

A review of accounting research in Australasia

Charl de Villiers
The University of Auckland, and University of Pretoria

Pei-Chi Kelly Hsiao
The University of Auckland

Please cite as:

De Villiers, C. & Hsiao, P.-C.K. 2018. A review of accounting research in Australasia, *Accounting & Finance*, 58(4), 993-1026.

Abstract

This study examines recent accounting research published in 10 journals led by New Zealand and Australia based editors, namely: *Abacus*; *Accounting and Finance*; *Accounting Forum*; *Accounting History*; *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*; *Australian Accounting Review*; *International Journal of Auditing*; *Meditari Accountancy Research*; *Pacific Accounting Review*; and *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management*. The paper identifies the most cited recent articles (2015-2017), and the most prolific authors, universities and geographical regions. It then reveals trends in research areas and relevance of recent accounting articles. The paper discusses the importance of the Australian Business Deans Council journal quality list in facilitating novel and relevant research, and recommends the integration of citation metrics into its ratings methodology.

JEL Classification: M40, M41, M42, M48

Keywords: Accounting; Research; New Zealand; Australia; Journal rankings

1. Introduction

In recent years an extensive literature that aims to enhance our understanding of the work environment of accounting and finance researchers has emerged (Benson *et al.*, 2015; Benson *et al.*, 2014; Gaunt, 2014; Linnenluecke *et al.*, 2017a; Linnenluecke *et al.*, 2017b). While prior reviews of accounting research provide valuable insights into research trends and avenues for future research, New Zealand based journals and specialist journals are often underrepresented in the analyses. For instance, Benson *et al.* (2015) analysed nine accounting journals that were considered to represent the state of accounting research in the Asia Pacific region. However, apart from *Pacific Accounting Review* (PAR), none of the other New Zealand based journals were included in their assessment.

In order to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of accounting research in the Australasian region, this study reflects upon recent accounting research published in New Zealand and Australia based journals. The study reviews accounting research published during the period 2015-2017 in five New Zealand accounting journals, namely: *Accounting History* (AHist), *International Journal of Auditing* (IJA), *Meditari Accountancy Research* (Meditari), *Pacific Accounting Review* (PAR), and *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management* (QRAM), as well as five Australian accounting journals, namely: *Abacus* (Abacus), *Accounting and Finance* (A&F), *Accounting Forum* (AForum), *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* (AAAJ), and *Australian Accounting Review* (AAR).

Empirical assessments of the most-cited articles, prolific sources and research trends not only broadens our understanding of the accounting research environment, but also stimulates discussions on whether journal rankings are reflective of research quality and influential research. Discussions on the adequacy of using journal rankings as a measure of research quality are of particular importance to academics and their evaluators. Several countries, including New Zealand, Australia, the United Kingdom and Hong Kong, have national research assessment exercises to evaluate the quality of universities' research outputs. Journal rankings are often used as a proxy for research quality, which influences academic performance evaluations and publication strategies (Macdonald and Kam, 2007; Northcott and Linacre, 2010; Vogel *et al.*, 2017).

This study focuses on the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) journal quality list as the ranking aims to be relevant for the Australian and New Zealand business academic community and is often used to inform academic management in universities based in New

Zealand and Australia (ABDC, 2018). In a practical sense, the analyses and discussions provided in this study have implications for the ABDC, academics, and academic performance evaluators. Our analyses of recent accounting research and discussion of journal rankings and citation statistics highlight discrepancies between the ABDC rankings and citation metrics, the latter of which are objective indicators of research impact and relevance. Therefore, it is recommended that the ABDC incorporate citation metrics into its ranking methodology to account for research impact and to better align its rankings with other international rankings and metrics, which are now more readily available to all academics. Further, as elaborated in our discussions, journal rankings influence publication strategies, and growing emphasis on publications in top-ranked journals could limit innovation and research relevant to practice. Thus, it is important for the ABDC and academic managers to evaluate performance and quality in ways that support novel and relevant research.

The remainder of this study is structured as follows. Section 2 details the research method. Section 3 discusses the most cited articles published during recent years (2015-2017) for each of the 10 journals, and details the source of the articles, indicating the most prolific authors, universities and geographical regions. Section 4 analyses recent accounting articles in greater depth, reviewing their research areas and relevance. Section 5 discusses the use of journal rankings as a measure of quality, specifically focusing on the appropriateness of the ABDC list. Section 6 concludes.

2. Research method

In selecting the journals to be analysed, we started with journals in the Field of Research code of 1501 (Accounting) on the 2016 ABDC journal list. Among the 124 accounting journals listed, we identified five journals with at least one New Zealand based individual listed as editor-in-chief (on 31 December 2017), namely: *Accounting History* (AHist), *International Journal of Auditing* (IJA), *Meditari Accountancy Research* (Meditari), *Pacific Accounting Review* (PAR), and *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management* (QRAM). Next, we set out to identify five Australian journals. To limit the Australian sample to five, we defined Australia based journals as those with only Australia based individuals listed as editors-in-chief (on 31 December 2017). This resulted in five journals, namely: *Abacus* (Abacus), *Accounting and Finance* (A&F), *Accounting Forum* (AForum), *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* (AAAJ), and *Australian Accounting*

Review (AAR). One of the journals in our sample, *AHist*, has one New Zealand based editor-in-chief and one Australia based editor-in-chief.

As this study focuses on assessing research articles, publications such as book reviews, dedications, tributes, creative pieces and calls for papers were excluded from the analyses. Commentaries and editorials were included if they provide further insights on the research topic discussed or provide research ideas, rather than summarising the articles included in the issue in descriptive form. This resulted in analyses of 894 recently published articles (2015-2017), which comprise 327 articles from the New Zealand sample and 567 from the Australian sample.

Appendix 1 presents an overview of the 10 journals analysed, showing the year each journal was first published, the editor(s)-in-chief as at 31 December 2017, the 2017 Scopus based citation metrics, the 2016 ABDC ranking (which was current on 31 December 2017) and the 2018 UK Association of Business Schools (ABS) ranking. It is interesting to note that when ranking journals by different citation metrics, the rankings are not always consistent. Further, rankings based on citation metrics and the ABS list do not align with the ABDC ranking. Possible reasons for these differences are discussed throughout the paper and in Section 5.

Consistent with prior review studies, including Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2009), Dumay (2014) and Benson *et al.* (2015), the citation analysis ranked articles according to citation data from Google Scholar. Google Scholar is arguably the leading tool for citation analysis. In comparison with Scopus and Web of Science, Google Scholar covers a more comprehensive range of scientific publications (Dumay, 2014; Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2009). Citation counts were drawn from Google Scholar on 8 May 2018 using Harzing's Publish or Perish software program. The citation dataset was manually cleaned and corrected for any duplications and other errors in Google Scholar.

The articles were ranked according to citations per year (CPY), calculated as the total number of citations divided by 2018 minus the year of publication. Total aggregate citations was not considered useful in identifying the top articles of recent years, given that the most recently published articles would not have had much opportunity to be cited and would therefore be at a disadvantage compared to articles published earlier in the sample period. CPY compensates for the time an article was available to be cited, allowing for an assessment of the impact of an article after correction for its age (Harzing, 2013). Google Scholar does not provide the facility to exclude self-citations; hence, the reported citation counts are inclusive of self-citations. Harzing (2013)

explains that self-citations do not necessarily reflect manipulative behaviour. Further, the exclusion of self-citations do not normally make a major difference to citation records, especially if the statistics are used to compare citations between journals or individuals (Harzing, 2013; Singh *et al.*, 2007).

For analyses of the most prolific authors and universities, we followed Dumay *et al.* (2018) and employed the equal credit method. This method corrects for the number of co-authors each paper has and provide results that are more comparable. Each author (university) received a credit of $1/N$ for each published article, with N representing the number of co-authors (universities) of the article. For example, an author of a single-authored article gets a credit of 1.0, while each author of an article with two co-authors gets 0.5 credit. The editorial board memberships identified for prolific authors and universities were based on the 124 accounting journals on the ABDC list. Thus, board memberships in non-accounting journals or journals not covered by the ABDC list are not listed. For this purpose, the list of editorial board members provided on the website of each journal was used. For authors, any involvement in the editorial board is listed as an affiliation. For universities, our list only includes journals where members of the university serve a senior role, defined as editor-in-chief, editor or associate editor.

The study focuses on accounting publications. Multidisciplinary studies published in the 10 journals were categorised according to their dominant focus, resulting in articles classified under a single category. For multidisciplinary studies, the dominant research field was determined by the stated purpose of the article, keywords listed by the author(s), references cited and the academic department of the author(s). Analyses of research trends followed Benson *et al.* (2015) to enable comparisons. Topic areas were categorised using the European Accounting Association (2017) subject categories. Research areas were determined by the title, purpose statement and keywords provided. As there are articles with multiple research areas, classification into multiple categories were allowed. Research contributions were classified into relevance to academia, policy and/or practice.

3. Analyses of citation statistics and article sources

Proponents of citation-based journal rankings argue that citation analysis is the most objective way to measure the impact and importance of research outputs. This argument assumes that articles with higher citation statistics either are more widely read or have greater effects on the research of

others. While citation analysis is an objective and relatively simple measure compared to peer-reviewed journal rankings, it is important to note its limitations. Citation analysis measures impact rather than represent quality, articles could be cited for reasons other than a positive evaluation of its content, and halo effects, self-citations and popular research topics influence citation patterns (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2009; Singh *et al.*, 2007).

Nevertheless, citation analysis has become widely applied by prior accounting review studies (Benson *et al.*, 2015; Dumay, 2014; Dumay *et al.*, 2018; Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2009), and is one of the methodological components of the ABS rankings (Chartered Association of Business Schools, 2018). Unlike the ABS, the ABDC does not provide the public with many details about its ranking methodology. While the ABDC ranking appears primarily based on expert reviews and public consultation, its evaluation panel has recommended revising the ranking methodology to consider citation metrics and other reputable journal quality lists in future reviews (ABDC, 2018).

3.1 Most-cited articles

A journal's most recent citation profile should be a more accurate indication of its future citations than its long-term citation profile. With the exception of seminal works, the number of new citations to older articles is expected to drop over time as the relevance of these articles reduces and authors start to prefer citing more recent articles (Dumay, 2014). Articles that are cited more frequently early on often continue to be cited more frequently and can be expected to become the citation classics of the future (Dumay *et al.*, 2018). Citations to recent articles are important in assessing journal impact factors. Therefore, we regard articles published during 2015-2017 as an important indicator of current focus and future citation potential.

