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Abstract

Purpose – The paper investigates how environmental management accounting research has contributed to the profession. The accounting profession includes academics, practitioners and policy makers. The paper thus provides a detailed overview of the academic as well as the professional literature published in the field of environmental management accounting.

Design/methodology/approach – The research described in the paper develops and is based on a bibliometric database containing 766 (371 of them published in academic journals) publications in English, German and French with a publication date before 2011. Data on the publications, authors, theories referred to, and methods were collected, double-checked and analysed.

Findings – Analysing the bibliometric data reveals several novel findings. Among these is the identification of environmental management accounting papers in accounting journals. Although the number is growing, a substantial part of the publications have been published in non-accounting journals, books and as reports. In the course of research, a recent trend towards establishing specialised environmental (and sustainability) accounting journals became apparent. The above average rate of increase in the number of publications suggests that the field is enjoying a lot of interest from researchers and practitioners alike.

Originality/value – The paper is outlines trends and observations in the development of the field. A bibliometric analysis is undertaken and a broad range of publications considered in order to investigate the contribution of the environmental management accounting research to the development of the profession.

Paper type Literature review

Keywords Environmental management accounting, development, status, topics, methods, theories
Introduction

Environmental accounting, and particularly environmental management accounting (EMA), has gained considerable attention in academia as well as among international organisations, professional accounting organisations, and in corporate practice. This attention is reflected in a large body of academic literature, including scientific journal articles, books and working papers. Recently, various specialized journals have evolved and mainstream accounting and management journals have accepted publications in the field. Furthermore, EMA has become an increasingly popular topic for international organisations like the UN Division on Sustainable Development (UNSD), or national and international accounting institutions like the Association of Chartered Accounts (ACCA), the Institute for Chartered Accountants of England and Wales (ICAEW), the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA), or the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), which have published various reports and issued recommendations and guidelines.

The topic has emerged from a “twenty year niche issue” to a widely recognized topic, particularly for the last two decades (see e.g. Parker 2011). It is thus timely to ask the question “How has environmental management accounting research developed?” To answer this question it is necessary to review and analyse the existing EMA literature with regard to its origins and developments.

This paper investigates how environmental management accounting research has so far contributed to the profession. The accounting profession includes academics, practitioners and policy makers (see e.g., Evans et al. 2011). Based on several comments of renowned academics who indicated that academic accounting research has become increasingly detached from practice and society (e.g., Guthrie et al. 2011; Hopwood, 2007; 2008; 2009; Baldvinsdottir et al., 2010; Malmi & Granlund, 2009; Owen, 2008), and given the substantial development in academic journals as well as the visible involvement of professional accounting organisations and international organisations, this paper considers both, academic and professional contributions to EMA.

This literature review takes a systematic approach by applying bibliometric methods (see e.g. De Bellis, 2009; De Solla Price, 1974; Jokic and Ball, 2006; Rider, 1944) to analyse past developments and to serve as a basis for recommendations for future research.
The paper is structured as follows: After a short description of the scope of research, i.e. what EMA encompasses, and a discussion of the few existing literature reviews on EMA and the remaining gap for a systematic review (Section 2), the chosen bibliometric approach is explained (Section 3). Section 4 reviews the descriptive statistical results with regard to the development of the number and type of publications, authorship, and citations. This analysis is supported by bibliometric evaluation based on Bradford’s law (Bradford, 1985), Garfield’s law (see De Bellis, 2009, 100ff.) and the Ortega hypothesis (see Cole and Cole, 1972) as well as a contents analysis of the publications and investigations of collaboration, regions of origin, topics covered and type of studies. Finally, new trends are discussed and conclusions are drawn for further research (Section 5).

2 EMA and existing literature reviews

2.1 Environmental management accounting (EMA)

This literature review covers all identified English, French and German publications which explicitly deal with corporate environmental accounting, particularly environmental management accounting (EMA). EMA is a part of the broader concept of accounting and an approach of corporate environmental information management which covers a set of accounting tools and practices to support company-internal management decision making on environmental and economic performance (see e.g. Gray, 1990; Gray and Laughlin, 1991; Schaltegger and Burritt, 2000; UNDSD 2002; IFAC 1998; 2005). EMA comprises a set of various accounting topics and methods, including environmental cost accounting, environmental investment appraisal, budgeting or financial planning, to mention some well-known tools (Burritt et al., 2002).

Although the term was used quite differently in the earlier literature it seems that a fairly common understanding of EMA, as summarized above, has developed for the last two decades. A major influence may have been exerted by publications of the UN Division on Sustainable Development (UNDSD) involving many experts and stakeholders in the field (see UNDSD, 2002), and by the widely spread international guideline published by IFAC (2005). Also widely cited academic publications which do not differ substantially in their definitions of EMA such as seminal Gray’s paper on
Corporate Environmental Accounting (Gray and Laughlin, 1991) or the book by Schaltegger and Burritt (2000) may have had some influence on shaping this common understanding.

2.2 Previous literature reviews

With the development of EMA, a few literature reviews have been conducted to date. Whereas most of these reviews summarise and describe the existing body of literature, a few authors have attempted to conceptualise a framework to map their findings e.g. Mathews (1997; 2004). Due to various limitations in scope and methods used in the identified literature reviews, however, the need for the following literature review was recognised.

