Communications of the Association for Information Systems

4-8-2021

Editorial Board Diversity at the Basket of Eight Journals: A Report to the College of Senior Scholars

Cynthia Beath
University of Texas at Austin, cbeath@mail.utexas.edu

Yolande Chan
Smith School of Business, Queen's University, ychan@queensu.ca

Robert M. Davison
City University of Hong Kong, isrobert@cityu.edu.hk

Alan Dennis
Indiana University - Bloomington, ardennis@indiana.edu

Jan Recker
University of Hamburg, jan.christof.recker@uni-hamburg.de

Follow this and additional works at: https://aisel.aisnet.org/cais

Recommended Citation

Editorial Board Diversity at the Basket of Eight Journals: A Report to the College of Senior Scholars

Cynthia M. Beath
University of Texas in Austin
cbeath@mail.utexas.edu

Yolande Chan
Queen's University
ychan@queensu.ca

Robert M. Davison
City University of Hong Kong
isrobert@cityu.edu.hk

Alan Dennis
Indiana University
ardennis@indiana.edu

Jan Recker
University of Hamburg
jan.christof.recker@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract

At the 2019 International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS), the College of Senior Scholars appointed a committee to investigate diversity in the editorial boards of their Basket of Eight journals. Editorial board diversity signals that a journal welcomes and includes all authors. The committee compared the gender, regional and ethnic diversity of the editorial boards to that of AIS members in the Academic membership category. This comparison showed that the editorial boards overall had fewer female members, more members from Region 1, and fewer from Region 3 than one would reasonably expect. Furthermore, there were more editorial board members of Indian ancestry than one would expect, while several other ethnicities appeared on editorial boards in smaller numbers than one would expect, in comparison to AIS Academic members. The individual journals also differed a great deal among themselves with respect to these diversity criteria. Regrettably, every journal fell below what one would reasonably expect with respect to either gender, regional, or ethnic diversity. Based on these findings, we make recommendations for the College of Senior Scholars, editors in chief of the Basket of Eight journals, the AIS Council, and individuals who lead other organizations of IS scholars.

1 Introduction

In 2018, the Association for Information Systems (AIS) Council adopted a statement on diversity and inclusion that emphasized participation in all AIS events and communities (see the Appendix). At a panel that the College of Senior Scholars hosted at the 2019 International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS) in Munich, panelists raised the question of whether AIS had problems with diversity and inclusion. Later that day, when the College of Senior Scholars met, Jane Fedorowicz offered a provisional "yes" to this question. In a report, she presented the results of a survey on diversity and inclusion that she had carried out in 2019 on behalf of the College of Senior Scholars.

The report[1] compared the gender, regional, and ethnicity composition of the AIS membership to that of the College of Senior Scholars, the 25 AIS presidents, and the AE boards at the Basket of Eight journals. The report showed that AIS as a whole had 1.27 men to every one woman and that 47 percent of members came from Region 1, 36 percent from Region 2, and 16 percent from Region 3. AIS does not maintain data on members' ethnicity. The report noted that:

- The College of Senior Scholars (83% male, 82% from Regions 1 and 2) is representative of the AIS membership in regard to regional representation but not gender
- The 25 AIS presidents (92% male, 80% Caucasian) are not representative of AIS membership in regard to gender or, it is likely, ethnicity
- The male/female ratio among AEs ranged from 1.4:1 to 3.9:1 for seven journals, while one journal (*Journal of Management Information Systems* (*JMIS*)) was reported to have a male/female ratio of more than 12:1 among its AEs. The report noted that, between 2000 and 2019, the male/female ratio among the AEs of all the Basket journals except *Information Systems Research* (*ISR*) came closer to the male/female ratio of AIS members

During the discussion that followed, some Senior Scholars expressed views about the need for, and the value of, diversity on the editorial boards of the College of Senior Scholars' Basket of Eight journals. Two proposals were made during this discussion: 1) that key AIS institutions, including the Basket of Eight journals, should reflect and represent the AIS membership's diversity and 2) that the Senior Scholars should delist a journal currently in the Basket of Eight if it failed to show that it had begun to address diversity and inclusion in its structures[2].

As a result of this discussion, the CSS approved a motion to undertake a more careful investigation of diversity in the Basket of Eight journal editorial boards before taking any concrete action. Accordingly, they solicited volunteers to form a task force to examine journal editorial board diversity. The task force included the following members: Cynthia Beath, Yolande Chan, Robert Davison, Alan Dennis, and Jan Recker.

