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Abstract

This paper reviews some of the most recent published literature in the field of management accounting. 116 articles were examined on management accounting taken from three leading journals in order to analyse key issues and themes in contemporary management accounting research. The articles were published between 2008 and 2010. This paper contributes to the literature in several ways. First, it provides a focused analysis of research published in recent years, allowing researchers to gain a better understanding of the direction of the contemporary management accounting research. Second, it highlights the emergence of intellectual resource management as a major area of management accounting research. Finally, it highlights key emerging research themes including trust, leadership, and organisational justice.
INTRODUCTION

The field of management accounting research is dynamic and constantly evolving. Therefore it is beneficial to step back at times and observe the key themes and patterns that are emerging. This paper seeks to do that. The aim is to provide a review of some of the recent literature in the field of management accounting. In order to do this, we examined 116 articles on management accounting taken from three leading journals in order to analyse key issues and themes in contemporary management accounting research. The articles were published between 2008 and 2010 and appeared in Management Accounting Research (MAR), the Journal of Management Accounting Research (JMAR), and Accounting, Organizations and Society (AOS). While previous studies have reviewed the management accounting literature (Hesford et al., 2007; Berry et al., 2009; Lindquist and Smith, 2009), this paper covers a more concentrated time span and therefore better represents contemporary thinking in the management accounting field.

This paper contributes to the literature in several ways. First, it provides a focused analysis of management accounting research published in recent years, allowing researchers to gain a better understanding of the direction of the contemporary management accounting research. Second, it highlights the emergence of intellectual resource management as a major area of management accounting research. Finally, it highlights key emerging research themes in the literature including trust, leadership, and organisational justice.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In the following section, the method of the review is set out and a taxonomy presented. Next, the findings of the review are presented. In the discussion and analysis section, analysis of macro trends is followed by general analysis. The final section summarises the paper and outlines limitations and suggestions for future research.

METHOD

This paper reviews 116 articles on management accounting published between 2008 and 2010 and taken from three leading journals: Management Accounting Research (MAR), the Journal of Management Accounting Research (JMAR), and Accounting, Organizations and Society (AOS).  

This review of recent literature was an iterative process in which the taxonomy of research themes and issues was developed and refined throughout the review and writing process. Papers were first classified as either management accounting or not management accounting. Where uncertainty existed in this regard, another management accounting academic was consulted for input. Editorials, forewords, tributes, notes, and comments were not included except when they were considered to contain substantive research material. As papers were reviewed, they were then placed into loose and emerging classifications. Throughout the review process the classifications were refined and adapted as new areas and insights emerged. Previous literature review papers were also consulted throughout the process in order to provide additional insights.

A draft research taxonomy was then developed and papers were classified within that structure. Where a paper addressed several major themes, a judgement was made and the paper was included under the heading of the most prominent theme. Papers were not included in

1 All articles classified as management accounting in the three listed journals between 2008 and 2010 have been included except for those articles in 2010 which had not been published before the paper was submitted to the AFANZ conference.
more than one category. Where there was uncertainty on the classification of a paper, the paper was classified in consultation with another management accounting academic. After final adjustments, the taxonomy of contemporary research themes and issues that emerged from this process is presented below.

1) MANAGEMENT CONTROL
   a) Budgeting
   b) Organisational control
      • Corporate governance
      • International control
      • Interorganisational control
      • Intraorganisational control
      • Transfer pricing
   c) Performance measurement and evaluation
      • Benchmarking
      • Consequences for organisational behaviour and performance
      • Incentive systems
      • Performance measurement systems

2) COST ACCOUNTING
   a) Activity-Based Costing
   b) Interorganisational cost management

3) INTELLECTUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
   a) Accounting information systems
   b) Knowledge management
   c) Management information presentation
   d) Organisational learning

4) OTHER
   a) Literature review/analysis
   b) Research methods/methodologies
   c) Risk management
   d) Strategic management accounting
   e) Sustainability and environmental management

The order of subheadings in the taxonomy has no significance as these are presented in alphabetical order. Hence the ordering does not imply the level of prominence within the literature reviewed. In terms of the classifications adopted under organisational control, interorganisational control addresses the relationship between two cooperating firms while Intraorganisational control deals with relationships within a single firm. International control addresses either interorganisational or Intraorganisational control with a focus on handling cultural or national differences between firms or divisions. The performance measurement and evaluation systems classification includes the general concept of management control systems. In relation to interorganisational cost management and interorganisational control it is recognised that there is significant conceptual crossover between these two areas.