So far, very few quantitative reviews of the existing Social and Environmental Accounting (SEA) and EMA literature exist (an exception is e.g. Ienciu et al., 2010). However, various qualitative review studies have been conducted by Mathews (1997; 2004), Gray (2002), Parker (2005; 2011), Deegan and Soltys (2007), Thomson (2007), McGrath and Mathews (2008) and Owen (2008). The identified EMA review publications, or SEA publications with a literature review related to EMA, are listed in Table 1.

An analysis of the existing literature reviews published until 2010 reveals that they do not capture the current (state of) development of corporate environmental management accounting, as they either deal with environmental accounting on a general and even national level (e.g. Ienciu et al., 2010), or are older publications (e.g. Mathews, 1997; 2004; Gray, 2002) and not up-to-date anymore, as the field has been developing rapidly. The first published systematic review paper was completed by Mathews (1997), who covered twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research, which, however, was characterized by very few publications until then. He classified the contributions by periods, and whether they were “empirical studies”, “normative statements”, “philosophical discussions”, “radical/critical literature”, “non-accounting literature”, “teaching programmes and textbooks”, “regulatory frameworks” and “other reviews of the literature”. Subsequently, Mathews (2004) took his approach one step further by developing a matrix approach of categorization with the perceived underlying philosophies. A well-cited, older paper published in the journal Accounting, Organization
and Society by Gray (2002) provides a well-structured review of all contributions in the social accounting field. Both qualitative analyses provide comprehensive references and excellent introductions for anybody who is looking for an introductory overview of the literature on environmental accounting. Neither of these reviews conducts a quantitative analysis with bibliometric measures and, given their date of publication, neither covers more recent publications.

Table 1: Reviews of EMA literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Published in</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>Twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research: Is there a silver jubilee to celebrate?</td>
<td>AAAJ</td>
<td>Identifies theory building approaches</td>
<td>qualitative, categorization</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>The social accounting project and Accounting, Organizations and Society Privileging engagement, imaginings, new accountings and pragmatism over critique?</td>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>All existing publications on EA</td>
<td>qualitative, conceptual</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>Developing a matrix approach to categorise the social and environmental accounting research literature</td>
<td>QRAM</td>
<td>social and environmental accounting</td>
<td>qualitative, conceptual categorization</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Social and environmental accountability research</td>
<td>AAAJ</td>
<td>social and environmental accounting</td>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deegan and Soltys</td>
<td>Social accounting research: an Australasian perspective</td>
<td>Accounting Forum</td>
<td>Social accounting</td>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Mapping the terrain for sustainability accounting</td>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>Environmental accounting research</td>
<td>qualitative, descriptive</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Chronicles of wasted time? A personal reflection on the current state of, and future prospects for, social and environmental accounting research</td>
<td>AAAJ</td>
<td>Social and environmental accounting</td>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrath and Mathews</td>
<td>Moving to Sustainability: An Application of a Matrix Model to Gain Insight into the Research Literature</td>
<td>Accounting, Accountability &amp; Performance</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>qualitative, conceptual categorization, link to practice</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branco and Delgado</td>
<td>Research on social and environmental accounting in Southern European countries</td>
<td>Revista Española de Financiación y Contabilidad</td>
<td>Southern European countries</td>
<td>quantitative, descriptive</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ienciu et al.</td>
<td>Status of research in the field of environmental accounting</td>
<td>Research report</td>
<td>Publications in accounting journals</td>
<td>quantitative, descriptive</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More recently, Thomson (2007), in the book Sustainability Accounting and Accountability, conducted a well-received qualitative analysis of the broader field of sustainability accounting. The review, however, only addresses the better known
academic English publications (similarly, Parker 2011 focuses on SEA publications between 1998 and 2008 in six leading journals). It does therefore not give an overview or quantitative analysis of further developments which were influenced by continental European academics and professionals.

A recent quantitative review study showing descriptive statistical data between 1988 and 2009 on environmental accounting research was published by Ienciu et al. (2010). Their focus is narrow in terms of publication type, focusing on papers published in accounting journals only, and broad in scope, including national environmental accounting, financial environmental accounting, and auditing. Thus the review does not provide an overview and analysis of the development of environmental management accounting literature in general. McGrath and Mathews (2008) touch on the link between accounting research and the profession but do not consider literature from professional accounting organizations, or international organizations.

Another example of limitations is the 2009 paper of Branco and Delgado (2009) that “explores the role of Southern European academics within social and environmental accounting (SEA) research”. Similarly, Deegan and Soltys (2007) follow a geographic focus by discussing an Australiasian perspective of social accounting and how PhD-students are taking up the topic. Given the geographical scope, the conclusions of these review papers do not represent the broader international developments of EMA (for a discussion of how global or local accounting is as a discipline, see e.g. Lukka and Kasanen, 1996).

In addition to these review papers, numerous attempts exist to classify different approaches or methods of environmental accounting. These papers usually focus on an even more narrow selection of papers. In France, Richard (2009) developed a framework to qualify the different types of contributions according to criteria such as the relationship with the environment, the environmental dimension, the spatial dimension of the information, the degree of detail of the information, the type of valuation of the data, and how the result is conceptualized. Mathews (2004) also developed a matrix approach to classify the different contributions in terms of underlying philosophy (from normative/critical to positive/business case) and in terms of direction of action (not supporting the status quo, to “limited to action where profitable”). Furthermore, Brown and Fraser (2006) introduce an overview of the conceptual landscape, dividing it into three approaches: the business case approach, the
stakeholder-accountability approach and the critical theory approach. Similarly, Cullen (2006) groups the literature, however, only in two categories: the “conservative approach”, which she says, “characterizes the mainstream literature in EMA” and the “critical approach” most prominently represented by Gray’s work. Another well-received paper by Burritt *et al.* (2002) proposes a framework for EMA and allocates existing literature to different decision situations.

