EDITORIAL

Dear readers!

We are pleased to present the third issue of the journal "Corporate Board: Role, Duties and Composition" in 2018. It is devoted to the issues of accounting standards, financial reporting, profit and loss contracts, IFRS, inside debt, CEO pay slice, executive compensation, incentives, organisational demography, board size, board leadership structure, CEO duality, sustainable development, environmental accounting etc.

Adil EL Fakir and *Mohamed Tkiouat* examine moral hazards and adverse selection risks in profit and loss sharing (PLS) Islamic contracts, trying to reduce moral hazards in the form of the entrepreneur's effort shirking, within the game theory approach. *Kanellos Toudas* investigates how US GAAP and IFSR accounting frameworks are evaluated by accounting professionals in four European countries, aiming at understanding the factors that impede the convergence of the two frameworks and the differences among the countries. *Randy Beaver* focuses on the different components of CEO incentives, in particular inside debt, overconfidence and CEO pay slice, and how they interact together, in order to find what matters most. *Dimitrios Koufopoulos* and *Ioannis Gkliatis* aimed at examining the effects of organisational characteristics on board attributes, such as board size, CEO duality and CEO dependence/independence among Greek manufacturing listed firms. Lastly, *Nikolaos Sariannidis*, *Alexandros Garefalakis*, *Panagiotis Ballas* and *Evdoxia Grigoriou* investigate the notion of sustainable development within the realm of hospitality and tourism industry, trying to link sustainability with financial reporting and business performance.

Boards of directors are key corporate governance mechanisms able to control and influence corporate decisions. A great deal of research has been conducted on boards of directors (Davidson, & Rowe, 2004; Hermalin & Weisbach, 1988; Johnson, Daily & Ellstrand, 1996; Kirkman, Tesluk & Rosen, 2004; Kosnik, 1990; Kostyuk, 2003; Miller & Triana, 2009;), but there is still need of further research in many areas, especially in firms where large shareholders are present and countries where this type of ownership is prevalent. Most of the articles in this issue are focused on countries such as Greece, Portugal, France and Germany, with high ownership concentration and the presence of controlling shareholders, advancing the knowledge on how boards perform in these contexts. The study of Koufopoulos and Gkliatis, in particular, investigates how organizational demography, in terms of organizational age, size and longevity on the Stock Exchange, impacts on board structure. They interestingly reported a positive association with the board size, but not with the leadership structure. This latter could be mainly related to other factors, such as ownership structure, which in these contexts usually takes the form of majority shareholder ownership, with the emergence of peculiar conflicts between controlling and minority shareholders. Indeed, a reflection on how different owners may pursue different goals, and on how these differences may have significant effects on firm governance, such as board structure, composition and functioning, is emerging. In particular, for firms characterized by high ownership concentration, because board structure and board members' selection is likely to be influenced by controlling shareholders.

Reflecting on the articles of this issue, another important topic which is worthy to highlight is the link between board of directors and corporate sustainability actions, such as sustainability reporting. In recent years, it has become evident that the success of a business is no longer defined only by monetary gains but also by the impact that the activities of an organization have on society as a whole. Achieving sustainability is therefore one of the most relevant challenges for society and firms. In particular, corporate social issues are increasingly perceived as a competitive advantage for firms, that firms tend to disclose more and more often. This is clearly emerging in the article by Sariannidis, Garefalakis, Ballas and Grigoriou, who exploit the role of sustainable development and environmental accounting in the hospitality and tourism industry, finding a lack of focused research on sustainability reporting (Bear, Rahman & Corinne, 2010; Dunn & Sainty, 2009; Erhardt, Werbel & Shrader, 2003) and giving many useful directions for future explorations. Notwithstanding in recent years social and sustainable information has moved from a 'peripheral' to a 'core' part of investment analysis of institutional investors, and many countries across the world are increasingly asking their firms to disclose non-financial information, extant research on the issue is still underdeveloped.