Table 1 lists the 10 most frequently cited 2015-2017 articles published in each journal, measured by CPY. Referring to the mean CPY for the top 10 cited articles, the top four journals are A&F (15.77), AAAJ (14.52), Meditari (12.97), and AForum (10.65). Abacus (9.68) is not far behind, followed by IJA (6.80), QRAM (6.73), PAR (5.73), AAR (4.87), and AHist (3.45). These means can be compared to similar means reported in Benson *et al.* (2015) for the nine Asia Pacific journals in their sample, albeit for a different three year period, namely 2011-2013. The journals and means in Benson *et al.* (2015) are (our analyses shown in brackets where available): AAAJ 11.4 (14.5), A&F 9.2 (15.8), Abacus 7.9 (9.7), *Managerial Auditing Journal* 5.8, AAR 4.4 (4.9),

Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics 3.2, *Australian Journal of Management* 2.7, *PAR* 2.6 (5), and *Accounting Research Journal* 1.0. Note that this metric increased from 2011-2013 to 2015-2017 for each of the five journals included in both studies. This could indicate that Australasian journals now publish articles that are more relevant; therefore, they are cited more often. Alternatively, increased citations could evidence a general trend that manuscripts now cite more prior research than before.

Vogel *et al.* (2017) provide a detailed overview of article characteristics associated with publication and citation success. Some academics argue that articles published in top-ranked journals tend to build on pre-existing knowledge rather than promote innovativeness. Further, review articles, theoretical articles and research conforming to mainstream paradigms receive more citations. The journals assessed in this study covers the second to fourth tier of the ABDC rankings and third to fifth tier of the ABS rankings; thereby, while the journals are not necessarily considered the ‘top-ranked’ in their discipline, many are perceived as high quality.

For New Zealand and Australia based journals, recent articles that attract the most citations tend to be on topics that are not traditionally considered mainstream. Mainstream accounting research is dominated by economics-based empirical financial accounting research (Lukka, 2010). Aside from specialist journals (AHist and IAJ), which publish articles related to its aims and scope, the citation analysis shows that integrated reporting and social and environmental studies feature strongly among the most cited recent articles (26), mostly attributable to *Meditari* (9), *PAR* (5) and *AAAJ* (4). Further, studies on accounting academics/research (12) and management accounting (11) are common. This indicates that, relative to top-ranked journals based in the United States, journals based in New Zealand and Australia facilitate research about new ideas and such non-mainstream topics are impacting accounting research.

In terms of the research method applied, literature reviews or general reviews account for the largest proportion of articles (31), where all journals have between one to six review articles in their most cited recent articles. This finding is consistent with the idea that review articles predict higher citations.

Table 1. Most frequently cited articles published in each journal during 2015-2017 (by CPY)

Authors	Year	Title	Citations	
			Per year	Total
Abacus (Abacus)				
Zhou <i>et al.</i>	2017	Does integrated reporting matter to the capital market?	36.00	36
Gippel <i>et al.</i>	2015	Endogeneity in accounting and finance research: Natural experiments as a state-of-the-art solution	12.00	36
Penman	2016	Valuation: Accounting for risk and the expected return	10.00	20
Easton and Monahan	2016	Review of recent research on improving earnings forecasts and evaluating accounting-based estimates of the expected rate of return on equity capital	8.50	17
Evans <i>et al.</i>	2015	Colliding worlds: Issues relating to language translation in accounting and some lessons from other disciplines	6.67	20
Dyckman and Zeff	2015	Accounting research: Past, present, and future	5.67	17
Sunder	2015	Risk in accounting	5.00	15
Kajüter and Nienhaus	2017	The impact of IFRS 8 adoption on the usefulness of segment reports	5.00	5
Bertomeu and Cheynel	2016	Disclosure and the cost of capital: A survey of the theoretical literature	4.00	8
Caglio and Cameran	2017	Is it shameful to be an accountant? GenMe perception(s) of accountants' ethics	4.00	4
Mean			9.68	17.80
Accounting and Finance (A&F)				
Hoffmann and Post	2017	How return and risk experiences shape investor beliefs and preferences	26.00	26
Faff	2015	A simple template for pitching research	24.00	72
de Villiers <i>et al.</i>	2017	Integrated reporting: Background, measurement issues, approaches and an agenda for future research	17.00	17
Cummings	2016	Effect of fund size on the performance of Australian superannuation funds	15.00	30
Habib and Hasan	2017	Firm life cycle, corporate risk-taking and investor sentiment	15.00	15
Beaumont	2015	An investigation of the short-and long-run relations between executive cash bonus payments and firm financial performance: A pitch	13.67	41
Unda	2015	Board of directors characteristics and credit union financial performance: A pitch	13.00	39
Chen <i>et al.</i>	2017	Economic policy uncertainty in China and stock market expected returns	12.00	12
Ratiu	2015	Financial reporting of European banks during the GFC: A pitch	11.00	33
Chong and Monroe	2015	The impact of the antecedents and consequences of job burnout on junior accountants' turnover intentions: A structural equation modelling approach	11.00	33
Mean			15.77	31.80
Accounting Forum (AForum)				
Dumay <i>et al.</i>	2016	Integrated reporting: A structured literature review	35.50	71
Lokanan	2015	Challenges to the fraud triangle: Questions on its usefulness	10.00	30
Sikka	2017	Accounting and taxation: Conjoined twins or separate siblings?	9.00	9
Schuchter and Levi	2015	Beyond the fraud triangle: Swiss and Austrian elite fraudsters	8.67	26
Nielsen <i>et al.</i>	2015	Management accounting and decision making: Two case studies of outsourcing	8.67	26
Calabrese <i>et al.</i>	2015	A feedback-based model for CSR assessment and materiality analysis	7.33	22
Nielsen <i>et al.</i>	2016	Continuities in the use of the intellectual capital statement approach: Elements of an institutional theory analysis	7.00	14

Dallyn	2017	An examination of the political salience of corporate tax avoidance: A case study of the Tax Justice Network	7.00	7
Sikka	2015	The corrosive effects of neoliberalism on the UK financial crises and auditing practices: A dead-end for reforms	6.67	20
Bowman	2015	An illusion of success: The consequences of British rail privatisation	6.67	20
Mean			10.65	24.50
Accounting History (AHist)				
Tyson and Oldroyd	2017	The debate between postmodernism and historiography: An accounting historian's manifesto	5.00	5
Fowler and Keeper	2016	Twenty years of Accounting History, 1996–2015: Evidence of the changing faces of accounting history research	4.00	8
Rodrigues <i>et al.</i>	2016	Double-entry bookkeeping and the manuscripts dictated in the Lisbon School of Commerce	4.00	8
Pinto and West	2017	Accounting, slavery and social history: The legacy of an eighteenth-century Portuguese chartered company	4.00	4
Fülbier and Klein	2015	Balancing past and present: The impact of accounting internationalisation on German accounting regulations	3.67	11
Gomes <i>et al.</i>	2015	Moving from regional to international publishing in accounting history: Pressures, issues, strategies and implications	3.33	10
Lai <i>et al.</i>	2015	The interplay of knowledge innovation and academic power: Lessons from “isolation” in twentieth-century Italian accounting	2.67	8
Jack	2015	Future making in farm management accounting: The Australian “Blue Book”	2.67	8
Cordery	2015	Accounting history and religion: A review of studies and a research agenda	2.67	8
Maltby and Rutterford	2016	Investing in charities in the nineteenth century: The financialization of philanthropy	2.50	5
Mean			3.45	7.50
Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal (AAAJ)				
Massaro <i>et al.</i>	2016	On the shoulders of giants: undertaking a structured literature review in accounting	24.50	49
Cho <i>et al.</i>	2015	CSR disclosure: the more things change...?	22.33	67
Ntim <i>et al.</i>	2017	Governance structures, voluntary disclosures and public accountability: The case of UK higher education institutions	17.00	17
Baker and Schaltegger	2015	Pragmatism and new directions in social and environmental accountability research	12.33	37
Thomson <i>et al.</i>	2015	Activism, arenas and accounts in conflicts over tobacco control	12.00	36
Anessi-Pessina <i>et al.</i>	2016	Public sector budgeting: A European review of accounting and public management journals	12.00	24
Atkins, <i>et al.</i>	2015	“Good” news from nowhere: imagining utopian sustainable accounting	11.67	35
Ahrens and Ferry	2015	Newcastle City Council and the grassroots: accountability and budgeting under austerity	11.33	34
Bracci <i>et al.</i>	2015	Public sector accounting, accountability and austerity: More than balancing the books?	11.00	33
Agyemang and Broadbent	2015	Management control systems and research management in universities: An empirical and conceptual exploration	11.00	33
Mean			14.52	36.50
Australian Accounting Review (AAR)				
Drew and Dollery	2015	Inconsistent depreciation practice and public policymaking: Local government reform in New South Wales	6.00	18
Lodhia and Stone	2017	Integrated reporting in an internet and social media communication environment: Conceptual insights	6.00	6
Martin-Sardesai <i>et al.</i>	2017	Accounting for research: Academic responses to research performance demands in an Australian university	6.00	6