This overview of publications reviewing the environmental and environmental management accounting literature shows that no publication exists which:

- investigates how environmental management accounting research has contributed to the profession, including academic and professional contributions,
- covers both, academic literature and publications by professional accounting organizations, and
- conducts a systematic quantitative analysis based on acknowledged bibliometric methods,
- captures the more recent developments in EMA publications since the internationally influential practitioner oriented publications of the UNDSD in 2002 and IFAC in 1998.

The next section explains the scope of research, the basic idea of bibliometric analysis and the methods applied in this review article.

3 Scope of research and methods of bibliometric analysis

3.1 Scope of research

The scope of the following literature review on EMA publications encompasses all management accounting approaches which are explicitly used in EMA (e.g. key performance indicators, the balanced scorecard, etc.) thus considering a broad range of company-internal environmental accounting and all environmental management accounting methods ranging from full cost accounting to total cost assessment, material flow cost accounting, life-cycle costing, and accounting tools dealing with corporate investments, natural equity accounts of companies, etc. (see Table 2). Also considered are papers focusing on specific issues such as carbon accounting (e.g. Hoffmann and
Busch, 2008; Burritt et al., 2011), natural capital/biodiversity accounting (e.g. Houdet, 2009), water accounting (e.g. UNEP, 2009), or material flow and waste accounting (e.g. Jasch, 2009), etc. as long as they have a clear focus supporting corporate management decisions.

Since the field of EMA is fairly interdisciplinary (e.g. Gray, 2000), and – until recently – not considered as a long established “mainstream” accounting topic (e.g. Schaltegger and Burritt, 2006; Burritt and Schaltegger, 2010), also general management and environmental management contributions are included and accounting publications, in addition to those published in peer-reviewed journals, such as e.g. contributions published in professional body journals, or as conference papers, working papers, books, PhD-dissertations or reports by NGOs, professional bodies, or governments. The identified authors are either associated to the academic community in accounting and/or management studies and/or environment sciences, or sometimes publish for the business community (such as the “Big Four” accounting firms), or for NGOs (such as the World Resource Institute - WRI) or international organizations (such as the UN).

### 3.2 Methodological approach

The bibliography on environmental management accounting was compiled starting with nearly one hundred papers on EMA found in earlier literature reviews and complemented by more recent publications in journals and by academic book publishers who have already published in the area of EMA. In this process the research focused on publications on the corporate level and environmental management accounting. Publications in the three major (globally and in Europe) languages – English, French and German - were considered, covering a total of 44% of the population of the European Union member states and 41% of the population in the OECD countries (http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx). Furthermore these are also the three largest economies in Europe currently with major academic institutions and established professional accounting organisations. With a “snowball principle” reviewing the literature lists of these first one hundred publications further EMA publications were identified. This way 497 journal articles, working papers, reports and books were collected. The enlarged bibliography was complemented further with the following process:
Systematic search of papers in 88 academic journals listed in Appendix 1. The research was conducted with major databases including ebsco, proquest, sciencedirect and emerald.

Examining the websites of all major accounting, management and environmental and sustainability management journals. The search was run at minimum on basis of the publication title, and mostly (wherever possible) on basis of the abstract and/or the full text.

The search was also conducted on SSRN with the keywords listed in Table 2, and on the proquest search for PhD theses.

Crosschecking the accessible publication lists of established research institutes such as the Centre for Social and Environmental Accounting Research (CSEAR) in St. Andrews, UK, the Centre for Accounting, Governance and Sustainability (CAGS), Adelaide, Australia and the Centre for Sustainability Management (CSM) in Luneburg, Germany, etc.

Excluded from the scope of this research were publications with a main focus on reporting, auditing, national environmental accounting, or social accounting in a more narrow sense, dealing with social issues only and not covering environmental topics. Furthermore, company reports, including environmental and sustainability reports, advertisement brochures of accounting firms and the like were not considered.

As a result of this literature search a robust bibliographic database of English, French and German publications between 1973 and (including) 2010 was collected with the following characteristics:

- 766 EMA publications in total, including peer-reviewed journal papers, reports, books, and book chapters,
- written by 650 authors,
- of the 766 publications 371 are journal papers,
- published in 83 peer-reviewed and academic journals,
- of which only 17 published in the Financial Times list of highly recognized management journals (FT 2010): 14 publications in Accounting, Organizations and Society, and 3 publications in the Journal of Business Ethics.
Table 2: Keywords used for the search of EMA publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English keywords</th>
<th>French keywords</th>
<th>German keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carbon accounting</td>
<td>comptabilité environnementale</td>
<td>Abfallrechnungswesen (incl. Abfallkostenrechnung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental accounting</td>
<td>contrôle de gestion environnemental</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental management accounting</td>
<td>comptabilité verte</td>
<td>Informationsmanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological accounting</td>
<td>comptabilité carbone</td>
<td>Materialflusskostenrechnung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eco-control</td>
<td>comptabilité écologique</td>
<td>Öko-Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full cost accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nachhaltigkeitscontrolling, Rechnungslegung (incl. ökologisches Rechnungswesen) Umweltcontrolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Umweltinformationsmanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material flow cost accounting (incl. mass balance accounting)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Umweltkostenrechnung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Umweltrechnungswesen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability balanced scorecard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total cost assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triple bottom line accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the methodological triangulation of snowballing, database search and internet-based search a most comprehensive database was aimed at. This searching approach strove for a collection of academic journal papers but also EMA contributions beyond journals, including academic books, book chapters, PhD-dissertations, conference papers, working papers, and reports by professional accounting organizations. To avoid repetition, working papers which have been developed to a publication until the end of 2010 were not considered; only the final publication was counted.