FINDINGS
This section outlines the classification of papers examined resulting from the process described above. The classification is set out below under four major categories: ‘management control’, ‘cost accounting’, ‘intellectual resource management’, and ‘other’.
**Management control**
Major themes identified under this heading are budgeting, organisational control, and performance management and evaluation.

Budgeting is a traditional management accounting topic and is addressed by Brown et al. (2009), Frow et al. (2010), King et al. (2010), Libby and Lindsay (2010), Schatzberg and Stevens (2008), and Sprinkle et al. (2008).

Organisational control addresses issues of corporate governance (Baxter and Chua, 2008; Gulamhussen and Guerreiro, 2009; and Hughes, 2009), international control (Busco et al., 2008; Chanegrih, 2008; Hyvönen et al., 2008; Jansen et al., 2009; Li and Tang, 2009; Masquefa, 2008; and Moilanen, 2008), interorganisational control (Boland et al., 2008; Caglio and Ditillo, 2008; Cäker, 2008; Dekker, 2008; Free, 2008; Gosman and Kohlbeck, 2009; Langfield-Smith, 2008; Vosselman and van der Meer-Kooistra, 2009; and Vélez et al., 2008), intraorganisational control (Giraud et al., 2008; Jørgensen and Messner, 2009; Rowe et al., 2008; and van der Meer-Kooistra and Scapens, 2008), and transfer pricing (Chang et al., 2008; Cools et al., 2008; Cools and Slagmulder, 2009; Fjell and Foros, 2008; and Rossing and Rohde, 2010).

Performance measurement and evaluation encompasses benchmarking (Devillé, 2009), consequences for organisational behaviour and performance (Chung et al., 2009; Church et al., 2008; Demski et al., 2008; Dossi and Patelli, 2008; Hall, 2008; Hansen, 2010; Hartmann and Slapničar, 2009; Mensah et al., 2009; Román, 2009; and Schulerer and Krotter, 2008), incentive systems (Budde, 2009; Dikolli et al., 2009; Homburg and Stebel, 2009; Pfeiffer and Velthuis, 2009; Upton, 2009; Zamora, 2008), and performance measurement systems (Abernethy et al., 2010; Broadbent and Laughlin, 2009; Burney et al., 2009; Cardinaels and van Veen-Dirks, 2010; Davila et al., 2009; Demski et al., 2009; Ferreira and Otley, 2009; Kennedy and Widener, 2008; Lillis and van Veen-Dirks, 2008; Malmi and Brown, 2008; Mundy, 2010; Sandelin, 2008; van Veen-Dirks, 2010; Wiersma, 2008; Wiersma, 2009; and Wouters and Wilderom, 2008).

**Cost accounting**
The major classifications under cost accounting are Activity-Based Costing and interorganisational cost management.

Under Activity-Based Costing (ABC), Hoozée and Bruggeman (2010) address leadership style and user participation in the design of an ABC system while Kallunki and Silvola (2008) address the way in which the life cycle stage of an organisation may affect the decision to implement an ABC system. Banker et al. (2008) focuses on attempts to measure the benefit to the firm when adopting ABC. Englund and Gerdin (2008) provide a counterpoint to mainstream cost accounting research pointing out the growing criticism of the mainstream ABC research for “neglecting issues of power and politics and for viewing ABC implementations as something inherently positive” (p.154). In order to remedy this, they call on mainstream ABC researchers to draw on the insights of the politically oriented literature.

Intellectual resource management

The contemporary literature reveals the emergence of what this paper calls “intellectual resource management” (IRM) as a significant area of management accounting research. IRM, as set out in Table 2, is a broad heading intended to cover such areas as accounting information systems, knowledge management, management information presentation, and organisational learning.

Four key areas of IRM research have been identified. Accounting information systems is addressed by Chapman and Kihn (2009), Cobb (2009), Eldenburg et al. (2010), Hall (2010), Lamminmaki (2008), and Ozbilgin and Penno (2008). Knowledge management is addressed by Alcouffe et al. (2008), Berland and Chiapello (2009), and van Helden et al. (2010). Management information presentation is addressed by Cardinaels (2008) and Mouritsen et al. (2009) and finally, organisational learning is addressed by Batac and Carassus (2009).

Other

There are five classifications under this heading: literature review/analysis, research methods/methodologies, risk management, strategic management accounting, and sustainability and environmental management. First, Lindquist and Smith (2009) provide the literature review and analysis which was cited earlier in this paper.