The goal of the taskforce was to identify the extent to which the editorial board of each journal in the Basket of Eight reflected AIS membership[3] in terms of gender[4], region, and ethnicity[5]. We believe that the Senior Scholars' Basket of Eight journals should be open, encouraging, and supportive of all individuals who conduct great research, irrespective of a journal's size, strategic positioning, or niche and that their editorial boards should reflect the AIS membership's diversity to communicate or signal a commitment to fairness to all submitters.

---

1 Readers can find the report at https://higherlogicdownload.s3.amazonaws.com/AISNET/ff3612b1-c1e0-4591-bdd0-e0c1b63fe7e2/UploadedImages/CSS_Diversity_and_inclusion_2019.pptx

2 Readers can obtain the meeting's minutes from the coordinator of the College of Senior Scholars. They can find the current coordinator's name at https://communities.aisnet.org/seniorscholars/home

3 The members of the AIS are our target population. We acknowledge that AIS membership is less diverse than the global IS scholar population and that AIS's pattern of diversity might be different from that of other organizations of IS scholars.

4 Although many people often use the terms gender and sex interchangeably, we acknowledge that, strictly speaking, sex refers to "a set of biological attributes in humans and animals...and is usually categorized as female or male", whereas gender refers to "the socially constructed roles, behaviors, expressions and identities of girls, women, boys, men, and gender diverse people" (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, 2020). We use the term gender in this report to refer to "sex".

5 According to the American Psychological Association (2019), "race refers to physical differences that groups and cultures consider socially significant. For example, people might identify their race as Aboriginal, African American or Black, Asian, European American or White, Native American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Māori, or some other race. Ethnicity refers to shared cultural characteristics such as language, ancestry, practices, and beliefs. For example, people might identify as Latino or another ethnicity". We use the term ethnicity to refer to "racial and ethnic identity".

We acknowledge that not every AIS member has the necessary qualifications to serve as an editorial board member, but we see no reason to conclude that members with the necessarily qualifications would significantly and meaningfully differ from the overall membership in demographic terms (and, if differences did exist, the CSS would seek to reduce such systemic bias).

2   Methods

We sought to compare the gender, region, and ethnicity of the editorial boards of the Basket of Eight journals with that of the AIS membership as a whole. One might argue that some journals may strive to serve certain constituencies and, thus, that one should assess them against such constituencies, not some broader community. For example, INFORMS (whose members are mainly in the United States (US)) publishes *ISR*, while the *European Journal on Information Systems* (*EJIS*) includes the European region in its name. We believe that journals in the Basket of Eight should serve IS researchers as a whole rather than some narrower constituency; thus, we chose to use the more global AIS membership as our point of comparison.

To assess the diversity in the AIS membership as a whole, we used membership data from AIS as of January, 2020. We used the 3,210 Academic members as the baseline group (i.e., we excluded individuals in AIS's Student, Professional, or Retired classes of membership), reasoning that AIS's Academic members would form the pool of candidates from which journals would draw editorial board members.

We used AIS's publicly reported proportions to establish the gender and regional diversity of AIS's Academic members (see Table 1). The gender proportion omits anyone who did not report gender. AIS assigns the region code to members based on the region where they work. One task force member coded the ethnicity of AIS's Academic members. We used the U.S. census and other sources to develop our ethnicity categories for analysis. We coded Academics as Hispanics only if they worked in Region 1 because the category has no significance in Regions 2 and 3. Thus, we coded Academics of Latin American descent working in Region 2 or 3 as "Caucasian/European". One cannot easily code ethnicity for many reasons (not just because many people are of mixed ethnicities), so the proportions that we report in Table 1 have some inexactness. In particular we believe that reliably identifying individuals as Hispanics was a challenge for our task force member who coded AIS Academic members and for the editors in chief who subsequently validated our coding of editorial board members.