The analysis of the data required several decisions. Firstly, a publication was not attributed to one single country as co-authors are often from different countries. Instead the contributions of authors were counted with regard to the country of their home institutions. Secondly, the type of publication was decided on basis of whether it is a single publication with a professional publisher, a publication as part of a series of books, a journal with regular issues for various years and an ISSN, or a report or working paper issued by a professional accounting or consulting institution. This categorization is not always straight forward, as for example the publication by Freedman (2010), *Advances in Environmental Accounting & Management*, shows. Even the publisher Emerald uses two different descriptions by grouping the publication
under “book series” while promoting it with: “The journal has three main objectives” (see Emerald, 2011). Whatever the reasons for this discrepancy are, for the purposes of this bibliometric research this publication is classified as a book in a series of books as it has been published irregularly over the years.

Data was collated with Excel on a number of work sheets as to allow for an extensive analysis. Among the analysed data are:

- Historical development of the volume of publications by year
- The type of publications – e.g. scientific papers, reports, etc.
- The number of publications per author
- The number of authors per publication
- Citations
- Etc.

Apart from author and citation analysis, further analyses of the collected publications were also carried out. They aimed at identifying further properties of the publications such as type of research (empirical, conceptual, normative), methods deployed, theoretical framework, etc. The collection of data (see Section 4.5) was carried out by two or three researchers independently to minimise error and bias – a method improving the inter-coder reliability (see Hayes and Krippendorff, 2007).

It has to be noted that the triple search approach based on earlier literature review papers, snowballing and electronic search has its limitations. Furthermore, publications in languages other than English, French and German were not considered. Nevertheless, for the purposes of the following analysis it can be expected that most of the major publications in the area would be referred to in one of these three major European languages.

4 Results of the bibliometric analysis

After a descriptive discussion of the development of the total number of publications and publication types (journal papers, books, etc.) authorship, publication type and contents are analysed. Thus the analysis follows the logic of general development of the field of EMA where, by which journals, by whom, and what?
4.1 Historical development of EMA publications

Environmental accounting can be considered a “rare orchid” topic playing a negligible niche role until 1990 in terms of academic publications, although the first books and papers (in AOS) were published already in the 70s. Figure 1 shows the numerical development of the total number of EMA publications as well as the journal and other publications (including books, book chapter, working papers and reports).

In terms of the number of publications the field remains negligibly small until 1990 (below 3 publications per annum) and then “explodes” with a strong increase until 1997 (up to more than 40 publications per annum) and a much smaller average increase between 1997 and 2010. Since 1997 the development has been characterized by strong outlays with lows particularly in 2004, 2007 and 2009 and with peaks in 2002, 2006, 2008 and 2010.

Although a chart depicting the number of publications cannot show a cause and effect relationship, the rapid development of EMA research and the turning point (when the number of EMA publications started to grow substantially) can be identified after the publication of the Brundtland Report in 1987 as well as the book by David Pearce (in 1989) and Gray’s (Gray, 1990) response to it.

Figure 1: Historical development of the number of EMA publications
The fluctuation and the peaks in the number of EMA journal publications can be attributed to special issues and edited books published in these years. Due to the low total number of publications, the publication of two special issues and an edited book can result in doubling the volume of publications compared to adjacent years. Examples of the influence of these special issues with usually between five and ten papers on environmental accounting are the years 1997 (*Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, AAAJ), 2002 (AAAJ), 2006 (*Business Strategy and the Environment* with 5 papers, *Journal of Cleaner Production* with 8 papers), and 2010 (AAAJ) whereas the number of edited books influences the “other” publications to a large degree (e.g. Bennett *et al.*, 2003 with 17 authored contributions, Rikardsson *et al.*, 2005 with 17 authored contributions, Schaltegger *et al.*, 2006 with 30 authored contributions, Schaltegger *et al.*, 2008 with 27 authored chapter contributions). As Section 4.3 shows, the editors and guest editors of these special issues and books are among the driving contributors of other EMA publications, too.

Despite discrepancies in the number of papers and other publications, a correlation analysis provides a correlation factor of 0.78 (level of significance 0.05), suggesting a strong correlation in the number of academic and other publications for the period between 1973 and 2010. Figure 1, however, shows that until 1989 various years are without any EMA publications thus distorting the correlation results. A correlation analysis for the period between 1989 and 2010 shows a correlation factor of 0.51 (level of significance 0.05) with only a weak correlation between the research published in scientific journals and research in other media such as books, book chapters, reports or working papers. Thus no general indication could be found that the number of academic journal papers is related to other publications.

Figure 1 reveals several conclusive bibliometric observations. One bibliometric observation in scientific literature in general is that a research area grows by doubling the publications in ten to twenty years (de Solla Price, 1974; Rider, 1944). With regard to the development of the EMA literature, the total number of publications on EMA between 1973 and 1990 was equal to the number of related publications published in the succeeding year 1991 (11 in one year versus 11 in total for all years before 1990). This is a much higher growth rate than the doubling of knowledge in 10 to 20 years as observed in many academic disciplines and known as exponential increase of knowledge (de Solla Price, 1974). Looking at the next decade, the period between 1991 and 2000
saw 297 publications on EMA, a volume that was multiplied by 1.5 in the most recent decade (2001-2010) with 458 publications. This development of the discipline of environmental management accounting shows a growth well over the 3.5% annual increase observed in established disciplines, therefore suggesting that EMA is i) a young discipline ii) with very substantial growth and development, especially in recent years, and that EMA is likely to see further expansion in the future.