The body of literature discussing research methods and methodologies is significant and demonstrates a maturing and self-analysing discipline (Ahrens, 2008; Birnberg, 2009; Coad and Herbert, 2009; Gerdin and Greve, 2008; Hopwood, 2008; Johansson and Siverbo, 2009; Kakkuri-Knuuttila et al., 2008a; Kakkuri-Knuuttila et al., 2008b; Lukka, 2010; Lukka and Modell, 2010; Malmi, 2010; Merchant, 2010; Modell, 2009; Modell, 2010; Vaivio and Sirén, 2010; and Vollmer, 2009). Risk management is considered by Mikes (2009), Wahlström (2009), and Woods (2009).

Strategic management accounting is addressed by Cadez and Guilding (2008), Carr et al. (2010), Jørgensen and Messner (2010), Naicker et al. (2008), Seal (2010), Skærbæk and Tryggestad (2010), and Tillmann and Goddard (2008).

Finally, sustainability and environmental management is addressed by Gray (2010) as well as Henri and Journeault (2010). These findings are presented in Table 1 and summarised in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of papers</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brown et al. (2009), Frow et al. (2010), King et al. (2010), Libby and Lindsay (2010), Schatzberg and Stevens (2008), Sprinkle et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Baxter and Chua (2008), Gulamhussen and Guerreiro (2009), Hughes (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Busco et al. (2008), Chanegrih (2008), Hyvönen et al. (2008), Jansen et al. (2009), Li and Tang (2009), Masquefa (2008), Moilanen (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraorganisational control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Giraud et al. (2008), Jørgensen and Messner (2009), Rowe et al. (2008), van der Meer-Kooistra and Scapens (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer pricing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chang et al. (2008), Cools et al. (2008), Cools and Slagmulder (2009), Fjell and Foros (2008), Rossing and Rohde (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. measurement &amp; evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deville (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chung et al. (2009), Church et al. (2008), Dossi et al. (2008), Hall (2008), Hansen (2010), Hartmann and Slapničar (2009), Mensah et al. (2009), Román (2009), Schueler and Krotter (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Budde (2009), Dikolli et al. (2009), Homburg and Stebel (2009), Pleiffer and Veltius (2009), Upton (2009), Zamora (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity-Based Costing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banker et al. (2008), Englund and Gerdin (2008), Hoozée and Bruggeman (2010), Kallunki and Silvolta (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual resource management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alcouffe et al. (2008), Berland and Chiapello (2009), van Helden et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management info. pres.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cardinaels (2008), Moiritsen et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Batac and Carassus (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review/analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lindquist and Smith (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mikes (2009), Wahlström (2009), Woods (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management acct.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cadez and Guilding (2008), Carr et al. (2010), Jørgensen and Messner (2010), Naiker et al. (2008), Seal (2010), Skærbæk and Tryggestad (2010), Tillmann and Goddard (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Content summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management control</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganisational control</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraorganisational control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer pricing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational control</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. measurement systems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perf. measurement &amp; evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity-Based Costing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganisational cost mgt.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost accounting</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting info. systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management info. pres.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual resource management</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review/analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methods</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management acct.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust. &amp; env. management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strategic management acct.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust. &amp; env. management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The discussion and analysis is divided into two sections. In the first section, the findings above will be placed into the context of previous literature reviews in order to highlight several macro trends. In the second section, key themes emerging from the recent literature are analysed.

Analysis of macro trends
The purpose of this section is to give a brief summary of the broad trends in management accounting research over the last three decades. In order to do this, it is important to establish comparability between the findings of this paper and the findings of previous papers. The taxonomy used in this paper allows for a certain degree of comparability with previous content analyses. Two earlier studies are particularly noteworthy for the purposes of this comparison. First, Hesford et al.’s

---

2 A 0.01% rounding error has been ignored in this representation.
3 A 0.01% rounding error has been ignored in this representation.
(2007) paper is valuable both for its breadth and its depth. Hesford et al. (2007) reviews management accounting papers published over a period of twenty years from 1981 to 2000 in ten major journals. The sheer volume and span of this paper makes it useful for purposes of comparison.

Second, Lindquist and Smith (2009) present an analysis of the first twenty years of JMAR (1989-2008). While this paper is limited by its scope and its primarily North American focus, its long-term perspective on a leading journal that deals exclusively with management accounting makes it an appropriate point of reference for comparison of findings.