In particular, the linkages between board structure and composition and corporate sustainable disclosure and performance have been exploited, based on the idea that boards are responsible for decisions related to sustainability, but the few studies addressing the relationship present fragmented and partially contradictory empirical evidence, highlighting the need for additional research in this area (Zhang, 2012). Indeed, board's decision of disclosing non-financial information is vital for managing the change towards a sustainable global economy, by combining long term profitability with social impact and environmental protection.

Some of the aspects of the topics studied in the current issue of the journal were explored in the academic literature previously. For example, the International Standards on Auditing were described in several papers (Bartov, Goldberg & Kim, 2005; Chalmers, Clinch & Godfrey, 2011; El-Bannany, 2008; El-Gazzar & Finn, 2017; Erchinger & Melcher, 2007; Ricketts, Riley & Shortridge, 2018; Wu & Zhang, 2014) however the conclusion that economy of a country does indeed affect the perception of listed companies towards a potential convergence is presented for the first time. Components of compensation have been analysed in previous studies of corporate financial variables of interest (Alshimmiri, 2004; Deckop, Merriman & Gupta, 2006; Faghani, Monem & Ng, 2015; Lazarides, Drimpetas & Dimitrios, 2009; Petra & Dorata, 2008; Pukthuanthong, Talmor & Wallac, 2003; Sanders & Carpenter, 1998) but never together to get a sense of the complete picture of what truly matters (as it is done in the paper published in the current issue). Overall, this issue of the journal is composed of papers which consider many fundamental issues of corporate governance which have been described in a whole by other scholars (Akanmidu, 2017; Boubaker & Nguyen, 2014; Huse, 2005; Mintz, 2006; Pearce & Zahra, 1991; Sikandar & Mahmood, 2018; Umans & Smith, 2013).

Overall, the articles in the present issue are dealing with timely subjects which have become extremely important in the last few years, but where the debate on the issue is still ongoing and unresolved. Hopefully, this issue of *Corporate Board Journal* will help to advance scholarly research on boards of directors, generating new ideas and calling for new emerging studies.

We hope that you will enjoy reading this issue of our journal!

Dr. Giorgia Profumo,
University of Genoa, Italy;
Editorial Board member, Corporate Board: Role, Duties and Composition