4.2 Journals contributing to EMA

Academic journals play an important role in the development of a discipline and a topic as they reflect topical priorities of academic discussion and fundamental research, and the acknowledgement in the respective scientific community. The only accounting journal in the Financial Times list of highly acknowledged journals which has published on environmental accounting until 2010 is Accounting, Organizations and Society with 14 publications between 1976 and 2010 (Table 3). Among the top ranked journals (A or A* qualified) the Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal (AAAJ) has published most on environmental accounting, followed by Accounting Forum and Critical Perspectives on Accounting. AAAJ has issued several special issues on the subject (1991, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2010), contributing substantially to the peak of literature in those years (see Figure 1).

Table 3: Journals with most publications on EMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Forum</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cleaner Production</td>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Perspectives on Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Asia Pacific Centre for Environmental Accountability</td>
<td>Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Strategy and the Environment</td>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Organisations and Society</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener Management International</td>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also environmental and sustainability management journals play a major role in EMA Research. The Journal of Cleaner Production, Business Strategy and the Environment, and Greener Management International are among the main contributors to EMA publications. Many publications in these journals take a broader view on environmental accounting by highlighting obstacles of introducing EMA, use of EMA information for strategic purposes, etc.

Placed between these two groups is the German journal Controlling, which focuses on management control and the use of accounting information. This is also the only non-English-speaking journal among the academic journals with most EMA publications.

The third group of journals with a large share of the total EMA journal publications are more specific social and environmental accounting journals (Table 4) such as Social and Environmental Accounting, and Journal of the Asia Pacific Centre for Environmental Accountability. Albeit specialized on environmental accounting, they are fairly young and often have fewer issues per year, which so far results in a lower total number of EMA publications than other, long-established journals.

An interesting observation can be drawn by applying another bibliometric tool – Bradford's law. Bradford (1985) described a pattern and predicts the distribution of publications in core, related, and sporadically related journals. He postulated that the number of publications in core journals \( n \), i.e. these journals where most publications in one field are found, is the same as the number of publications found in the next related journals \( n^2 \). In our sample of 371 publications in 83 scientific journals, the first 122 publications are concentrated in 5 journals (see Table 3), the next 128 publications are found in (the following) 12 journals and the remaining 121 publications are scattered among further 66 (hardly related) journals. These numbers reveal an underrepresentation of related and slightly related journals compared to the number of core journals. Whereas an over-proportionality of related journals could have been expected due to the interdisciplinary nature of EMA, the distribution of publications suggests that the core area is represented more strongly and plays a more active role compared to the whole research field and other scientific disciplines in general.
Table 4: Number of EMA publications in specialized journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Asia Pacific Centre for Environmental Accountability</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Social &amp; Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 shows this is even more the case with specialized journals in environmental and sustainability accounting (e.g. *Issues in Social and Environmental Accounting* started in 2007, *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal* started in 2010). With the exception of *Social and Environmental Accounting* most of the specialized journals have started more recently, thus indicating that a shift of the total number of publications towards specialized journals may be expected in the future.

### 4.3 Authorship

Authors in any field of research have an impact of how this field is shaped. According to the Ortega hypothesis (Cole and Cole, 1972) *scientific progress is based on the work of a small number of researchers* and authors in each field. For the research field of EMA, only 15 (2.3%) out of 650 authors contribute towards 333 (43.5%) publications out of the 766 publications (see Table 6). The proportion of authors to the overall contribution to the field remains similar when only journal publications are analysed. Again, 15 (3.8%) authors contribute to 162 (44%) of the 371 publications (Table 5). This can also be attributed to the high number of “one-off” authors who conduct their research in related areas and often have one single publication in the field of EMA.

Several further observations can be made by looking at the major contributors in the field. The order of the authors with most journal papers (Table 5) is somewhat counterintuitive. Since this review focuses on environmental management accounting literature, it appears surprising that Rob Gray and Jan Bebbington are in the lead, given that their work is focused on the critical perspective of social accounting (see Burritt and Schaltegger, 2010 for a taxonomy of sustainability accounting). This observation
can, however, be explained with Gray's earlier work, when he produced numerous publications with case studies within various organisations.

Table 5: Major contributors in published journal papers on EMA (out of 394 authors with paper contributions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of academic journal papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Robert</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebbington, Jan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaltegger, Stefan</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritt, Roger</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews, Reg</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman, Glen</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Günther, Edeltraud</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasch, Christine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen, David</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson, Ian</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Major contributors of publications on EMA in total (out of 650 authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schaltegger, Stefan</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritt, Roger</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Robert</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebbington, Jan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Martin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasch, Christine</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews, Reg</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Günther, Edeltraud</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, Peter</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, Tobias</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Marcus</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6, on the other hand, presents the major contributors to the overall volume of publications. The order of authors in this table differs from the previous, with Schaltegger and Burritt as being most productive. The discrepancy between the two tables can be explained with the stronger focus of some of the researchers on practice-oriented topics, whereas others have concentrated on purely academic research and academic journal publications.

