32.1 24.5		34 24.8		-0.977 (0.167)	
International Scholar % in academe using author details as proxy	35.7 30.7	40.8 29.9						
Paired samples T Test	-0.749 (0.231)	-1.313 (0.101)						
Panel C: Comparison of Non-Western Scholar Representation with Trends in Authorship Profile (Paired T test)(n = 25)[1,2]								
			Mean (n = 50)[1] Std Dev 1999		2009			
Editorial Board	3.5 6.9	5.0 5.3	4.3 6.3		4.3 6.5		0.059 (0.476)	
Non-Western Scholar % in academe using author details as proxy	3.4 4.2		3.8 4.1					
Paired samples T Test	0.075 (0.47)		1.587 (0.126)					

Notes:
The Table uses the mean scores of proportionate representation of female and international scholars across the sample journals.
Results for gender diversity and internationalisation are presented in the white shaded parts of the tables, respectively.
[1] Results for the international and non-Western characteristics of boards are presented on the sample of 25 journals in which board patterns were compared to those of authorship and the full sample of 50 journals, data for which is used to track changes over time.
[2] For both the international and non-Western characteristics, paired T tests were used to compare board data to the author data (as a proxy for the international nature of the accounting academe) even though the sample size was small (n = 25) because the variances of the groups for both categories in both time periods (1999 and 2009) were similar.

Table 3: Diversity Characteristics of Boards of Accounting Journals by Journal Nationality

	Proportion of Female / International Scholars (%)			Change in Females / international Ratio[1]
	1999 Mean Std Dev	2009 Mean Std Dev	T value Significance	Mean Std Dev
Panel Ai: Gender				
US	16.7	23.1	-3.082	58.4
	9.9	14.9	(0.003)	79.6
UK	11.5	17.2	-2.086	107.7
	9.8	12.6	(0.034)	255.6
Australia	15.4	21.8	-1.798	98.8
	10.4	9.6	(0.061)	132.9
Other	15.7	15.5	0.03	6.2
	9.2	12.2	(0.489)	119.4
One Way ANOVA	0.673	0.705		0.684
	(0.573)	(0.554)		(0.567)
Panel B: International				
US	20.6	21.6	-0341	4.04
	19.1	20.9	(0.368)	126.2
UK	46.3	50.1	-1.578	11.1
	24.7	21.3	(0.075)	16.9
Australia	50.8	50.8	0.09	4.8
	23.4	22.7	(0.497)	26.9
Other	47.3	54.8	-0.905	39.7
	19.0	5.8	(0.216)	79.9
One Way ANOVA	7.073	8.484		0.359
	(0.001)	(0.000)		(0.783)

Notes:
The Table uses the mean scores of proportionate representation of female and international scholars across the sample journals.
Results for gender diversity and internationalisation are presented in the white shaded parts of the tables, respectively.

Table 4: Diversity Characteristics of Boards of Accounting Journals by Journal Ranking

	Proportion of Female / International Scholars (%)			Change in Females / international Ratio[1]
	1999 Mean Std Dev	2009 Mean Std Dev	T value Significance	Mean Std Dev
Panel Ai: Gender				
4*	14.32	18.20	-1.687	54.6
	11.03	7.13	(0.084)	69.5
3*	12.47	18.17	-2.274	102.9
	8.42	12.48	(0.019)	196.5
2*	17.15	22.37	-2099	55.1
	9.40	10.31	(0.026)	101.8
unclassified	17.56	25.0	-1.880	46.9
	11.44	20.56	(0.045)	85.2
One Way ANOVA	0.883	0.680		0.485
	(0.457)	(0.569)		(0.695)
Panel Aii: Gender: 3* + 4* journals versus 2* and unranked journals				
3* + 4*	12.9	18.2	-2.858	
	8.8	11.3	(0.04)	
2*+ unranked	17.3	23.4	-2.658	
	10.2	11.3	(0.0075)	
Independent T test	1.63	1.365		
	(0.057)	(0.09)		
Panel B: International				
4*	21.71	19.37	0.718	-12.5
	35.26	28.66	(0.257)	35.0
3*	37.77	42.37	-2.074	27.0
	24.04	23.99	(0.028)	72.1
2*	33.29	40.12	-2.155	51.2
	23.60	23.53	(0.024)	110.4
unclassified	26.19	18.40	1.344	16.2
	21.85	20.0	(0.105)	130.4
One Way ANOVA	0.822	3.472		0.548
	(0.488)	(0.023)		(0.652)

Notes:
The Table uses the mean scores of proportionate representation of female and international scholars across the sample journals.
Results for gender diversity and internationalisation are presented in the white shaded parts of the tables, respectively.