Carvalho <i>et al.</i>	2016	The recognition of goodwill and other intangible assets in business combinations – The Portuguese case	5.50	11
Vafaei <i>et al.</i>	2015	Board diversity and financial performance in the top 500 Australian firms	5.33	16
Fernandez-Feijoo <i>et al.</i>	2015	Multilevel approach to sustainability report assurance decisions	4.33	13
Chand <i>et al.</i>	2015	Adopting International Financial Reporting Standards for small and medium-sized enterprises	4.00	12
Merigó and Yang	2017	Accounting research: A bibliometric analysis	4.00	4
Zhong and Li	2017	Accounting conservatism: A literature review	4.00	4
Drew <i>et al.</i>	2016	Peas in a pod: are efficient municipalities also financially sustainable?	3.50	7
Mean			4.87	9.70
International Journal of Auditing (IJA)				
Sultana <i>et al.</i>	2015	Audit committee characteristics and audit report lag	10.67	32
Boolakay and Quick	2016	Bank directors' perceptions of expanded auditor's reports	9.00	18
Abernathy <i>et al.</i>	2017	An international perspective on audit report lag: A synthesis of the literature and opportunities for future research	9.00	9
Habib	2015	The new Chinese accounting standards and audit report lag	6.00	18
Svanström	2016	Time pressure, training activities and dysfunctional auditor behaviour: Evidence from small audit firms	6.00	12
Asiedu and Deffor	2017	Fighting corruption by means of effective internal audit function: Evidence from the Ghanaian public sector	6.00	6
D'Onza <i>et al.</i>	2015	A study on internal auditor perceptions of the function ability to add value	5.67	17
Beisland <i>et al.</i>	2015	Audit quality and corporate governance: Evidence from the microfinance industry	5.33	16
Sultana	2015	Audit committee characteristics and accounting conservatism	5.33	16
Knechel	2016	Audit quality and regulation	5.00	10
Mean			6.80	15.40
Meditari Accountancy Research (Meditari)				
Atkins and Maroun	2015	Integrated reporting in South Africa in 2012: Perspectives from South African institutional investors	26.33	79
Atkins <i>et al.</i>	2015	The emergence of integrated private reporting	16.67	50
Stent and Dowler	2015	Early assessments of the gap between integrated reporting and current corporate reporting	16.00	48
Massa <i>et al.</i>	2015	Developing a sustainability report in a small to medium enterprise: process and consequences	13.00	39
Rao and Tilt	2016	Board diversity and CSR reporting: An Australian study	12.00	24
McNally <i>et al.</i>	2017	Exploring the challenges of preparing an integrated report	12.00	12
Dumay and Dai	2017	Integrated thinking as a cultural control?	11.00	11
Khelif <i>et al.</i>	2015	The effect of national culture on the association between profitability and corporate social and environmental disclosure: A meta-analysis	8.33	25
Free	2015	Looking through the fraud triangle: A review and call for new directions	7.33	22
Dumay <i>et al.</i>	2017	Barriers to implementing the International Integrated Reporting Framework: A contemporary academic perspective	7.00	7
Mean			12.97	31.70
Pacific Accounting Review (PAR)				
De Klerk <i>et al.</i>	2015	The influence of corporate social responsibility disclosure on share prices: Evidence from the United Kingdom	11.00	33
Lu <i>et al.</i>	2015	Corporate social responsibility reporting quality, board characteristics and corporate social reputation: Evidence from China	6.67	20
Muttakin <i>et al.</i>	2015	Firm characteristics, board diversity and corporate social responsibility: Evidence from Bangladesh	6.67	20

Kerr <i>et al.</i>	2015	Sustainability reporting integrated into management control systems	6.33	19
Carey	2015	External accountants' business advice and SME performance	6.33	19
Farooq and de Villiers	2017	The market for sustainability assurance services: A comprehensive literature review and future avenues for research	6.00	6
Tsunogaya <i>et al.</i>	2015	Adoption of IFRS in Japan: challenges and consequences	4.00	12
Walther	2017	Expected shortfall in the presence of asymmetry and long memory: An application to Vietnamese stock markets	4.00	4
Su <i>et al.</i>	2015	Management control system effectiveness: The association between types of controls with employee organizational commitment across organisational life cycle stages	3.33	10
Narayan	2016	An ethical perspective on performance measurement in the public sector	3.00	6
Mean			5.73	14.90
Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management (QRAM)				
Laine <i>et al.</i>	2016	Boundary subjects and boundary objects in accounting fact construction and communication	11.00	22
Kihn and Ihantola	2015	Approaches to validation and evaluation in qualitative studies of management accounting	10.67	32
O'Grady and Akroyd	2016	The MCS package in a non-budgeting organisation: A case study of Mainfreight	10.00	20
Nørreklit <i>et al.</i>	2016	Understanding practice generalisation – opening the research/practice gap	6.50	13
Coad <i>et al.</i>	2015	Structuration theory: reflections on its further potential for management accounting research	5.67	17
Jollands <i>et al.</i>	2015	Core values as a management control in the construction of "sustainable development"	5.00	15
Leotta <i>et al.</i>	2017	Management accounting and leadership construction in family firms	5.00	5
Nørreklit, Raffnsøe-Møller, <i>et al.</i>	2016	A pragmatic constructivist approach to accounting practice and research	4.50	9
Ahmed and Hossain	2016	Exploring the implications of integrated reporting on organisational reporting practice	4.50	9
Henttu-Aho	2016	Enabling characteristics of new budgeting practice and the role of controller	4.50	9
Mean			6.73	15.10

3.2 Most prolific authors, universities and regions

Table 2 lists the top 10 authors for the period 2015-2017 and their respective editorial board affiliations. There are 1,624 unique authors. Table 2, Panel A shows that the most prolific authors, on a co-author adjusted basis, are Stewart Jones, followed by Michael Bradbury and Warren Maroun. Warren Maroun and James Guthrie are the most prolific authors based on the unadjusted number of articles, with 10 each. Table 2, Panel B presents the editorial board affiliations of the most prolific authors. Most of the authors serve on multiple editorial boards and contribute advice, support and research to their affiliated journals. For example, Panel A shows Stewart Jones to be the most prolific author, yet his entire score is derived from articles published in *Abacus*, the journal he is the editor of, with four sole authored articles and one co-authored article.

Table 2. Most prolific authors (top 10)**Panel A – Number of publications**

Author	Co-author adjusted	Number of articles
Stewart Jones	4.50	5
Michael E. Bradbury	4.33	7
Warren Maroun	4.25	10
Carolyn J. Cordery	3.50	7
James Guthrie	3.28	10
Prem Sikka	3.00	3
Ian Thomson	2.92	5
Wessel M. Badenhorst	2.83	4
Lisa Jack	2.67	5
Ahsan Habib	2.58	5

Panel B – Editorial board memberships

Author	Editorial board membership (articles)
Stewart Jones	Abacus (5) , Asian Review of Accounting, Journal of Applied Research in Accounting and Finance
Michael E. Bradbury	Abacus (0) , A&F (4) , AAR (2) , Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, Journal of Accounting Education, Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics, PAR (1)
Warren Maroun	AAAJ (1) , AForum (1) , Meditari (8)
Carolyn J. Cordery	AAAJ (1)
James Guthrie	AAAJ (4) , AForum (1) , Critical Perspectives on Accounting, Financial Accountability and Management, Issues in Social and Environmental Accounting: An International Journal, Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change, Journal of Intellectual Capital, Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management, Meditari (4) , PAR (0) , Social and Environmental Accountability Journal
Prem Sikka	Accountancy Business and the Public Interest, Accounting and the Public Interest, British Accounting Review, Critical Perspectives on Accounting
Ian Thomson	AAAJ (3) , AForum (2) , Journal of Applied Accounting Research, QRAM (0) , Social and Environmental Accountability Journal, Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal
Wessel M. Badenhorst	N/A
Lisa Jack	AForum (0) , British Accounting Review, Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies, Journal of Applied Accounting Research
Ahsan Habib	Asian Review of Accounting, Managerial Auditing Journal, PAR (0)

The majority of the names on the list will be familiar to Australasian accounting researchers. However, it is interesting to note that Warren Maroun (South Africa), Prem Sikka (UK) and Ian Thomson (UK) are not based in Australia or New Zealand. They are however prominent members

of the interdisciplinary community, represented in our sample of journals by AAAJ, and to an extent by AForum and Meditari.

Table 3. Most represented universities (top 10)

Panel A – Number of publications

University	Co-author adjusted	Number of articles
University of Sydney	16.35	31
University of Queensland	15.71	31
Massey University	13.67	29
Auckland University of Technology	13.17	25
RMIT University	13.13	29
University of New South Wales	13.03	33
Macquarie University	12.83	34
University of Auckland	10.75	25
University of Technology Sydney	10.10	25
Curtin University	9.33	17

Panel B – Editorial board memberships of authors from most represented universities

University	Senior editorial board memberships of academics from these universities (articles)
University of Sydney	Abacus (15) , Australasian Accounting Business and Finance Journal, AAR (4) , Critical Perspectives on Accounting, Journal of Applied Research in Accounting and Finance (discontinued), QRAM (1)
University of Queensland	Abacus (5) , A&F (22) , Accounting Research Journal, Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems, Journal of Business Finance and Accounting, Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics, Meditari (1) , Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal
Massey University	PAR (8)
Auckland University of Technology	A&F (0) , Accounting Education: An International Journal, QRAM (0)
RMIT University	AAAJ (10) , AHist (5)
University of New South Wales	Abacus (2) , Journal of Business Finance and Accounting, Meditari (2)
Macquarie University	A&F (3) , AAAJ (8) , AAR (11) , Meditari (5)
University of Auckland	A&F (6) , Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting and Economics, IJA (1) , Meditari (7) , PAR (7)
University of Technology Sydney	A&F (15) , Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics
Curtin University	Accounting Research Journal

Table 3 lists the top 10 universities for the period 2015-2017 and their respective editorial board affiliations. There are 604 unique universities and other institutions. Table 3, Panel A shows

that, as may perhaps be expected, seven Australian and three New Zealand universities make up the top 10. This may be seen as evidence of the Australasian roots of the 10 journals in our sample. Table 3, Panel B presents the senior editorial board memberships (editor-in-chief, editor or associate editor) of the academics at the most represented universities. Panel B shows that University of Sydney academics are very successful at getting published in Abacus. Based on the articles in our sample, almost 50% of that university's publication score in Panel A is derived from Abacus articles. Similarly, Panel B shows that academics based at the University of Queensland and the University of Technology Sydney are very successful at getting published in A&F.

Table 4 lists the geographical region of the first author (at the time of publication) of articles published during 2015-2017. To enable comparison, the New Zealand and the Australian sample of journals are presented separately. Overall, the New Zealand and Australian journals publish articles from similar regions. Independent *t*-tests (untabulated), excluding AHist, indicate no statistically significant differences between the New Zealand and Australian samples, in terms of geographical regions. Australasia/Oceania and Europe account for the majority of publications in both samples. The main difference between the two samples is that New Zealand based journals publish a higher percentage of papers by African authors, mostly from South Africa. This difference is driven by *Meditari*, which originated in South Africa and maintains strong links with the accounting research community there, including hosting a biennial conference in South Africa.