These two papers combine to provide a comparative context for drawing attention to some long-term trends in the management accounting research. Highlighting macro trends over the last three decades is intended to enhance the depth of this paper by placing its insights into the broader context of management accounting research.

Table 3 compares the general topics in Hesford et al. (2007) and Lindquist and Smith (2009) with the main headings presented in Table 2 except that IRM has been combined with other in order to enhance comparability with previous studies. In order to properly interpret Table 3, it is important to remember that while Hesford et al. (2007) analyses articles up until 2000, Lindquist and Smith (2009) analyse articles up until 2008 and this study analyses articles from 2008 to 2010. Therefore it is important, when drawing time-based inferences, to recognise the spatial and longitudinal variances between the three studies portrayed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesford et al</th>
<th>Lindquist &amp; Smith (JMAR)</th>
<th>Harris &amp; Durden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three major headings in Table 3 reveal important trends in management accounting research.

Management control
It is notable that the topic of control still dominates management accounting research, though perhaps to a lesser degree than in past decades. Two of the three topics under management control (budgeting and organisational control) demonstrate notable trends.

Budgeting demonstrates a small and decreasing, but vibrant body of papers. While Lindquist and Smith (2009) found 20.4% of papers dealt with budgeting, our analysis finds only 5.2% of papers dealt with budgeting issues. Still, while some scholars seem to be composing a requiem for budgeting (Gurton, 1999; Wallander, 1999), Libby and Lindsay (2010), in a survey of North American firms, demonstrate that budgeting is far from dead and has rather proven resilient and adaptable in corporate practice. It is worth noting that while there are myriad voices addressing concerns about the way budgeting is often used, the voices calling for an end to budgeting per se are relatively few and generally fall outside the mainstream of academia. Despite some weaknesses in the research

---

4 This figure has been presented as an aggregate of the “intellectual resource management” and “other” classifications.
carried out by Libby and Lindsay (2010), their study seems to confirm what we know intuitively: budgeting is far too powerful and beneficial to be disposed of at this time. Instead, it will be adapted to the changing environment through ideas such as Frow et al.’s (2010) continuous budgeting. Perhaps it is best to understand the decreased publication on budgeting as an indication of research saturation in the area rather than as a decline in the relevance of budgeting in practice.

While organisational control demonstrates a significant collection of articles, there is one key trend to be highlighted. This trend is apparent in the bulk of papers addressing both international control and Interorganisational control. The significant increase in emphasis on these two topics seems to be closely related to the emerging macro theme of the multinational enterprise or internationalisation. This theme is directly or indirectly addressed under international control and transfer pricing, but also shows up under categories such as interorganisational control, Intraorganisational control, corporate governance, performance measurement, accounting information systems, and knowledge management. This emphasis on issues surrounding internationalisation reflects the major trends in practice over recent decades and demonstrates that—at least in this area—researchers have attempted to keep their work connected to the issues that are important in management accounting practice.

Cost accounting
As highlighted in Table 3, cost accounting seems to be receiving a lot less attention than previously. While Table 3 seems to suggest that JMAR has not seen this pattern of decrease in cost accounting papers, the underlying data tells a different story. The number shown in Table 3 (23.7%) is an aggregate of the first and second half of the period over which JMAR was analysed. The first period covered the years 1989 to 1998 while the second period encompassed the period from 1999 to 2008. In the first period, 29.2% of papers were classified as cost accounting papers while in the second period, only 16.3% were classified as cost accounting papers. This demonstrates that not only has JMAR seen a significant drop in publication of papers on cost accounting, but may also indicate that JMAR gives more attention to cost accounting issues than other management accounting journals in general. Future research could analyse the causes of this seeming propensity toward a higher emphasis on cost accounting and whether JMAR’s inclination toward quantitative research methods is in any way correlated with this trend.

Intellectual resource management
We have identified IRM as a substantial emerging category of management accounting research. Table 2 demonstrates that 10.34% of contemporary research is directed toward IRM issues. Not even cost accounting, one of the key areas of management accounting research traditionally, has received the research emphasis that IRM has received in recent years. This seems to indicate both a decreasing emphasis on some of the more traditional areas of management accounting research (primarily cost accounting) and an increasing emphasis on newer areas of management accounting research, specifically IRM. Though it is too soon to know for sure whether IRM research will continue to increase, it is reasonable to expect that it will. A combination of technological advances, improvements in technology utilisation, internationalisation, and increasingly complex and nuanced control systems provides a solid rationale for increasing future research on the management of intellectual resources.