Table 1. Reported Proportions of AIS Academic Members

Dimension	Distribution of AIS Academic members (n = 3210)	
	%	One standard deviation (SD)
Gender		
Female	33%	0.8%
Male	67%	0.8%
Region		
1	45%	0.8%
2	31%	0.6%
3	24%	0.6%
Ethnicity		
Chinese	19%	0.8%
Indian subcontinent	8%	0.8%
Other Asian	7%	0.3%
Black/African descent	2%	0.3%
Caucasian/European descent	54%	0.8%
Middle Eastern descent	8%	0.5%
Hispanic (only in Region 1)	2%	0.2%
Other	< 1 %	

We summarize the results from our analysis of the Basket of Eight journal editorial boards in Table 2. A cell with dark shading indicates the value fell below the AIS population value by five standard deviations (SD) or more. A cell with lighter shading indicates that is the value exceeded the AIS population value by five standard deviations or more. For our analysis, we used either a journal's published editorial board or its published list of senior editors and associate editors based on the reasoning that these are the individuals mainly responsible for the management and evaluation of submissions. We did not include members on advisory boards or honorary boards in our analysis. Each task force member coded the members of two journals' boards using publicly available materials on the Web, such as profile pages, biographies, and images. Where required, we contacted board members directly to request clarification. The editors in chief (EICs) at each journal validated that our data on their editorial boards' composition and diversity were correct as of May, 2020.

We examined several approaches to assessing whether a journal's editorial board was reflective of AIS membership. In the end, we chose to focus on the reported proportions of AIS Academic members to calculate an expected value in each category. For each journal, we used the size of the editorial board and the AIS proportion of a category to compute an expected number of board members in each category. For example, if a journal had 100 members on its board, and 33 percent of AIS Academic members were female, we would expect the journal to have about 33 female board members.

One cannot expect a journal's board composition to exactly match the AIS proportions, so we also wanted to identify some range around the expected value as a reasonable basis for identifying differences and promoting discussion. We started with three standard deviations around the expected value (usually 99.7% of a normal distribution). Three standard deviations is commonly used in other analyses in our field. But we found that this approach produced rather narrow ranges, especially for journals with small editorial boards, and essentially made all the journals' editorial board look very problematic. To focus our discussion on the more egregious situations, we chose five standard deviations as a range for discussion (usually 99.99% of a normal distribution). While we refer to results falling in the five-standard deviation range as "reasonably expected," in the statistical sense, by no means does that mean that we find results falling in that range as equitable or acceptable.

Table 2. Basket of Eight Journal Editorial Boards' Proportions with Respect to AIS Academic Members as of May, 2020

Population	AIS population			Basket overall				European Journal of Information Systems				Information Systems Journal				Information Systems Research			
Size	3,210			475				56				66				66			
Statistics	#	1 SD	5 SD	#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD	
Gender																			
Female	33%	0.8%	4.1%	125	26%	137	176	10	18%	16	21	21	32%	19	24	12	18%	19	24
Male	67%	0.8%	4.1%	350	74%	299	338	46	82%	35	40	45	68%	42	47	54	82%	42	47
Region																			
1	45%	0.8%	4.1%	247	52%	194	233	21	38%	23	28	17	26%	27	32	48	73%	27	32
2	31%	0.6%	3.2%	140	29%	132	162	29	52%	16	19	31	47%	18	23	5	8%	18	23
3	24%	0.7%	3.3%	88	19%	98	130	6	11%	12	15	18	27%	14	18	13	20%	14	18
Ethnicity																			
Chinese	19%	0.8%	4.1%	98	21%	71	110	2	4%	8	13	23	35%	10	15	29	44%	10	15
Indian subcontinent	8%	0.8%	3.9%	86	18%	20	56	1	2%	2	7	6	9%	3	8	21	32%	3	8
Other Asian	7%	0.3%	1.5%	9	2%	26	40	1	2%	3	5	1	2%	4	6	2	3%	4	6
Black/African descent	2%	0.3%	1.5%	11	2%	4	18	3	5%	0	2	2	3%	1	3	0	0%	1	3
Caucasian/European descent	54%	0.8%	4.1%	245	52%	237	276	44	79%	28	33	32	48%	33	38	10	15%	33	38
Middle Eastern descent	8%	0.5%	2.3%	26	5%	27	49	5	9%	3	6	2	3%	4	7	4	6%	4	7
Hispanic (R1 only)	2%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0%	11	11	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	2	2	0	0%	2	2
Other	<1%																		

Table 2. Basket of Eight Journal Editorial Boards' Proportions with Respect to AIS Academic Members as of May, 2020 (Cont.)