Among the New Zealand journals, *IJA* appears to be the journal with the widest geographical dispersion of authors. *PAR* is very much focused on Australasia/Oceania authors and *QRAM*, surprisingly for a journal founded in New Zealand, appears to publish almost exclusively studies by European authors. *AHist* publish many articles by European authors, but Australasia/Oceania is also well represented. *IJA* and *AHist* are the journals in the sample that publish the most articles by North American authors.

Among the Australasian journals, *Abacus* appears to be the journal with the widest geographical dispersion of authors. *A&F* mostly publishes research by Australian and Asian authors. Similar to *QRAM*, *AForum* publishes a large proportion of studies by European authors. *AAAJ* is also very popular among Europeans, but Australasian authors are much better represented among its articles. *AAR* is focused on Australasian authors, with some representation by those based in Asia and Europe.

In summary, the Australasian journals in the sample publish research by authors from a wide range of geographical areas, with Australasia and Europe strongly represented, and supported by representation from Asia and North America. This can be seen as evidence of an open system where authors from different regions are included, and where researchers from diverse regions can learn from each other. Clearly, wider geographical dispersion of published authors indicate wider international participation, which must be correlated with international reputation. Thus, several Australasian journals show evidence of strong international support and therefore strong international reputation.

Table 4. Geographical region of the first author of articles

Panel A: New Zealand sample of journals

Regions	Journals					Total (<i>n</i>)	%
	AHist	IJA	Meditari	PAR	QRAM		
Africa	0	2	29	1	1	33	10.09
Asia	1	14	4	13	5	37	11.31
Australasia/Oceania	19	14	24	48	5	110	33.64
Europe	36	23	14	3	36	112	34.25
North America	9	12	2	4	4	31	9.48
South America	0	1	2	0	1	4	1.22
Total	65	66	75	69	52	327	100.00

Panel B: Australian sample of journals

Regions	Journals					Total (<i>n</i>)	%
	Abacus	A&F	AForum	AAAJ	AAR		
Africa	0	0	1	4	3	8	1.41
Asia	10	36	2	5	19	72	12.70
Australasia/Oceania	26	98	7	44	53	228	40.21
Europe	14	11	57	109	19	210	37.04
North America	22	10	3	11	1	47	8.29
South America	0	0	2	0	0	2	0.35
Total	72	155	72	173	95	567	100.00

4. Analyses of recent accounting publications

While the majority of the articles published in the 10 journals focus on accounting, there are a few that are multidisciplinary. Table 5 reports the dominant research fields. As may be expected in accounting journals, accounting research predominates. Independent *t*-tests (untabulated), excluding AHist, indicate no statistically significant differences between the New Zealand and

Australian samples, in terms of the research field. While there are no differences on average, it is obvious that A&F has a strong focus on finance/financial economics research.

The articles with an accounting focus are further analysed in the following subsections. The other categories include finance, which primarily relates to analysing market behaviour and patterns (Boudt *et al.*, 2015; Frijns and Tourani-Rad, 2016), as well as economics and management research (Goretzki and Messner, 2016; Guest and Rohde, 2017).

Table 5. Research field

Panel A: New Zealand sample of journals

Research field	Journals					Total (<i>n</i>)	%
	AHist	IJA	Meditari	PAR	QRAM		
Accounting	65	66	73	55	50	309	94.50
Economics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Finance/Financial economics	0	0	2	11	0	13	3.98
Management	0	0	0	3	2	5	1.53
Total	65	66	75	69	52	327	100.00

Panel B: Australian sample of journals

Research field	Journals					Total (<i>n</i>)	%
	Abacus	A&F	AForum	AAAJ	AAR		
Accounting	61	90	69	173	93	486	85.71
Economics	1	1	0	0	1	3	0.53
Finance/Financial economics	9	64	0	0	0	73	12.87
Management	1	0	3	0	1	5	0.88
Total	72	155	72	173	95	567	100

4.1 Research areas

Table 6 reports the topic areas of recent accounting research. Accounting and Governance includes articles related to corporate governance and accounting. Within this category, studies have examined corporate governance mechanisms such as governance standards, internal audits, audit committees and board structure. Studies typically focus on the effect of board characteristics on corporate performance. For instance, Nguyen *et al.* (2017) investigated the influence independent directors have on firm performance and the mitigating effect of ownership structure and controlling shareholders on this relationship. Studies have examined the relation between governance mechanisms and managerial practice; for instance, Rao and Tilt (2016) focused on the influence of board diversity on corporate social responsibility reporting.

Accounting and Information Systems relates to studies on the interface between accounting, information systems and technology. Studies in this category focused on audit information technology (Abou-El-Sood *et al.*, 2015), accounting information systems (Gullberg, 2016), information technology in an educational setting (van Oordt and Mulder, 2016), and information technology innovation (Nath *et al.*, 2016).

Accounting Education covers educational aspects of accounting. This category includes research on student learning, student performance, teaching techniques and tools, and various aspects related to academic institutions. Studies commonly examine teaching techniques and student learning. An example is Viviers *et al.* (2016), which examined the usefulness of an educational game in developing soft skills in undergraduate accounting students. For institution-related research, Baldarelli *et al.* (2016) examined gender equality in Italian universities and academic contexts.

Auditing includes articles on auditing and assurance. This category includes audit-related internal controls, audit fees, audit information technology, auditor judgement and behaviour, audit practice, auditing regulations and standards, non-audit services, non-financial assurance, and audit research. In addition to auditor judgement and behaviour being a common research area, audit-related internal controls, audit quality and audit fees are the focus of many articles. As examples of studies on auditor judgement and behaviour, Johari *et al.* (2017) examined the effects of individual ethical orientation, independence threat and moral intensity on auditors' ethical decision-making process. Audit-related internal controls include studies on audit committees (Böhm *et al.*, 2016), and internal audit (Coetzee and Erasmus, 2017). Studies on audit quality, for example, focused on the influence of regulation on audit quality (Knechel, 2016), and studies on audit fees include assessment of the relationships between business group affiliation, board quality and audit pricing (Johl *et al.*, 2016).

Financial Analysis broadly relates to the user perspective of financial statements and other sources of information. Examples of studies included in this category are Richards and van Staden (2015), which investigated the readability of annual reports before and after adoption of the International Financial Reporting Standards, Ma and Ma (2017), which examined the relation between earnings quality and corporate performance in China, and Xu *et al.* (2016), which focused on the disclosure of underlying profits.

Financial Reporting covers preparer perspectives on the choices and methods concerning the preparation of financial statements. Studies within this category primarily focused on accounting standards (Tsunogaya *et al.*, 2015), accounting conservatism (Salama and Putnam, 2015), and accounting disclosures (Du *et al.*, 2016). For example, Cohen and Karatzimas (2017) assessed changes in accounting information quality following a transition from cash accounting to a modified-cash accounting basis.

History covers investigation into historical issues of accounting thought and practices. Studies included in this category covers a wide range of aspects on accounting history. For instance, a historical perspective on medieval accounting (Liyanarachchi, 2015), pink accounting (Baldarelli and Del Baldo, 2016), and accounting change (Black and Edwards, 2016). Furthermore, there are articles that discusses the future of accounting history research (Fowler and Keeper, 2016).

Interdisciplinary/Critical relates to studies that draw on more than one discipline or various strands of critical theory. Bowman (2015) is the only article coded in this category. The study drew on economic, financial and political perspectives to examine the role of accounting numbers in rail privatisation.

Management Accounting covers the areas of management accounting and control systems. Common study focuses include management control, performance measurement and cost accounting. As an example of management control, Evans and Tucker (2015) investigated ways formal and informal control implicated organisational change that resulted from the introduction of a new legislation. In terms of performance measurement, Moulang (2015) investigated performance measurement system innovations in hospitals, and for cost accounting, Kantola (2015) examined the negotiation of cost accounting systems during the implementaion of a new diagnosis-related groups accounting system in the healthcare sector.

Public Sector Accounting and Not-For-Profit Accounting includes accounting in the public and voluntary sectors. Studies focusing on the public sector have examined management practices (Lapsley and Ríos, 2015), performance measurement (Phiri, 2017), audit practices (Alwardat *et al.*, 2015), and reporting (Bellucci and Manetti, 2017). Similarly, studies on the not-for-profit sector examined the same areas as studies on the public sector. For instance, Langton and West (2016) examined the reporting practices of the Australian Red Cross to reveal how accounting is used to discharge accountability.

Social and Environmental Accounting and Ethical Issues in Accounting covers all aspects of social and environmental accounting. Research topics in this category include integrated reporting (de Villiers *et al.*, 2017), sustainability reporting (Baker and Schaltegger, 2015), corporate social responsibility disclosures (Hossain *et al.*, 2015), sustainability accounting or performance measurement (Linnenluecke *et al.*, 2015), and non-financial assurance (Green *et al.*, 2017). For example, Barkemeyer *et al.* (2015) assessed anti-corruption disclosures in sustainability reports and Fernandez-Feijoo *et al.* (2015) analysed the determinants of sustainability report assurance.

Taxation covers all aspects related to the subject area of taxation. Dallyn (2017) examined the political salience of corporate tax avoidance, and Taylor *et al.* (2015) assessed the determinants of tax haven utilisation.

Studies that could not be clearly assigned to a European Accounting Association subject category are included in Other. This category primarily includes studies on accounting journals and accounting research. As examples, Barth (2015) reflected on the role of financial accounting research in supporting financial accountability and provides direction for future research, and Dyckman (2016) argued for abandonment of null hypothesis statistical tests. Furthermore, other research areas include topics related to accountants (Clayton and Staden, 2015) and fraud (Margret and Hoque, 2016).

Independent *t*-tests (untabulated), excluding the specialist journals AHist and IJA, indicate no statistically significant differences between the New Zealand and Australian samples, in terms of topic areas. In terms of the coverage of the different research areas in each journal, most AHist articles are classified as History, and most IJA articles are classified as Auditing. QRAM appears to specialise in Management Accounting articles, probably because management accounting research often involve qualitative methods. Meditari and PAR articles are classified into a broader range of research areas, with a large proportion of Meditari articles falling into the Social and Environmental research area.