Other
Table 3 suggests a steady and profound increase in the research published under classifications other than management control and cost accounting. It seems reasonable to infer that this reflects the gradually changing face of management accounting research over the last three decades as new areas such as strategic management accounting and sustainability and environmental management

---

5 For instance, the response rate from the United States portion of their survey was a mere 1.5% compared to the response rate of 13.6% in the Canadian portion.
vie for research resources. It also seems to reflect the growth in papers on research methods/methodologies as well as various areas of IRM.

Table 4 demonstrates the steady growth of strategic management accounting (SMA) from 1.6% of published research between 1981 and 2000\(^6\) to 6.0% of the research reviewed in this paper. While SMA neither started with a bang nor exploded to dominance, it has matured into a substantial area for management accounting research and has much to contribute to management accounting in the future. One key area in which SMA has much to offer is the emerging area of sustainability and environmental management (SEM) whose success arguably relies largely on its ability to influence the strategic outlook of firms to include a broader spectrum of stakeholders. SEM research can benefit from the insights of SMA in terms of integrating SEM-congruent strategic goals into the management systems of the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
<th>Growth in proportion of strategic management accounting research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesford et al</td>
<td>Lindquist &amp; Smith (JMAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA 1.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General analysis
This section will address seven general themes that emerge from the literature which was reviewed. The themes addressed are performance measurement systems (PMS), trust, leadership, organisational justice, sustainability and environmental management, research methods, and the research/practice dichotomy.

First, PMS continues to occupy a sizeable slice of the total research in management accounting (see Table 2). It seems that the PMS is at the core of management accounting practice and research to date. It also seems reasonable to suggest that PMS will remain at the core of management accounting practice and research because internationalisation is presenting many new challenges. Internationalisation’s influence on modifying corporate structure, increasing competition, changing strategies, and raising cross-cultural concerns is likely to open new areas of research in this area for some time to come.

Second, a theme that seems to dominate the reviewed literature is the concept of trust. While acknowledging that “the issue of defining trust remains largely unresolved,” Vosselman and van der Meer-Kooistra (2009, p. 269) give what they consider to be a fundamental element of the concept of trust: “willingness to accept vulnerability.” This core statement captures the general reality that parties trust each other when they believe the likelihood of the other party engaging in opportunistic behaviour is low. Over 34.5%\(^7\) of the papers reviewed made explicit reference to trust at a conceptual level. These references cluster around the organisational control classification and less so around PMSs and research methods/methodologies, but are otherwise scattered fairly evenly throughout the papers. This suggests a widespread trend toward recognition of the critical role of trust in management accounting generally and specifically in organisational control and PMSs. While Free (2008), Hartmann and Slapničar (2009), Langfield-Smith (2008), Vélez et al. (2008),

\(^6\) Within the ten journals included in the overview.
\(^7\) This number is calculated as 40/116.
and Vosselman and van der Meer-Kooistra (2009) each address trust directly and at some depth, there is still much research to be done in this area, both at conceptual and empirical levels.

Third, the popular leadership literature has increasingly distinguished between leadership and management in recent decades (e.g. Covey, 1989; Maxwell, 1998), yet few would argue that leadership is not an important component of effective management. Leadership has historically attracted only minimal attention in management accounting research; however, in recent years this has begun to change. The construct of leadership/leadership style was addressed in 12.9\%\textsuperscript{8} of papers in the contemporary research considered in this study; however, only a handful addressed leadership in any depth. Still, this seems to be an area pregnant with benefits for the field of management accounting, especially considering that it is intimately tied to the also emerging theme of trust.

The fourth theme comes under the heading of responsibility accounting. The ideas of organisational justice (encompassing distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) and controllability in performance evaluation are addressed in 9.5\%\textsuperscript{9} of the papers considered; however, only a few address the issue at any length. As Cools and Slagmulder (2009, p. 155) have noted, responsibility accounting has undergone very limited empirical research. Cools and Slagmulder (2009) cite only Merchant (1987) and Rowe et al. (2008) as exceptions. This review of the contemporary literature identifies several additional empirical studies that focus specifically on organisational justice and controllability. Burney et al. (2009) focuses on how employees perceive organisational justice, Hartmann and Slapničar (2009) consider how organisational justice affects trust, and Giraud et al. (2008) argues that in practice, at least with respect to external factors, managers understand that they will be held accountable for a number of factors over which they have very limited control. While these studies constitute a significant contribution to the empirical research on responsibility accounting, this is a field that warrants significant additional empirical research.