Table 5: A Further Analysis of Internationalisation Trends: the US and the Rest.

Proportion International Scholars (%)						
Panel Ai: Comparison of the 'exporting' and 'importing' activities by the different geographic regions						
	1999			2009		
	US	UK	Australia	US	UK	Australia
Home scholars on	22.5	7.7	4.0	20.6	9.2	5.0
International boards	15.3	10.6	4.3	12.7	11.3	5.4
International scholars	20.6	53.6	49.1	21.6	49.9	49.2
on home boards	19.1	24.7	23.4	20.9	21.3	22.7
Independent Sample T	-0.403	-5.761	-5.085	0.190	-5.849	-5.143
Test	(0.35)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.43)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Panel Aii: Comparison of US scholar representation in non-US journals versus other international scholar representation (n = 21)						
US scholars	22.5			20.6		
	15.5			12.7		
Other international	25.5			30.6		
scholars	16.2			18.1		
Paired Sample T Test	-0.614			-1.851		
	(0.28)			(0.04)		

Notes:
The Table uses the mean scores of proportionate representation of home / international scholars on the journal sample specified.

Table 6: Gender Characteristics of Boards of Accounting Journals by Journal Specialism

	Proportion of Female (%)			Change in Females Ratio[1]
	1999 Mean Std Dev	2009 Mean Std Dev	T value Significance	Mean Std Dev
Panel Ai: Gender				
Positivist	6.0	15.2	-4.150	158.1
(n = 6)	3.4	6.9	(0.005)	81.8
General accounting (n	15.7	20.8	-2.742	63.0
= 37)	10.1	14.7	(0.005)	146.3
Critical accounting (n	18.6	20.1	-0.889	14.1
= 3)	6.5	3.8	(0.234)	25.0
Education	24.0	33.6	-2.003	44.0
(n = 4)	3.5	6.1	(0.07)	47.6
One Way ANOVA	3.417	1.520		0.987
	(0.025)	(0.222)		(0.408)

Notes:
The Table uses the mean scores of proportionate representation of female scholars across the sample journals.

Table 7: Influence of Editorship Characteristics on Board Diversity

Panel A: Change in Editorship	Editor Change n = 21 Mean Std Dev	Editor no change n = 29 Mean Std Dev	T value significance
Panel Ai: Gender			
Proportional representation	23.1	19.7	-0.883
(2009)	16.2	11.3	(0.191)
% change in female ratio	70.3	67.1	-0.079
	186.6	83.3	(0.461)
Panel Aii: International scholar			
`Proportional representation	46.0	25.4	-3.141
(2009)	25.5	20.8	(0.002)
% change in international	13.7	40.9	1.042
scholar ratio	45.0	124.7	(0.152)
Panel B: Presence of a Female Editor			
	Female editor	No female editor	
1999	n = 6	n = 44	
Proportion of female	25.8	13.95	-3.001
members	10.6	8.9	(0.000)
2009	n = 7	n = 43	
Proportion of female	32.8	19.2	-1.473
members	24.2	10.2	(0.046)
% Change in the female	74.2	67.4	-0.125
ratio	57.2	142.7	(0.455)

Notes:
Results for gender diversity and internationalisation are presented in the white shaded parts of the tables, respectively.
Change in editorship was defined as at least a 50% change in the position of the 1999 editor(s) in 2009. This change materialised either as the resignation of the individual(s) or a change in their position of authority with more scholars being recruited to the position of editor and thus diluting the effect of the individual(s).
Editor gender refers to at least 50% of the editorship being in the hands of a female academic.