Table 6. Articles by research area
Panel A: New Zealand sample of journals

Research area	Journals					Total (n)	%
	AHist	IJA	Meditari	PAR	QRAM		
Accounting and Governance	1	5	3	7	0	16	4.61
Accounting and Information Systems	0	1	3	0	2	6	1.73
Accounting Education	0	0	12	1	0	13	3.75
Auditing	2	62	8	9	1	82	23.63
Financial Analysis	0	0	1	5	1	7	2.02
Financial Reporting	1	1	6	9	1	18	5.19
History	56	0	1	0	3	60	17.29
Interdisciplinary/ Critical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Management Accounting	4	1	3	14	30	52	14.99
Public Sector Accounting and Not-For-Profit Accounting	4	3	2	6	3	18	5.19
Social and Environmental Accounting and Ethical Issues in Accounting	2	0	30	7	3	42	12.10
Taxation	0	0	2	0	0	2	0.58
Other	2	2	12	5	10	31	8.93
Total	72	75	83	63	54	347	100

Panel B: Australian sample of journals

Research area	Journals					Total (n)	%
	Abacus	A&F	AForum	AAAJ	AAR		
Accounting and Governance	4	20	5	9	13	51	9.26
Accounting and Information Systems	0	1	0	1	1	3	0.54
Accounting Education	0	0	0	0	5	5	0.91
Auditing	4	9	5	8	10	36	6.53
Financial Analysis	20	11	1	1	5	38	6.90
Financial Reporting	16	30	19	9	38	112	20.33
History	3	1	4	15	0	23	4.17
Interdisciplinary/ Critical	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.18
Management Accounting	3	6	4	25	9	47	8.53
Public Sector Accounting and Not-For-Profit Accounting	2	2	15	32	15	66	11.98
Social and Environmental Accounting and Ethical Issues in Accounting	2	7	13	53	10	85	15.43
Taxation	0	3	2	3	0	8	1.45
Other	13	8	11	39	5	76	13.79
Total	67	98	80	195	111	551	100

Articles in Abacus mostly focus on Financial Analysis and Reporting; A&F on those same categories and Corporate Governance; AForum on Financial Reporting, Public sector, and Social and Environmental; AAAJ focus strongly on Social and Environmental, Public Sector, and Management Accounting; while AAR mostly publish articles on Financial Reporting.

4.2 Relevance to academia, policy and/or practice

Table 7 reports the stated contribution(s) of the recent accounting articles published in the five journals. Research classified under Academia are concentrated on extending the current literature through addressing research gaps and suggesting implications for future research (Leoni and Florio, 2015; Siboni *et al.*, 2016). A few articles extended methodology or theory (Abrahamsson *et al.*, 2016; Coad *et al.*, 2015), or suggested how future accounting research may benefit from alternative research methods (Turner and Coote, 2017). Some studies have provided findings targeted at accounting educators (Halabi and Larkins, 2016).

Articles included in Practice relate to studies with an explicit focus on practitioners. Research that may be relevant to managerial practice include Alleyne *et al.* (2016), which constructed a whistle-blowing protocol for audit firms, and McNally *et al.* (2017), which provided insights on a number of challenges to the integrated reporting process and suggestions for reporters. Abou-El-Sood *et al.* (2015) explored audit technology in order to provide insights for the benefit of accountants and auditors, and Wei *et al.* (2017) suggested a fraud prediction tool for auditors. An example of relevance to investors is Bryan and Reynolds (2016), which suggested that auditor size and auditor tenure affects information risk and the cost of equity capital.

Articles that contribute to policy or standard development include Keerasuntonpong *et al.* (2015), which provided insights for regulators to improve reporting on statements of service performance.

All AHist articles only claim to be relevant to academia. This is also the most popular claim among articles published in the other four New Zealand based journals. Some articles claim relevance to policy and practice, with the largest percentage of AAR articles claiming such relevance, followed by PAR, AForum and Meditari. Independent *t*-tests (untabulated), excluding AHist, indicate articles published in the Australian journals in the sample are statistically more likely to claim policy implications ($p < 0.05$).

Table 7. Articles by contribution
Panel A: New Zealand sample of journals

Contribution	Journals					Total (<i>n</i>)	%
	AHist	IJA	Meditari	PAR	QRAM		
Academia	65	60	63	48	42	278	77.44
Policy	0	9	11	8	5	33	9.19
Practice	0	11	15	14	8	48	13.37
Total	65	80	89	70	55	359	100.00

Panel B: Australian sample of journals

Contribution	Journals					Total (<i>n</i>)	%
	Abacus	A&F	AForum	AAAJ	AAR		
Academia	58	87	62	169	77	453	71.00
Policy	14	20	16	23	38	111	17.40
Practice	6	10	11	26	21	74	11.60
Total	78	117	89	218	136	638	100.00

5. Journal rankings and citation statistics

Researchers are increasingly expected to demonstrate the impact and relevance of their research. Clearly, articles that are never cited can hardly claim to be relevant or impactful, therefore citations will always be seen as an important indicator of impact and relevance (Dumay *et al.*, 2018). Apart from citations, for Australia and New Zealand based accounting academics, the ABDC journal quality list plays an important role in research assessment and therefore in research management. Anecdotal evidence suggest that several universities' administrators forbid their accounting academics to submit to a journal below the B level (and sometimes below the A level) on the ABDC list.

Journal rankings are controversial but nonetheless important and influential to decision-making. Academic performance managers often use journal rankings to infer the quality of the publication (Northcott and Linacre, 2010; Vogel *et al.*, 2017). The use of journal rankings as a measure of quality facilitates comparisons between academics and faculties across disciplinary boundaries and enables colleagues with different specialties to assess the merit of individual articles (Singh *et al.*, 2007). Publication in top journals plays a significant role in promotion and tenure decisions, and collectively it influences a department's stature, prestige and external funding (Fogarty and Jonas, 2013; Macdonald and Kam, 2007; Singh *et al.*, 2007). Even though the ABDC may never have intended this to be the case, in practice, the ABDC journal quality list

is often used as the ultimate measure of the quality of individuals' and departments' research output.

Appendix 1 shows citation statistics, the ABDC ranking and the ABS ranking of each of the ten journals in our sample. The ABDC's A*, A, B and C categories roughly equate to the ABS' 4star, 3 star, 2 star and 1star categories, respectively. A number of the journals in our sample are assessed in a higher category, either by the ABDC or by the ABS. Such differences between the ABDC and ABS rankings highlight the subjective nature of journal rankings and raises the question of how research 'quality' is defined and assessed. For the journals analysed, the ABDC ranks A&F and IJA at 'A', however, the ABS ranks them at '2' (one category lower). AForum and PAR is ranked 'B' by the ABDC, but AForum is ranked '3' (one category higher) and PAR is ranked '1' (one category lower) by the ABS. Given that different countries use different ranking lists, these differences influence international career prospects. In addition to expert opinion and public consultation, the ABS rankings consider citation metrics, a quantitative basis for evaluating research quality. The ABDC may not have taken full advantage of citation metrics when determining journal quality categories in the past. This may have changed in the review of the ABDC business journal quality list currently being undertaken.

Appendix 1 shows that the ABDC rankings bear no discernible relation to journals' citation statistics. For example, the citation statistics for AHist, IJA and QRAM fall within a relatively narrow band, yet these journals are ranked in two categories, namely 'A' for IJA and 'B' for the other two journals. The citation statistics for AForum are higher than three of the four 'A' ranked journals in the sample, yet according to the ABDC, this journal is a 'B'. The CiteScore citation statistic for Meditari and its ABDC ranking show an even greater disparity. According to CiteScore, Meditari is only outranked by AAAJ among the journals in the sample, yet the journal is classified as a 'C'. Clearly, the ABDC list is out of date, as any ranking that is only updated once every five or six years must be.

The current trend of increasing focus on impact in academic research assessments is likely to enhance the importance researchers place on citations as a way to demonstrate relevance and impact. When the ABDC started their journal quality list, constantly updated citation statistics were not readily available to all researchers and their rankings must have been helpful. With researchers now able to see the disparities between journal quality lists, such as the ABDC's, and up to date citation statistics, they are more likely to question the ABDC's journal quality list in the

future. Unless the ABDC starts to update their journal quality list more often and align it more closely to citation statistics, the ABDC may not be seen as a reliable arbiter of journal quality or impact in the future. It is recommended that the ABDC incorporate citation statistics into its methodology for greater consistency with alternative ranking schemes and to account for research impact and that the ABDC's journal quality list is updated annually.

During September 2018, the ABDC completed the review of their journal quality list and it is now being considered by the ABDC's Business Academic Research Directors' Network (BARDsNet) (ABDC, 2018). However, in the meantime their journal quality list, as of October 2018, is still based on 2012 data. It is important for the ABDC to realise that research agenda is often driven by their journal rankings, and therefore it is imperative that these rankings are up to date and reliable. Publication in a top-ranked journal has become an important measure of academic success and achievement according to this measure is increasingly prized ahead of any intrinsic value the research may have (Macdonald and Kam, 2007). Driven by national research assessment exercises and the growing importance of journal rankings, what an academic finds matters less than where an academic publishes. This logic potentially limits research originality, diversity and practical relevance (Northcott and Linacre, 2010; Singh *et al.*, 2007; Vogel *et al.*, 2017). These trends may be outside the remit of the ABDC, but the least the ABDC can be expected to do is to ensure that their journal quality list is up to date and that apparent anomalies, such as differences between their rankings and journal citation metrics, are either removed by regular ABDC re-rankings or explained by the ABDC. Due to the substantial influence the ABDC has on academic research and careers, they have a responsibility to the broader research community to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of their journal quality list. Timeliness and accuracy should provide the environment where new and innovative journals are able to emerge and survive. Of course, it is equally important for academic managers to assess academic performance in ways that support the production of relevant and high quality research by encouraging publications in a broader set of journals, not only in today's A* and A ranked journals. In addition, the trend in research assessment in the UK and Australia, is to increasingly emphasise the impact of research on policy and practice. However, it is unlikely that impact on policy and practice can be measured by citation statistics or journal rankings, and therefore this may not be a matter for the ABDC to consider.

6. Conclusion

This study broadens our understanding of accounting research in the Australasian region. It has a focus on New Zealand based journals and provide analyses comparing the characteristics of New Zealand based journals with Australia based journals. The most cited articles of recent years (2015-2017) for each of the 10 journals are analysed. The source of the recent accounting articles are identified, indicating the most prolific authors, universities and geographical regions, before reviewing the research areas and the relevance of the accounting research articles.