Fifth, only two papers classified as management accounting papers in this study addressed the issue of SEM. This finding is surprising because this is an area that has tended to dominate the social, political, and scientific public discussion for quite some time. The typical handling of the topic tends to fall under the category of ‘religion’. We demonstrate this point with excerpts from one of the two papers considered for this review. Gray (2010) addresses the issue of sustainability with such theologically suggestive terms/phrases as “morally engaged,” “ethical perspective,” “planetary desecration,” “moral outrage,” “right,” “spirituality,” and “religion.” He then quotes Gladwin et al. (1997) as saying that sustainability is “a religious problem.” Finally, he overtly preaches Pantheism when he says “as humans, we embrace… our grounding in a physicality and the inextricable entwining with what we call ‘Nature.”\textsuperscript{10} While such overt preaching might be appropriate in a theological journal, should it be ‘masked’ as general academic research? The field of sustainability and environmental management is an important one in which much research needs to be done. It is crucial that research in this area be realistic and objective or the field will appropriately remain on the fringe.

The final two themes fall under the ‘general’ category of research. The first theme under research is comparative in nature. Of the three journals reviewed in this paper, AOS, MAR, and JMAR, the North American based JMAR demonstrates a noticeable reticence to transition toward publication of research grounded in more qualitative methods and methodologies. While it is not our intention to survey methodological approaches to management accounting research here or to argue for the exclusive use of qualitative research methods, the dominant use of quantitative research methods in

\textsuperscript{8} This number is calculated as 15/116.
\textsuperscript{9} This number is calculated as 11/116.
\textsuperscript{10} That “Nature” is capitalised is not theologically insignificant.
The second theme under the ‘general’ research category is expressed in calls to tie management accounting research more closely to practice. Among others (e.g. Seal, 2010), two notable names in management accounting research and AAA-AICPA\textsuperscript{12} Lifetime Contribution Award recipients, Anthony Hopwood (2008) and Jacob Birnberg (2009), have, in the published versions of their acceptance talks, expressed serious concerns about the growing distance between management accounting research and management accounting practice. Hopwood (2008) illustrates his comments by alluding to the medical field where researchers tend to simultaneously carry on at least a degree of practice. Hopwood (2008) suggests that such situations allow for the speedy transmission of problems from practice to research and of solutions from research to practice.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The aim of this paper was to provide a review of some of the recent management accounting literature. In this regard we reviewed 116 recent articles on management accounting taken from three leading journals. First, the research taxonomy was crafted through an iterative process of development and refinement. Then the papers were organised within this taxonomical structure. Next, the findings of the review were analysed both in the context of macro trends and then more generally.

In the analysis of macro trends, five key research trends emerged. The decreasing emphasis on budgeting research was addressed while a significant increase in research surrounding the concept of internationalisation was reported. The decreasing emphasis on cost accounting research was then pointed out while IRM was highlighted as a major emerging area for research. Finally, a slow but steady pattern of growth was noted in SMA research.

Next, the general analysis revealed some key themes. First, several justifications were given for the continued relevance of research on PMSs. Then, the theme of trust was briefly outlined as a major emerging theme and an area ripe for additional research. Next, the concept of leadership was addressed as a significant theme in the literature, followed by the general theme of organisational justice. SEM was then addressed as an area in which more objective, disciplined research is needed. *JMAR*’s hesitance to use qualitative research methods was then noted before the analysis was wrapped up with several thoughts on the current drive to tie management accounting research more closely to practice.

In summary, this review and analysis suggests a field of research that is slowly evolving through a process of self criticism and cooperative research. A slow shift is occurring in that less attention is being given to the more traditional areas of management accounting research such as management control and cost accounting while new areas such as IRM, SEM, and SMA are emerging as hotspots for current and future research. Finally, key emerging themes such as internationalisation, trust, organisational justice, and leadership are being examined from a range of angles and in a variety of contexts.

There are several limitations to the current paper. First, it has limited scope. This study covers only three journals over a period of three years. Future research could extend this study to review a longer period of time and a broader range of journals. Second, while classification was carried out through a painstaking process, there was much subjectivity involved. Accordingly it is impossible to assure compatibility with previous classifications. As a result comparisons between this and previous reviews and trend analysis needs to be interpreted with caution.

\textsuperscript{11} Of the papers reviewed from *JMAR*, 71.4\% used quantitative research methods.

\textsuperscript{12} American Accounting Association (AAA) and American Institute of Certified Practicing Accountants (AICPA).
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