Population	Journal of the Association for Information Systems				Journal of Information Technology				Journal of Management Information Systems				Journal of Strategic Information Systems				MIS Quarterly			
Size	50				44				68				59				66			
Statistics	#	%	5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD	
Gender																				
Female	11	22%	14	19	17	39%	13	16	11	16%	20	25	22	37%	17	22	21	32%	19	24
Male	39	78%	31	36	27	61%	28	31	57	84%	43	48	37	63%	37	42	45	68%	42	47
Region																				
1	31	62%	20	25	10	23%	18	22	51	75%	28	33	24	41%	24	29	45	68%	27	32
2	11	22%	14	17	25	57%	12	15	9	13%	19	23	20	34%	16	20	10	15%	18	23
3	8	16%	10	14	9	20%	9	12	8	12%	14	19	15	25%	12	16	11	17%	14	18
Ethnicity																				
Chinese	11	22%	7	12	0	0%	7	10	7	10%	10	16	6	10%	9	14	20	30%	10	15
Indian subcontinent	11	22%	2	6	3	7%	2	5	17	25%	3	8	10	17%	2	7	17	26%	3	8
Other Asian	1	2%	3	4	0	0%	2	4	0	0%	4	6	2	3%	3	5	2	3%	4	6
Black/African descent	2	4%	0	2	1	2%	0	2	1	1%	1	3	0	0%	0	2	2	3%	1	3
Caucasian/European descent	25	50%	25	29	37	84%	22	26	36	53%	34	39	41	69%	29	34	20	30%	33	38
Middle Eastern descent	0	0%	3	5	3	7%	2	5	6	9%	4	7	1	2%	3	6	5	8%	4	7
Hispanic (R1 only)	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	2	2	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	2	2
Other																				

3   Data Analysis

3.1   Overall Patterns in the Basket

We first assessed the Basket of Eight as a whole. As of May, 2020, the eight journals had 475 board members in total. We interpreted our data in light of our expectation that the editorial boards of the Basket of Eight journals would be reflective of AIS Academic membership in the diversity dimensions we considered. We found that the Basket journals have more men (74%) and fewer women (26%) on their boards than one would reasonably expect (i.e., using a generous five standard deviations range) given the current ratio of male and female Academic members in AIS. Likewise, the editorial boards had more members from Region 1 (52%) and fewer from Region 3 (19%) than one would reasonably expect given AIS's regional diversity. Finally, we found that the editorial boards had more members of Indian ethnicity (18%) and fewer board members categorized as Other Asian (2%), Middle Eastern (5%), or Hispanic (0%) than one would reasonably expect given the ethnicity of AIS's Academic members. We note that 1.5 percent of board members were of Black/African descent—within the five standard deviations range of their AIS membership (where they are 2% of Academics).

For the most part, these imbalances overall are not too large: to correct them, the eight journals would have to find 12 more female editors, 10 more editors from Region 3, 17 more other Asians, one more person of Middle Eastern descent, and 11 more Hispanics (e.g., people from Mexico, Central America, and South America working in Region 1). These are small changes in the 475 board members (3%, 2%, 4%, <1%, and 2%, respectively).

3.2   Gender

Four of the Basket journals (*EJIS*, *ISR*, *JAIS,* and *JMIS*) had fewer women and more men than one would reasonably expect. Three journals (*ISJ*, *JSIS* and *MISQ*) had gender proportions in the reasonably expected ranges. One journal (*JIT*) actually had one more woman and one less man than one would

reasonably expect. *JIT* has the smallest editorial board, so their +/-5 SD ranges on gender are narrow (four people).

To correct their editorial board imbalances *EJIS*, *ISR*, *JAIS* and *JMIS* would need to add at least six, seven, three, and nine women to their boards, respectively. With more than 1,000 female Academics just in AIS to pick from, the journals could seemingly manage this challenge even assuming that they have such high standards that only one percent of IS researchers qualify.

Please note that we do not examine gender diversity within regions because the regions did not significantly differ from one another in this respect. As Table 1 notes, among AIS Academics, 33 percent were women. In Region 1, 30 percent were women; in Region 2, 31 percent were women; and, in Region 3, 36 percent were women.