The study provides evidence that the citations of the five journals included in both Benson *et al.* (2015) and in our sample increased from 2011-2013 to 2015-2017, which could indicate that Australasian journals are publishing more relevant, useful and impactful articles. In terms of their citation profiles, the five New Zealand journals in our sample compare well with the nine Asia Pacific journals in Benson *et al.* (2015). Articles in the New Zealand edited journals are well cited and are contributed by authors from around the world, including excellent representation of Europeans and some by authors based in Africa. Both the New Zealand and Australian samples show evidence of influence and support from other geographical regions, which should be taken as evidence of international reputation. In terms of comparisons between the five Australian and five New Zealand journals in our sample, many of the differences are driven by the influence of individual journals in the two groups. For example, AAAJ articles are strongly cited and this journal is ahead of all the other journals in the sample using any of the recognised metrics. A&F has shown a remarkable increase in citations and outrank AAAJ in terms of the average number of annual citations of the top 10 cited articles published during 2015-2017. Meditari is another journal that has shown major progress in terms of increased citations.

The analyses show that social and environmental articles, as well as integrated reporting articles, rank highly in terms of citations. Public sector research is also very popular on this basis. These are some research areas of interest that have traditionally been supported by the interdisciplinary research community. However, there are signs of increased interest in these topic areas among all accounting researchers, for example among large dataset archival researchers whose research is often published in journals such as A&F. The popularity of these subject areas among expanded accounting research communities may be one of the reasons for the increasing citations of journals, such as AAAJ and Meditari, which publish many such articles. By contrast,

niche journals, such as AHist, would perhaps not have been able to take advantage of these trends to the same extent.

Comparison of the ABDC rankings with the ABS rankings and citation metrics indicates a disparity between the measures. While journal rankings are intended to reflect research quality, differences in the ABDC list and the ABS list shows subjectivity and inconsistency in defining quality. Despite its limitations, citation statistics are an objective way to measure research impact and importance. Therefore, the ABDC and academic managers should pay more attention to citation metrics in assessing journal rankings and the academic performance of individuals.

References

- ABDC, 2018, ABDC Journal Quality List Review. Available at: <http://www.abdc.edu.au/pages/abdc-journal-quality-list-2013>.
- Abernathy, J. L., M. Barnes, C. Stefaniak, and A. Weisbarth, 2017, An International Perspective on Audit Report Lag: A Synthesis of the Literature and Opportunities for Future Research, *International Journal of Auditing* 21, 100-127.
- Abou-El-Sood, H., A. Kotb, and A. Allam, 2015, Exploring Auditors' Perceptions of the Usage and Importance of Audit Information Technology, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 252-266.
- Abrahamsson, G., H. Englund, and J. Gerdin, 2016, On the (re)construction of numbers and operational reality: A study of face-to-face interactions, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 159-188.
- Agyemang, G., and J. Broadbent, 2015, Management control systems and research management in universities: An empirical and conceptual exploration, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 1018-1046.
- Ahmed, H. A., and D. M. Hossain, 2016, Exploring the implications of integrated reporting on organisational reporting practice: Evidence from highly regarded integrated reporters, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 415-444.
- Ahrens, T., and L. Ferry, 2015, Newcastle City Council and the grassroots: accountability and budgeting under austerity, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 909-933.

- Alleyne, P., R. Haniffa, and M. Hudaib, 2016, The Construction of a Whistle-Blowing Protocol for Audit Organisations: A Four-Stage Participatory Approach, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 72-86.
- Alwardat, Y. A., A. Benamraoui, and A. Rieple, 2015, Value for Money and Audit Practice in the UK Public Sector, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 206-217.
- Anessi-Pessina, E., C. Barbera, M. Sicilia, and I. Steccolini, 2016, Public sector budgeting: a European review of accounting and public management journals, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 29, 491-519.
- Asiedu, K. F., and E. W. Deffor, 2017, Fighting Corruption by Means of Effective Internal Audit Function: Evidence from the Ghanaian Public Sector, *International Journal of Auditing* 21, 82-99.
- Atkins, J., B. C. Atkins, I. Thomson, and W. Maroun, 2015a, "Good" news from nowhere: imagining utopian sustainable accounting, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 651-670.
- Atkins, J., and W. Maroun, 2015, Integrated reporting in South Africa in 2012: Perspectives from South African institutional investors, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 23, 197-221.
- Atkins, J. F., A. Solomon, S. Norton, and N. L. Joseph, 2015b, The emergence of integrated private reporting, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 23, 28-61.
- Baker, M., and S. Schaltegger, 2015, Pragmatism and new directions in social and environmental accountability research, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 263-294.
- Baldarelli, M. G., and M. Del Baldo, 2016, Accounting and charity: How to read the "pink" in accounting in the first half of the twentieth century through a real life case, *Accounting History* 21, 144-166.
- Baldarelli, M. G., M. Del Baldo, and S. Vignini, 2016, Pink accounting in Italy: cultural perspectives over discrimination and/or lack of interest, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 24, 269-292.
- Barkemeyer, R., L. Preuss, and L. Lee, 2015, Corporate reporting on corruption: An international comparison, *Accounting Forum* 39, 349-365.
- Barth, M. E., 2015, Financial Accounting Research, Practice, and Financial Accountability, *Abacus* 51, 499-510.

- Beaumont, S. J., 2015, An investigation of the short- and long-run relations between executive cash bonus payments and firm financial performance: a pitch, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 337-343.
- Beisland, L. A., R. Mersland, and R. Ø. Strøm, 2015, Audit Quality and Corporate Governance: Evidence from the Microfinance Industry, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 218-237.
- Bellucci, M., and G. Manetti, 2017, Facebook as a tool for supporting dialogic accounting? Evidence from large philanthropic foundations in the United States, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 30, 874-905.
- Benson, K., P. M. Clarkson, T. Smith, and I. Tutticci, 2015, A review of accounting research in the Asia Pacific region, *Australian Journal of Management* 40, 36-88.
- Benson, K., R. Faff, and T. Smith, 2014, Fifty years of finance research in the Asia Pacific Basin, *Accounting & Finance* 54, 335-363.
- Bertomeu, J., and E. Cheynel, 2016, Disclosure and the Cost of Capital: A Survey of the Theoretical Literature, *Abacus* 52, 221-258.
- Black, J., and J. R. Edwards, 2016, Accounting careers traversing the separate spheres of business and government in Victorian Britain, *Accounting History* 21, 306-328.
- Böhm, F., L. H. Bollen, and H. F. Hassink, 2016, Audit Committee Charter Scope: Determinants and Effects on Audit Committee Effort, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 119-132.
- Boolaky, P. K., and R. Quick, 2016, Bank Directors' Perceptions of Expanded Auditor's Reports, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 158-174.
- Boudt, K., P. Goeij, J. Thewissen, and G. Van Campenhout, 2015, Analysts' forecast error: a robust prediction model and its short-term trading profitability, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 683-715.
- Bowman, A., 2015, An illusion of success: The consequences of British rail privatisation, *Accounting Forum* 39, 51-63.
- Bracci, E., C. Humphrey, J. Moll, and I. Steccolini, 2015, Public sector accounting, accountability and austerity: more than balancing the books?, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 878-908.
- Bryan, D. B., and J. K. Reynolds, 2016, Auditor Size and the Cost of Equity Capital over Auditor Tenure, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 278-294.

- Caglio, A., and M. Cameran, 2017, Is it Shameful to be an Accountant? GenMe Perception(s) of Accountants' Ethics, *Abacus* 53, 1-27.
- Calabrese, A., R. Costa, and F. Rosati, 2015, A feedback-based model for CSR assessment and materiality analysis, *Accounting Forum* 39, 312-327.
- Carey, P. J., 2015, External accountants' business advice and SME performance, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 166-188.
- Carvalho, C., A. M. Rodrigues, and C. Ferreira, 2016, The Recognition of Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets in Business Combinations – The Portuguese Case, *Australian Accounting Review* 26, 4-20.
- Chand, P., A. Patel, and M. White, 2015, Adopting International Financial Reporting Standards for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, *Australian Accounting Review* 25, 139-154.
- Chartered Association of Business Schools, 2018, *AJG Academic Journal Guide 2018: Methodology* (Chartered Association of Business Schools, London).
- Chen, J., F. Jiang, and G. Tong, 2017, Economic policy uncertainty in China and stock market expected returns, *Accounting & Finance* 57, 1265-1286.
- Cho, C. H., G. Michelon, D. M. Patten, and R. W. Roberts, 2015, CSR disclosure: the more things change...?, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 14-35.
- Chong, V. K., and G. S. Monroe, 2015, The impact of the antecedents and consequences of job burnout on junior accountants' turnover intentions: a structural equation modelling approach, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 105-132.
- Clayton, B. M., and C. J. Staden, 2015, The Impact of Social Influence Pressure on the Ethical Decision Making of Professional Accountants: Australian and New Zealand Evidence, *Australian Accounting Review* 25, 372-388.
- Coad, A., L. Jack, and A. O. R. Kholeif, 2015, Structuration theory: reflections on its further potential for management accounting research, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 153-171.
- Coetzee, P., and L. J. Erasmus, 2017, What drives and measures public sector internal audit effectiveness? Dependent and independent variables, *International Journal of Auditing* 21, 237-248.