The number of authors was also investigated with regard to the bibliometric indicator of co-authorship. De Solla Price (1981) first observed for a developing research area an increase in multiple authorship of publication over time. Later research supports this empirically in various fields (Cronin, 2001). The average number of authors in the 371 EMA journal publications was 1.74, with 51% of the publications having two or more authors and 16% having three or more authors. This number (1.74) is above average across all research areas, 1.45 being the average for 2000 (Jokic and Ball, 2006). With more than 20% above the average, this deviation may be attributed to the interdisciplinary character of EMA. In fact, an analysis of the publications in the American Journal of Sociology carried out in 2000 (Jokic and Ball, 2006) revealed that 45% of the publications had more than one author, which is lower than in our sample. Similarly,
Kyvik (2003) observed that 43% of the scientific Norwegian publications in social sciences had more than one author, an even lower figure.

### 4.4 Publications by countries

Another analysis of the EMA literature deals with the “geographic hotspots” of EMA research. This was done by counting the number of authors for each country in which the institutional affiliation of the researcher is located. For the analysis only authors with two or more publications were considered in order to exclude authors with a marginal connection to EMA research. Table 7 and Table 8 summarise the results of this analysis.

#### Table 7: Hotspots of EMA research by number of publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total contribution (no.)</th>
<th>Journal papers (no.)</th>
<th>Journal publications in percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 8: Number of contributors with two or more publications and total number of publications and journal publications by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contributors with two or more publications (out of 166)</th>
<th>Total Publications per author</th>
<th>Contributors with two or more journal publications (out of 83)</th>
<th>Journal publications per author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, Europe, particularly the UK and Germany, is leading in total volume of publications. Other countries such as Italy, the Netherlands, Denmark or Spain have a more sporadic record of publications. Recently, the Asian-Pacific region has been very productive, with numerous publications by Australian researchers and Japan catching up for the last couple of years. The first EMA publications outside of Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and the USA were authored by Japanese academics and released in 2001.

Compared to scientific management and accounting publications in general, EMA seems to be underrepresented in the USA (Table 7). The fact that the US is in the list of the most contributing countries with authors having published two or more papers in EMA can be explained by the observation that many US contributions were produced by the US Environmental Protection Agency, the World Resource Institute and Tellus Institute, i.e. by the few organisations who were linked to the environmental accounting project in the 1990s. The current relatively narrow geographic spread of research does not support comparative empirical studies on a broad multinational basis.

Another interesting aspect is the strong journal focus of researchers in New Zealand and Australia (74% and 67% journal publications) compared to the low journal coverage in Japan (10%), France (16%) and Austria (27%). In these countries, books and edited volumes seem to play an important role.

Table 8 also shows that some countries like the United Kingdom and Germany have a broad basis of academics contributing to EMA (26 authors each with two or more publications) whereas the research in France and Japan relies on fewer researchers (10 and 7, not shown in Table 8). The total productivity per author with two or more publications on the other hand is highest in the UK, Germany and Australia with 6,3 to 7,5 publications per author. This productivity figure, shown in the third column in Table 8, is calculated as the total number of publications (second column in Table 7) divided by the number of contributors (third column in Table 8). The journal publication productivity (last column in Table 8) is derived the same way by dividing the figures in the third column in Table 7 by the fourth in Table 8. The ranking in productivity is basically the same for journals as for publications in total in spite of the large differences between these countries in the preferred publication media (e.g. Australia with 67% of all EMA publications being journal publications compared to Germany with 35% journal publications).
The above geographic hotspots are also reflected by the place of origin of the leading journals in EMA (Tables 3 and 4). Five of the ten most influential journals in the field are UK-based and three are Australian-based.

4.5 Most cited EMA publications

Citations are a measure of how often a publication has been referred to and thus how influential it is. A higher citation score shows that the contents of the publication have been received and discussed intensely in the scientific community. As of March 2011, 15 documents have been cited over a 100 times in Google Scholar (Table 9). The citation scores of ISI Web of Knowledge and Scopus were also collected in March 2011. A dash in Tables 9 and 10 indicates that a publication was not found in the ISI Web of Knowledge or Scopus database, whereas a zero indicates that it is in the database but has not been cited so far.

The two most cited publications are books written by the four most active contributors to the field of EMA. Considering the authors, the most influential author in environmental accounting is Professor Rob Gray who has five publications among the fifteen top cited publications on EMA. This is even more obvious when considering journal papers only (Table 9).