3.3 Region

We note first that *JSIS* had a regional editor distribution that matched our expectations. Four journals (*ISR*, *JAIS*, *JMIS*, and *MISQ*) had more editorial board members from Region 1 and fewer from Regions 2 and 3 than one would reasonably expect. These shortfalls—which exceeded the shortfalls for gender in magnitude—may reflect these three journals' historical focus on Region 1. To fall in the target range, the four journals would have to increase the number of editors from Regions 2 and 3 by at least 16, six, 18, and 13, respectively.

Three journals (*EJIS*, *ISJ,* and *JIT*) had more editorial board members from Region 2 than one would reasonably expect, which undoubtedly reflects their historical focus on Region 2. These journals also had fewer editorial board members from Region 1 than one would reasonably expect. *ISJ* and *JIT* had a reasonably expected number of editorial board members from Region 3. To fall in a five standard deviations range, these three journals would need to increase their number of editorial board members from Region 1 (for *ISJ* and *JIT*) or for both Regions 1 and 3 (for *EJIS*) by at least 10, eight, and 10, respectively.

3.4 Ethnicity

As we note in Section 2, one cannot perfectly code ethnicity. Nevertheless, we present our results from analyzing this diversity dimension.

IS researchers of ethnic Chinese descent had higher representation on the *ISJ*, *ISR*, *MISQ* editorial boards and lower representation on the *EJIS*, *JIT*, *JMIS,* and *JSIS* editorial boards than one would reasonably expect. For the latter journals, the gap equaled six, seven, three, and three members, respectively.

IS researchers who originated from the Indian subcontinent had higher representation on the *ISR*, *JAIS*, *JMIS*, *JSIS,* and *MISQ* editorial boards and lower representation on the *EJIS* board than one would reasonably expect.

IS researchers of "Other Asian" descent (i.e., neither of ethnic Chinese descent nor originating from the Indian subcontinent) had lower representation on all the journals' editorial boards than one would expect. The gap equaled 17 members across all journals. AIS had more than 200 members of "Other Asian" descent from countries such as Thailand, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Vietnam.

ISR had no IS researchers who were Black or of African descent on its editorial board. To fall in the five standard deviations range we used for comparison, *ISR* would need to add one editor who was Black or of African descent. *JSIS* also had no IS researchers who were Black or of African descent on its editorial board. However, because of the comparatively small size of the journal's editorial board, zero falls in our five standard deviation comparison range. *EJIS* had three Black or African board members, one more than the zero to two in our five standard deviation comparison range. The other five journals had either one or two board members who were Black or of African descent. These numbers fell in the five standard deviations range for those journals.

IS researchers of Caucasian or European descent had higher representation on the *EJIS*, *JIT*, and *JSIS* editorial boards and lower representation on the *ISJ*, *ISR*, and *MISQ* boards than one would reasonably expect.

IS researchers of Middle Eastern descent had lower representation on the *ISJ*, *JAIS*, and *JSIS* boards than one would reasonably expect. The gap was equivalent to two, three, and two members respectively. The other five journals had editorial board members of Middle Eastern descent in the five standard deviations range.

In our analysis, no journal had a Hispanic editorial board member[6]. As noted earlier, it was challenging for both our team and the EICs to code this category. AIS had around 60 Hispanic Academic members at universities throughout Region 1, which includes many universities in Latin America.

In total, not one CSS Basket journal met all ethnicity targets. However, some journals had noticeably more ethnically diverse editorial boards than others.

3.5   Summary

Looking at all three dimensions together (gender, region, and ethnicity), we see that, for most journals, their boards deviated from the five standard deviation range in most categories. *JSIS* is the one exception: its editorial board met expectations for gender and region. Two journals (*ISJ* and *MISQ*) met gender expectations but not regional or ethnicity expectations.

3.6   Limitations

The diversity and inclusion targets that we use in Table 1 are subject to constant change, so alignment at any point in time may not last long. This means we need to regularly reexamine diversity and inclusion targets. In fact, the AIS Student membership category had proportionally more women (39%) than did the AIS Academic membership category (33%), so we know that the proportion of women among AIS Academics will increase as students move into the ranks of Academic members. Moreover, women comprise approximately 50 percent of the world's population—substantially higher than the proportion of women among AIS Academics, and the proportion of women in the Student category continues to grow. Thus, we believe it would be wise to expect the proportion of female Academic members at AIS to increase in the long run.

Global membership in AIS also continues to grow in line with AIS policies to create a global community of IS scholars. Gradual demographic shifts in the IS community are more likely to exacerbate, not solve, existing problems of diversity and inclusion.