REFERENCES

1. Akanmidu, O. (2017). The deterrence theory: A case for enhanced enforcement of directors' duties. *Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review, 1(1)*, 25-31. http://doi.org/10.22495/cgobr_v1_i1_p3
2. Alshimmiri, T. (2004). Board composition, executive remuneration, and corporate performance: The case of REITs. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 2(1)*, 104-118. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv2i1p8
3. Bartov, E., Goldberg, S. R., & Kim, M. (2005). Comparative value relevance among German, U.S., and international accounting standards: A German stock market perspective. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance, 20(2)*, 95-119. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558X0502000201
4. Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Corinne, P. (2010). The impact of board diversity and gender composition on corporate social responsibility and firm reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 97*, 207-221. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0505-2
5. Boubaker, S., & Nguyen, D. K. (2014). *Corporate governance in emerging markets: Theories, practices and cases*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-44955-0
6. Chalmers, K., Clinch, G., & Godfrey, J. M. (2011). Changes in value relevance of accounting information upon IFRS adoption: Evidence from Australia. *Australian Journal of Management, 36(2)*, 151-173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896211404571
7. Davidson, W. N., & Rowe, W. (2004). Intertemporal endogeneity in board composition and financial performance. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 1(4)*, 49-60. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv1i4p4
8. Deckop, J. R., Merriman, K. K., & Gupta, S. (2006). The effects of CEO pay structure on corporate social performance. *Journal of Management, 32*, 329-342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305280113
9. Dunn, P., & Sainty, B. (2009). The relationship among board of director characteristics, corporate social performance and corporate financial performance. *International Journal of Managerial Finance, 5(4)*, 407-423. https://doi.org/10.1108/17439130910987558
10. El-Bannany, M. (2008). Factors affecting audit report lag in banks: The Egyptian case. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 5(3)*, 54-61. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv5i3p6
11. El-Gazzar, S. M., & Finn, P. M. (2017). Restatements and accounting quality: A comparison between IFRS and US-GAAP. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting, 15(1)*, 39-58. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRA-10-2015-0090
12. Erchinger, H., & Melcher, W. (2007). Convergence between US GAAP and IFRS: Acceptance of IFRS by the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). *Accounting in Europe, 4(2)*, 123-139. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449480701727908
13. Erhardt, N., Werbel, J., & Shrader, C. (2003). Board of director diversity and firm financial performance. *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 11*, 102-111. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8683.00011
14. Faghani, M., Monem, R., & Ng, C. (2015). 'Say on pay' regulation and chief executive officer pay: Evidence from Australia. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 12(3)*, 28-39. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv12i3p3
15. Hermalin, B., & Weisbach, M. (1988). The determinants of board composition. *RAND Journal of Economics, 19*, 589-606. https://doi.org/10.2307/2555459
16. Huse, M. (2005). Corporate governance: Understanding important contingencies. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 2(4)*, 41-50. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv2i4p3
17. Johnson, J. L., Daily, C. M., & Ellstrand, A. E. (1996). Boards of directors: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 22*, 409-438. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200303
18. Kirkman, B. L., Tesluk, P. E., & Rosen, B. (2004). The impact of demographic heterogeneity and team leader-team member demographic fit on team empowerment and effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management, 29(3)*, 334-368. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601103257412
19. Kosnik, R. (1990). Effects of board demography and directors' incentives on corporate greenmail decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 129-150. https://doi.org/10.2307/256355
20. Kostyuk, A. (2003). Board practices: An international review. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 1(1)*, 102-111. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv1i1p7
21. Lazarides, T., Drimpetas, E., & Dimitrios, K. (2009). Executive board members' remuneration: A longitudinal study. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 6(3)*, 94-103. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv6i3p9
22. Miller, T., & Triana, M. (2009). Demographic diversity in the boardroom: Mediators of the board diversity – firm performance relationship. *Journal of Management Studies, 46*, 755-786. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00839.x
23. Mintz, S. M. (2006). A comparison of corporate governance systems in the US, UK and Germany. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 3(4)*, 24-34. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv3i4p12
24. Pearce, J. A., & Zahra, S. A. (1991). The relative power of CEOs and boards of directors: Associations with corporate performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 12*, 135-153. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120205
25. Petra, S. T., & Dorata, N. T. (2008). Corporate governance and chief executive officer compensation. *Corporate Governance, 8*, 141-152. https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700810863779
26. Pukthuanthong, K., Talmor, E., & Wallac, J. S. (2003). Corporate governance and theories of executive pay. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 1(2)*, 94-105. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv1i2p8
27. Ricketts, R. C., Riley, M. E., & Shortridge, R. T. (2018). Information content of IFRS versus GAAP financial statements. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting, 16(1)*, 120-137. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRA-08-2016-0067
28. Sanders, W. M. G., & Carpenter, M. A. (1998). Internationalization and firm governance: The roles of CEO compensation, top team composition, and board structure. *Academy of Management Journal, 41(2)*, 158-178. https://doi.org/10.2307/257100
29. Sikandar, S., & Mahmood, W. (2018). Corporate governance and value of family-owned business: A case of emerging country. *Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review, 2(2)*, 6-12. http://doi.org/10.22495/cgsrv2i2p1
30. Umans, T., & Smith, E. (2013). Isolated islands in the upper apex of organisations: In search of interaction between the board of directors and the top management team. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 10(2)*, 80-90. http://doi.org/10.22495/cocv10i2art6
31. Wu, J. S., & Zhang, I. X. (2014). The adoption of internationally recognized accounting standards: Implications for the credit markets. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance, 29(2)*, 95-128. https://doi.org/10.1177/01485 58X14524420
32. Zhang, L. (2012). Board demographic diversity, independence, and corporate social performance. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 12(5)*, 686-700. https://doi.org/10.1108/1472070121 1275604