The citation numbers were obtained from Google Scholar, ISI Web of Knowledge (ISI WoK) and Scopus. Due to the nature of ISI WoK and Scopus, the figures are much lower than those in Google Scholar, although they display a similar trend. One of the major observations is that only 27 articles have one or more citations in ISI WoK, of which only six papers have ten or more citations. This may be an indication that EMA is still a research area which is not very well linked into other, more conventional, and often cited research areas.
Table 9: Most cited publications in environmental accounting and EMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of publication</th>
<th>Autor(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Google Scholar</th>
<th>ISI Web of Knowledge</th>
<th>Scopus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for the environment. The greening of accountancy part II</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary environmental accounting: issues, concepts and practices</td>
<td>Schaltegger and Burritt</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and environmentalism: An exploration of the challenge of gently accounting for accountability, transparency and sustainability</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research. Is there a silver jubilee to celebrate?</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the measurement of the environmental performance of firms. A literature review and a productive efficiency perspective</td>
<td>Tyteca</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sustainability balanced scorecard. Linking sustainability management to business strategy</td>
<td>Figge et al.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate environmental accounting</td>
<td>Schaltegger et al.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing new worlds. A role for social and environmental accounting and auditing</td>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring eco-efficiency: A guide to reporting company performance</td>
<td>WBCSD</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable value added. Measuring corporate contributions to sustainability beyond eco-efficiency</td>
<td>Figge and Hahn</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Ledgers: Case Studies in Corporate Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>Ditz et al.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greening of Accountancy: the profession after Pearce</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An account of sustainability: Failure, success and a re-conceptualisation</td>
<td>Bebbingston and Gray</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental indicators for business: a review of the literature and standardisation methods</td>
<td>Olsthoorn</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greening of Enterprise: An Exploration of the (NON) Role of Environmental Accounting and Environmental Accountants in Organizational Change</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also a notable observation revealed by the citation analysis is that like other (established) fields of research, only few scientists contribute to scientific progress in the field (Garfield’s law, De Bellis, 2009). Of the 650 authors, only the 43 most productive authors have 5 or more (often co-authored) publications. However, given the large number of authors with a single publication on EMA (488, 74.7 %), the
contribution of the large majority to the field is still essential for its progress. This observation may be explained with the interdisciplinary nature of EMA: it combines knowledge in the fields of business administration, accounting, environmental management, etc. Although a relatively small group of leading authors has been shaping the research area, they tend to involve or motivate different co-authors (such PhD students) to contribute to EMA research.

Table 10: Most cited journal papers in environmental accounting and EMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of publication</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ISI WoK</th>
<th>Scopus</th>
<th>Google Scholar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and environmentalism: An exploration of the challenge of gently accounting for accountability, transparency and sustainability</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research: Is there a silver jubilee to celebrate?</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the measurement of the environmental performance of firms. A literature review and a productive efficiency perspective</td>
<td>Tyteca</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sustainability balanced scorecard- linking sustainability management to business strategy</td>
<td>Figge et al.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing new worlds: a role for social and environmental accounting and auditing</td>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable value added. Measuring corporate contributions to sustainability beyond eco-efficiency</td>
<td>Figge and Hahn</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An account of sustainability. Failure, success and a reconceptualisation</td>
<td>Bebbington and Gray</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental indicators for business: a review of the literature and standardisation methods</td>
<td>Olsthoorn et al.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The greening of enterprise: An exploration of the (NON) role of environmental accounting and environmental accountants in organizational change</td>
<td>Gray et al.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Analysis of theories applied, types of study and topics

4.6.1 Analysis of theories used

One of the content analyses carried out investigated the underlying theories in EMA literature. For this analysis two kinds of theory were distinguished. On the one hand
established theories applied in management science, used for explaining EMA approaches and developments and used for predicting empirical observations in the field of EMA were searched for. These are well-known theories such as “transaction cost theory”, “contingency theory”, etc. which are often used in academic accounting and management publications. On the other hand “practical” or practice-oriented theories (see Malmi and Granlund, 2009; Quattrone, 2009) which seek to provide useful approaches to practitioners were considered. Malmi and Grandlund (2009) argue that e.g. a costing theory would have much higher value to accounting professionals than “borrowed” economic of management theories that only partially explain why activity-based costing can be superior over other costing approaches.

Only 13% of empirical EMA publications explicitly refer to the type of well-known, established academic theories, whereas the vast majority of publications attempts to develop a practice-oriented EMA theory or approach which seeks to explain what EMA is, how it contributes to corporate environmental performance as well as how it can be or has been applied and how it is likely to further develop. The two most applied theories are the neo-institutional theory and contingency theory (however only 8 and 6 publications representing 3,4% and 2,5% of total empirical studies each).

4.6.2 Type of studies

For the analysis of the type of studies (i.e. whether they are rather normative, conceptual, literature reviews, or empirical) all publications were considered which could be obtained electronically or in hard copy (i.e. are not out of print). Thus, 617 publications (81% of the total) were examined in more detail.

234 of these 617 publications on EMA present empirical research. The number has steadily increased from 0 before 1990, to 35 (21% of all publications) in the decade between 1991-2000 to now 199, or 46% of the most recent publications (2006-2010). Until 2000, most publications, also in academic journals were normative or conceptual. The very low number of empirical publications may be a result of the relative novelty of EMA and the short history of application in corporate practice at this time (Schaltegger and Burritt, 2000). Parker (2011) found a similar development for the broader area of SEA literature in six leading accounting journals where empirical research has only recently picked up. Furthermore, meta-studies using secondary published data based on
the existing EMA body of literature have so far not been produced. This is maybe a consequence of the few empirical papers which differ strongly with regard to their scope, time span and methods they apply.

The above considerations are supported when considering the type of empirical research. 74% of empirical publications are of qualitative nature – most often a single case study was used to identify, describe or visualise a very specific EMA-related topic only.

Just 26% of these empirical papers are of quantitative nature. A possible explanation for the relatively low number of quantitative empirical research is the small number of analytical qualitative research which often serves to provide empirically testable theories on EMA. Most of the qualitative research, particularly the earlier literature, is descriptive rather than theory based.

Figure 2: Type of EMA publications over time

This relates to the relative novelty of EMA when it started to rapidly develop as a research area. Although the first books and journal papers were published in the 70s, it was not before 1992 that the research area started to boom with a larger volume of publications (Figure 1). The majority of companies thus cannot be expected to have many decades of EMA experience, thus leaving empirical researchers without a large databasis of corporate practices.
Furthermore, only very few publications seem to highlight paths to a systematic quantitative research, i.e. to address the questions such as what data would be needed to test theories.