- Cohen, S., and S. Karatzimas, 2017, Accounting information quality and decision-usefulness of governmental financial reporting: Moving from cash to modified cash, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 95-113.
- Cordery, C., 2015, Accounting history and religion: A review of studies and a research agenda, *Accounting History* 20, 430-463.
- Cummings, J. R., 2016, Effect of fund size on the performance of Australian superannuation funds, *Accounting & Finance* 56, 695-725.
- D'Onza, G., G. M. Selim, R. Melville, and M. Allegrini, 2015, A Study on Internal Auditor Perceptions of the Function Ability to Add Value, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 182-194.
- Dallyn, S., 2017, An examination of the political salience of corporate tax avoidance: A case study of the Tax Justice Network, *Accounting Forum* 41, 336-352.
- De Klerk, M., C. de Villiers, and C. van Staden, 2015, The influence of corporate social responsibility disclosure on share prices: Evidence from the United Kingdom, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 208-228.
- de Villiers, C., E. R. Venter, and P. C. K. Hsiao, 2017, Integrated reporting: background, measurement issues, approaches and an agenda for future research, *Accounting & Finance* 57, 937-959.
- Drew, J., and B. Dollery, 2015, Inconsistent Depreciation Practice and Public Policymaking: Local Government Reform in New South Wales, *Australian Accounting Review* 25, 28-37.
- Drew, J., B. Dollery, and M. A. Kortt, 2016, Peas in a Pod: Are Efficient Municipalities also Financially Sustainable?, *Australian Accounting Review* 26, 122-131.
- Du, C., L. Song, and J. Wu, 2016, Bank accounting disclosure, information content in stock prices, and stock crash risk: Global evidence, *Pacific Accounting Review* 28, 260-278.
- Dumay, J., 2014, 15 years of the Journal of Intellectual Capital and counting: A manifesto for transformational IC research, *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 15, 2-37.
- Dumay, J., C. Bernardi, J. Guthrie, and P. Demartini, 2016, Integrated reporting: A structured literature review, *Accounting Forum* 40, 166-185.
- Dumay, J., C. Bernardi, J. Guthrie, and M. La Torre, 2017, Barriers to implementing the International Integrated Reporting Framework: A contemporary academic perspective, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 461-480.

- Dumay, J., and T. Dai, 2017, Integrated thinking as a cultural control?, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 574-604.
- Dumay, J., C. de Villiers, J. Guthrie, and P.-C. K. Hsiao, 2018, Thirty years of Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal: A critical study of the journal's most cited articles, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 31, 1510-1541.
- Dyckman, T. R., 2016, Significance Testing: We Can Do Better, *Abacus* 52, 319-342.
- Dyckman, T. R., and S. A. Zeff, 2015, Accounting Research: Past, Present, and Future, *Abacus* 51, 511-524.
- Easton, P. D., and S. J. Monahan, 2016, Review of Recent Research on Improving Earnings Forecasts and Evaluating Accounting-based Estimates of the Expected Rate of Return on Equity Capital, *Abacus* 52, 35-58.
- European Accounting Association, 2017, Submission & Review Process. Available at: http://www.eaacongress.org/r/submission_review_process.
- Evans, L., R. Baskerville, and K. Nara, 2015, Colliding Worlds: Issues Relating to Language Translation in Accounting and Some Lessons from Other Disciplines, *Abacus* 51, 1-36.
- Evans, M., and B. P. Tucker, 2015, Unpacking the package: Management control in an environment of organisational change, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 346-376.
- Faff, R. W., 2015, A simple template for pitching research, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 311-336.
- Farooq, M. B., and C. de Villiers, 2017, The market for sustainability assurance services: A comprehensive literature review and future avenues for research, *Pacific Accounting Review* 29, 79-106.
- Fernandez-Feijoo, B., S. Romero, and S. Ruiz, 2015, Multilevel Approach to Sustainability Report Assurance Decisions, *Australian Accounting Review* 25, 346-358.
- Fogarty, T. J., and G. A. Jonas, 2013, Author Characteristics for Major Accounting Journals: Differences among Similarities 1989–2009, *Issues in Accounting Education* 28, 731-757.
- Fowler, C. J., and T. Keeper, 2016, Twenty years of Accounting History, 1996–2015: Evidence of the changing faces of accounting history research, *Accounting History* 21, 389-418.
- Free, C., 2015, Looking through the fraud triangle: a review and call for new directions, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 23, 175-196.

- Frijns, B., and A. Tourani-Rad, 2016, The long-run performance of the New Zealand stock markets: 1899-2013, *Pacific Accounting Review* 28, 59-70.
- Fülbier, R. U., and M. Klein, 2015, Balancing past and present: The impact of accounting internationalisation on German accounting regulations, *Accounting History* 20, 342-374.
- Gaunt, C., 2014, Accounting and Finance: authorship and citation trends, *Accounting & Finance* 54, 441-465.
- Gippel, J., T. Smith, and Y. Zhu, 2015, Endogeneity in Accounting and Finance Research: Natural Experiments as a State-of-the-Art Solution, *Abacus* 51, 143-168.
- Gomes, D., E. Giovannoni, F. Gutiérrez-Hidalgo, and H. Zimnovitch, 2015, Moving from regional to international publishing in accounting history: Pressures, issues, strategies and implications, *Accounting History* 20, 183-205.
- Goretzki, L., and M. Messner, 2016, Coordination under uncertainty: A sensemaking perspective on cross-functional planning meetings, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 92-126.
- Green, W., S. Taylor, and J. Wu, 2017, Determinants of greenhouse gas assurance provider choice, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 114-135.
- Guest, R., and N. Rohde, 2017, The Contribution of Foreign Real Estate Investment to Housing Price Growth in Australian Capital Cities, *Abacus* 53, 304-318.
- Gullberg, C., 2016, What makes accounting information timely?, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 189-215.
- Habib, A., 2015, The New Chinese Accounting Standards and Audit Report Lag, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 1-14.
- Habib, A., and M. M. Hasan, 2017, Firm life cycle, corporate risk-taking and investor sentiment, *Accounting & Finance* 57, 465-497.
- Halabi, A. K., and J.-a. Larkins, 2016, The impact of discussion board usage on overall performance in an introductory accounting subject, *Pacific Accounting Review* 28, 337-358.
- Harzing, A.-W., 2013, *The publish or perish book: Your guide to effective and responsible citation analysis* (Tarma Software Research Pty Ltd, Melbourne).
- Henttu-Aho, T., 2016, Enabling characteristics of new budgeting practice and the role of controller, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 31-56.

- Hoffmann, A. O. I., and T. Post, 2017, How return and risk experiences shape investor beliefs and preferences, *Accounting & Finance* 57, 759-788.
- Hossain, M. M., M. Alam, M. A. Islam, and A. Hecimovic, 2015, Do stakeholders or social obligations drive corporate social and environmental responsibility reporting? Managerial views from a developing country, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 287-314.
- Jack, L., 2015, Future making in farm management accounting: The Australian “Blue Book”, *Accounting History* 20, 158-182.
- Johari, R. J., Z. Mohd-Sanusi, and V. K. Chong, 2017, Effects of Auditors' Ethical Orientation and Self-Interest Independence Threat on the Mediating Role of Moral Intensity and Ethical Decision-Making Process, *International Journal of Auditing* 21, 38-58.
- Johl, S. K., A. Khan, N. Subramaniam, and M. Muttakin, 2016, Business Group Affiliation, Board Quality and Audit Pricing Behavior: Evidence from Indian Companies, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 133-148.
- Jollands, S., C. Akroyd, and N. Sawabe, 2015, Core values as a management control in the construction of “sustainable development”, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 127-152.
- Kajüter, P., and M. Nienhaus, 2017, The Impact of IFRS 8 Adoption on the Usefulness of Segment Reports, *Abacus* 53, 28-58.
- Kantola, H., 2015, Creating an identity for a heterogeneous system in health care, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 87-102.
- Keerasuntonpong, P., K. Dunstan, and B. Khanna, 2015, Factors influencing disclosures of statements of service performance of New Zealand local authorities, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 304-328.
- Kerr, J., P. Rouse, and C. de Villiers, 2015, Sustainability reporting integrated into management control systems, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 189-207.
- Khelif, H., K. Hussainey, and I. Achek, 2015, The effect of national culture on the association between profitability and corporate social and environmental disclosure: A meta-analysis, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 23, 296-321.

- Kihn, L.-A., and E.-M. Ihantola, 2015, Approaches to validation and evaluation in qualitative studies of management accounting, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 230-255.
- Knechel, W. R., 2016, Audit Quality and Regulation, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 215-223.
- Lai, A., A. Lionzo, and R. Stacchezzini, 2015, The interplay of knowledge innovation and academic power: Lessons from “isolation” in twentieth-century Italian accounting studies, *Accounting History* 20, 266-287.
- Laine, T., T. Korhonen, P. Suomala, and A. Rantamaa, 2016, Boundary subjects and boundary objects in accounting fact construction and communication, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 303-329.
- Langton, J., and B. West, 2016, One hundred years of annual reporting by the Australian Red Cross: Building public trust and approbation through emotive disclosures, *Accounting History* 21, 185-207.
- Lapsley, I., and A.-M. Ríos, 2015, Making sense of government budgeting: an internal transparency perspective, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 12, 377-394.
- Leoni, G., and C. Florio, 2015, A comparative history of earnings management literature from Italy and the US, *Accounting History* 20, 490-517.
- Leotta, A., C. Rizza, and D. Ruggeri, 2017, Management accounting and leadership construction in family firms, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 14, 189-207.
- Linnenluecke, M. K., J. Birt, X. Chen, X. Ling, and T. Smith, 2017a, Accounting Research in Abacus, A&F, AAR, and AJM from 2008–2015: A Review and Research Agenda, *Abacus* 53, 159-179.
- Linnenluecke, M. K., J. Birt, J. Lyon, and B. K. Sidhu, 2015, Planetary boundaries: implications for asset impairment, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 911-929.
- Linnenluecke, M. K., X. Chen, X. Ling, T. Smith, and Y. Zhu, 2017b, Research in finance: A review of influential publications and a research agenda, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 43, 188-199.
- Liyanarachchi, G. A., 2015, Antecedents of double-entry bookkeeping and Buddhist Temple Accounting, *Accounting History* 20, 85-106.