4.6.3 Topics of research

The two topics of EMA which have attracted most attention are environmental cost accounting with 36 documents, closely followed by environmental indicators with 33 documents. Furthermore, topics dealing covering the sustainability involvement of the accounting profession (34 publications), or how SEA should be taught (28 time), have been dealt with extensively.

Although in total, the discussion of EMA tools and methods has been covered by many publications, no single approach has attracted very high attention. Among the top scorers are: Sustainability Balance Scorecard (14 publications), Material flow Cost Accounting (12 publications), Full Cost Accounting (9 publications), Total Cost Assessment (7 publications). Carbon accounting, which has just recently been taken up, has already shown a strong development with 14 publications, and water accounting has been discussed in as many as 6 publications for the last few years. On the contrary, biodiversity accounting, with early papers in the 90s, has not picked up and, inspite of the International Year of Biodiversity in 2010, is still rarely addressed.

Surprisingly, topics such as the public sector, investment, budgeting, agriculture related accounting and SMEs have barely been tackled.

5 Conclusions

The review and analysis of existing literature for various kinds of English, French and German publications on EMA shows the following core results.

• Growth: The field (environmental management accounting and also the coverage of environmental accounting topics in papers on sustainability accounting, including specific topics such as carbon accounting, etc.) is developing substantially a) in terms of the number of publications (766 in total, 371 in journals, 395 in the other publication categories such as books and book
chapters), and b) in terms of the number of journals with a specific focus. This shows that the discipline of environmental and sustainability accounting has been established as a sub-discipline of accounting and management in the academic literature over the last two decades mainly.

- **Mainstreaming:** The number of publications in mainstream accounting and management journals has increased steadily. This shows that the topic has been taken up by mainstream accounting and management academic circles. Environmental management accounting is going mainstream and has been acknowledged as an important contribution to accounting and (sustainability) management in general. Also former literature reviews support the establishment of the field.

- **Authors and regions contributing and dominating the academic discussion:** The authors who influenced and influence the literature most as well as the countries where the discussion is flourishing most are the UK, Germany and Australia. This shows that the topic of environmental and sustainability accounting is mainly discussed in a small part of the European world and Australia. More recently, however, especially Asian academics have started to deal with EMA, too. Furthermore, even more recently EMA has been introduced in developing countries through empirical research mainly (Viere *et al.* 2007; Li 2004; Lodhia 1999; Burritt *et al.* 2009).

- **Research community is growing:** The number of authors dealing with environmental management accounting has increased steadily. This shows that the topic has gained ever more attention in academic circles. The interdisciplinary nature of EMA research is illustrated by the large number of publications with various co-authors, of which many seem to be involved in one or very few publications only.

- **Conceptual studies dominating:** So far the vast majority of EMA publications is conceptually oriented, proposing different approaches and tools. Although increasing substantially in recent years, only very little empirical work, mostly case studies, has been conducted, and very few established management and accounting theories have been used so far.
In conclusion, the literature review of various kinds of academic and qualified practitioner-oriented publications on EMA shows that the area is developing with a high speed, involving an increasing range of authors, regions and topics. If EMA and sustainability accounting research as a discipline develops similarly to other fields of research, it can be expected that empirical studies will be published increasingly often in the next couple of years. Assuming the current development continues, environmental and sustainability accounting research will be much further matured in the next decade.
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## Appendix

### Appendix 1: Journals researched for Bibliography building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Researched years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abacus</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1965-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Business Research</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1973-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Finance</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1979-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Education</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Forum</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK/USA</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1999-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Horizons</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Organisations and Society</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1976-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, accountability and performance</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1995-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1988-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances in Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2000-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Review of Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Accounting Review</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1998-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Research in Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1989-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptabilité, Contrôle, Audit</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1995-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Accounting Research</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1989-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Environmental Strategy</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management</td>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>UK/Hong Kong</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Perspectives on Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Canada/UK</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1990-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1989-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management &amp; Health</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1990-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality Management</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental research, engineering and management</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1995-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Values</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accountability &amp; Management</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK/USA</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1985-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener Management International</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICFAI Journal of Environmental Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2007-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Name</td>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Environmental Review</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Social &amp; Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2007-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Accounting Education</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting &amp; Public Policy</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting and Economics</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no search possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting Education</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting Research</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1963-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cleaner Production</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Economics Perspectives</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2002-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Education for Business</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1931-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Environmental Management</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1990-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Industrial Ecology</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La revue française de gestion</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Management</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1975-2002-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Policy in International Business (now Georgetown Journal of International Law)</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1968-no search possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Accounting Research</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1990-1990-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Auditing Journal</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1986-1986-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Finance</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1975-1975-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Prevention Review (Pollution Prevention Review is discontinued. It has merged with Environmental Quality Management)</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>n.a.-no search possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research in Accounting &amp; Management</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>New-Zealand/Australia</td>
<td>2004-2004-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Accounting Studies</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1996-1996-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Business Research</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Management</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2000-2008-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>Environmental Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1981-1993-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Journal of Finance and Accounting (Revista Espanola de Financiacion y Contabilidad)</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1972-1972-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2010-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Accounting Review</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1926-1926-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British Accounting Review</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1974-1988-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Accounting Review</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1992-1992-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the International Journal of Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1965-1965-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International Journal of Environmental Cultural Economic and Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Australia/USA</td>
<td>n.a.-2005-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadyby Management</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Management</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>n.a.-no search possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitschrift für Controlling &amp; Management</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1956-2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Document numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All documents</th>
<th>Journal Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>766</strong></td>
<td><strong>371</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>