- Lodhia, S., and G. Stone, 2017, Integrated Reporting in an Internet and Social Media Communication Environment: Conceptual Insights, *Australian Accounting Review* 27, 17-33.
- Lokanan, M. E., 2015, Challenges to the fraud triangle: Questions on its usefulness, *Accounting Forum* 39, 201-224.
- Lu, Y., I. Abeysekera, and C. Cortese, 2015, Corporate social responsibility reporting quality, board characteristics and corporate social reputation: Evidence from China, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 95-118.
- Lukka, K., 2010, The roles and effects of paradigms in accounting research, *Management Accounting Research* 21, 110-115.
- Ma, S., and L. Ma, 2017, The association of earnings quality with corporate performance: Evidence from the emerging market of China, *Pacific Accounting Review* 29, 397-422.
- Macdonald, S., and J. Kam, 2007, Ring a Ring o' Roses: Quality Journals and Gamesmanship in Management Studies*, *Journal of Management Studies* 44, 640-655.
- Maltby, J., and J. Rutterford, 2016, Investing in charities in the nineteenth century: The financialization of philanthropy, *Accounting History* 21, 263-280.
- Margret, J., and Z. Hoque, 2016, Business Continuity in the Face of Fraud and Organisational Change, *Australian Accounting Review* 26, 21-33.
- Martin-Sardesai, A., H. Irvine, S. Tooley, and J. Guthrie, 2017, Accounting for Research: Academic Responses to Research Performance Demands in an Australian University, *Australian Accounting Review* 27, 329-343.
- Massa, L., F. Farneti, and B. Scappini, 2015, Developing a sustainability report in a small to medium enterprise: process and consequences, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 23, 62-91.
- Massaro, M., J. Dumay, and J. Guthrie, 2016, On the shoulders of giants: undertaking a structured literature review in accounting, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 29, 767-801.
- McNally, M.-A., D. Cerbone, and W. Maroun, 2017, Exploring the challenges of preparing an integrated report, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 481-504.
- Merigó, J. M., and J. B. Yang, 2017, Accounting Research: A Bibliometric Analysis, *Australian Accounting Review* 27, 71-100.

- Moulang, C., 2015, Performance measurement system use in generating psychological empowerment and individual creativity, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 519-544.
- Muttakin, M. B., A. Khan, and N. Subramaniam, 2015, Firm characteristics, board diversity and corporate social responsibility: Evidence from Bangladesh, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 353-372.
- Narayan, A. K., 2016, An ethical perspective on performance measurement in the public sector, *Pacific Accounting Review* 28, 364-372.
- Nath, N., Y. Hu, and C. Budge, 2016, Information technology and diffusion in the New Zealand public health sector, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 216-251.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., E. Evans, and M. Lu, 2017, Independent directors, ownership concentration and firm performance in listed companies: Evidence from Vietnam, *Pacific Accounting Review* 29, 204-226.
- Nielsen, C., R. Roslender, and S. Schaper, 2016, Continuities in the use of the intellectual capital statement approach: Elements of an institutional theory analysis, *Accounting Forum* 40, 16-28.
- Nielsen, L. B., F. Mitchell, and H. Nørreklit, 2015, Management accounting and decision making: Two case studies of outsourcing, *Accounting Forum* 39, 64-82.
- Nørreklit, H., L. Nørreklit, and F. Mitchell, 2016a, Understanding practice generalisation – opening the research/practice gap, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 278-302.
- Nørreklit, H., M. Raffnsøe-Møller, and F. Mitchell, 2016b, A pragmatic constructivist approach to accounting practice and research, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 266-277.
- Northcott, D., and S. Linacre, 2010, Producing Spaces for Academic Discourse: The Impact of Research Assessment Exercises and Journal Quality Rankings, *Australian Accounting Review* 20, 38-54.
- Ntim, C. G., T. Soobaroyen, and M. J. Broad, 2017, Governance structures, voluntary disclosures and public accountability: The case of UK higher education institutions, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 30, 65-118.
- O'Grady, W., and C. Akroyd, 2016, The MCS package in a non-budgeting organisation: a case study of Mainfreight, *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* 13, 2-30.

- Penman, S., 2016, Valuation: Accounting for Risk and the Expected Return, *Abacus* 52, 106-130.
- Phiri, J., 2017, Stakeholder expectations of performance in public healthcare services: Evidence from a less developed country, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 136-157.
- Pinto, O., and B. West, 2017, Accounting, slavery and social history: The legacy of an eighteenth-century Portuguese chartered company, *Accounting History* 22, 141-166.
- Rao, K., and C. Tilt, 2016, Board diversity and CSR reporting: an Australian study, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 24, 182-210.
- Ratiu, R. V., 2015, Financial reporting of European banks during the GFC: a pitch, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 345-352.
- Richards, G., and C. van Staden, 2015, The readability impact of international financial reporting standards, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 282-303.
- Rodrigues, L. L., H. O. Carqueja, and L. F. Ferreira, 2016, Double-entry bookkeeping and the manuscripts dictated in the Lisbon School of Commerce, *Accounting History* 21, 489-511.
- Rosenstreich, D., and B. Wooliscroft, 2009, Measuring the impact of accounting journals using Google Scholar and the g-index, *The British Accounting Review* 41, 227-239.
- Salama, F. M., and K. Putnam, 2015, Accounting conservatism, capital structure, and global diversification, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 119-138.
- Schuchter, A., and M. Levi, 2015, Beyond the fraud triangle: Swiss and Austrian elite fraudsters, *Accounting Forum* 39, 176-187.
- Siboni, B., D. Sangiorgi, F. Farneti, and C. de Villiers, 2016, Gender (in) accounting: insights, gaps and an agenda for future research, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 24, 158-168.
- Sikka, P., 2015, The corrosive effects of neoliberalism on the UK financial crises and auditing practices: A dead-end for reforms, *Accounting Forum* 39, 1-18.
- , 2017, Accounting and taxation: Conjoined twins or separate siblings?, *Accounting Forum* 41, 390-405.
- Singh, G., K. M. Haddad, and C. W. Chow, 2007, Are Articles in “Top” Management Journals Necessarily of Higher Quality?, *Journal of Management Inquiry* 16, 319-331.
- Stent, W., and T. Dowler, 2015, Early assessments of the gap between integrated reporting and current corporate reporting, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 23, 92-117.

- Su, S., K. Baird, and H. Schoch, 2015, Management control system effectiveness: The association between types of controls with employee organizational commitment across organisational life cycle stages, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 28-50.
- Sultana, N., 2015, Audit Committee Characteristics and Accounting Conservatism, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 88-102.
- Sultana, N., H. Singh, and J. L. W. M. Van der Zahn, 2015, Audit Committee Characteristics and Audit Report Lag, *International Journal of Auditing* 19, 72-87.
- Sunder, S., 2015, Risk in Accounting, *Abacus* 51, 536-548.
- Svanström, T., 2016, Time Pressure, Training Activities and Dysfunctional Auditor Behaviour: Evidence from Small Audit Firms, *International Journal of Auditing* 20, 42-51.
- Taylor, G., G. Richardson, and R. Taplin, 2015, Determinants of tax haven utilization: evidence from Australian firms, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 545-574.
- Thomson, I., C. Dey, and S. Russell, 2015, Activism, arenas and accounts in conflicts over tobacco control, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 28, 809-845.
- Tsunogaya, N., A. Hellmann, and S. D. Scagnelli, 2015, Adoption of IFRS in Japan: challenges and consequences, *Pacific Accounting Review* 27, 3-27.
- Turner, M. J., and L. V. Coote, 2017, Discrete choice experiments: a research agenda for experimental accounting, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 25, 158-182.
- Tyson, T. N., and D. Oldroyd, 2017, The debate between postmodernism and historiography: An accounting historian's manifesto, *Accounting History* 22, 29-43.
- Unda, L. A., 2015, Board of directors characteristics and credit union financial performance: a pitch, *Accounting & Finance* 55, 353-360.
- Vafaei, A., K. Ahmed, and P. Mather, 2015, Board Diversity and Financial Performance in the Top 500 Australian Firms, *Australian Accounting Review* 25, 413-427.
- van Oordt, T., and I. Mulder, 2016, Implementing basic e-learning tools into an undergraduate taxation curriculum, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 24, 341-367.
- Viviers, H. A., J. P. Fouché, and G. M. Reitsma, 2016, Developing soft skills (also known as pervasive skills): Usefulness of an educational game, *Meditari Accountancy Research* 24, 368-389.
- Vogel, R., F. Hattke, and J. Petersen, 2017, Journal rankings in management and business studies: What rules do we play by?, *Research Policy* 46, 1707-1722.

- Walther, T., 2017, Expected shortfall in the presence of asymmetry and long memory: An application to Vietnamese stock markets, *Pacific Accounting Review* 29, 132-151.
- Wei, Y., J. Chen, and C. Wirth, 2017, Detecting fraud in Chinese listed company balance sheets, *Pacific Accounting Review* 29, 356-379.
- Xu, B., M. B. U. Bhuiyan, and A. Rahman, 2016, Underlying profit in New Zealand, *Pacific Accounting Review* 28, 111-134.
- Zhong, Y., and W. Li, 2017, Accounting Conservatism: A Literature Review, *Australian Accounting Review* 27, 195-213.
- Zhou, S., R. Simnett, and W. Green, 2017, Does Integrated Reporting Matter to the Capital Market?, *Abacus* 53, 94-132.

Appendix 1 - Overview of the 10 New Zealand and Australian accounting journals in this study

Journal name	Year first issued	Editor(s)-in-chief	2017 CiteScore*	2017 SJR*	2016 ABDC rank**	2018 ABS rank***
Abacus	1965	Stewart Jones	0.850	0.325	A	3
Accounting and Finance	1960	Tom Smith	1.290	0.384	A	2
Accounting Forum	1976	Glen Lehman	2.210	0.932	B	3
Accounting History	1996	Garry Carnegie Carolyn Fowler	0.800	0.527	B	2
Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal	1988	James Guthrie Lee D. Parker	4.330	2.187	A	3
Australian Accounting Review	1991	Tyrone M. Carlin	0.870	0.358	B	2
International Journal of Auditing	1997	David Hay	1.080	0.382	A	2
Meditari Accountancy Research	1993	Charl de Villiers	3.020	0.766	C	1
Pacific Accounting Review	1988	Rachel Baskerville Nick Nguyen Asheq Rahman Paul Rouse	0.310	N/A	B	1
Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management	2004	John Burns Deryl Northcott	1.350	0.529	B	2

* Scopus citation metrics – CiteScore weights each citation equally, whereas SJR gives more weight to citations in higher quality journals (based on citation metrics).

** ABDC Journal Quality List – 4-point scale ranked from ‘highest quality’ to ‘fourth highest quality’: A* (5-7% of journals), A (15-25% of journals), B (35-40% of journals), and C (remaining percentage of journals).

*** ABS Academic Journal Guide – 5-point scale with the highest category representing ‘Journals of Distinction’: 4* (exemplars of excellence), 4 (original and best-executed research), 3 (original and well executed research), 2 (original research of acceptable standard), and 1 (research of a recognised but modest standard).