Our analysis does not adequately surface the poor representation from the southern parts of Region 1 and Region 2. Thus, while we found that the eight journal boards lacked any Hispanic member, these findings do not truly highlight the fact that the editorial boards lacked scholar from universities south of the US in Region 1 and from universities in Africa or the Caribbean.

We did not limit our comparison pool to Academic members with tenure. AIS does not maintain tenure information. While one can most likely find editorial board member candidates among the 85 percent of Academic members that received their doctorate degrees more than six years ago (i.e., among those tenured), in just a few years, even these more junior Academics will be among those sufficiently seasoned for editorial roles.

Finally, we used the AIS Academic community as a baseline for comparison. The IS community comprises many other formal and informal IS researcher groups besides AIS Academics, such as the Information Systems Society (ISS) at the Institute for Operations Research and Management Science (INFORMS); the Academy of Management's Organizational Communications and Information Systems (OCIS) and Technology and Information Management (TIM) divisions; the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI); and the communities surrounding the i-Schools' i-Conference, the International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE), the Workshop on Information Technologies and Systems (WITS), and the Workshop on Information Systems and Economics (WISE). We have no specific reason to believe that any of these groups of IS researchers have demographics that differ markedly from our AIS Academic member sample. Moreover, we believe that AIS Academic members and all these groups'

---

6 Please recall that the committee considered "Hispanic" to be an ethnic category that only had meaning in Region 1. Hence, we would have coded someone born and raised in Latin America and working anywhere in Region 1 as Hispanic. We would have coded the same individual working anywhere in Region 2 or 3 as Caucasian, and we believe that the individual's colleagues would have likely considered the individual to be Caucasian.

members significantly overlap. To the best of our knowledge, our sample of 3,210 AIS Academics constitutes the largest sample of IS researchers.

3.7   Comments from Editors in Chief

We shared our data and a draft of this report with our preliminary findings with the editors in chief of the journals in the Basket of Eight and asked them for comments and suggestions. Most noted that they select editorial board members on the basis of prior contributions to the journal (in terms of submissions and reviewing) and their fit with the journal's strategy and domain. Most indicated a continuing strong commitment to diversity and inclusion in their editorial board, and most indicated that they sought submissions from all scholars to meet their ambitious publication objectives. Several pointed out limitations in our analysis, which we either incorporated into our revision or note in this paper as limitations.

4   Recommendations

Since AIS represents itself to be the premier global association of IS scholars, the College of Senior Scholars' Basket of Eight journals should reflect that global ethos. We expect that all journals in the Basket should seek to publish research from the broad community of IS scholars across all regions and to offer fair treatment to every submission regardless of the journal's size, particular strategic positioning, or niche. We also expect that, over time, AIS's membership will gradually shift to resemble the global population. If ignored, any imbalance in gender, region, or ethnicity will likely worsen over time.

Therefore, we make several recommendations for the College of Senior Scholars, for the editors of the journals in the Basket of Eight, and for AIS as well as other organizations of IS scholars. Most of our recommendations address ways in which we can make the service ladder that takes researchers from a reviewer to an EIC more diverse and inclusive at each rung. We believe that all the EICs would like to have a much larger pool of great reviewers from which to choose.

4.1   Recommendations for the College of Senior Scholars

- Offer online implicit bias training for EICs and senior editors (SEs) of the Basket of Eight journals at times that will accommodate editors in all three regions. Ensure that all gatekeepers know how to be encouraging and inclusive.

- Offer online diversity and inclusion coaching for journal EICs and SEs at times that will accommodate editors in all three regions.

- Ask the EICs of Basket of Eight journals to report annually to the chair of the review committee on their efforts to increase board diversity and inclusion (i.e., what measures they have taken, how well have they worked).

- Repeat the analysis in this report in the first quarter in 2021 and 2022. Keep the same review committee for those two reviews. By 2022, the review committee should be able to identify diversity and inclusion goals for the Basket of Eight journals.

- Set diversity thresholds for the Senior Scholars' Basket of Eight journals as a whole. Ask EICs to work together to collectively achieve them.

- Follow the Diversity and Inclusion task force's recommendations for colleges[7].

4.2   Recommendations for the EICs of the Basket of Eight Journals

- Develop virtual mentoring programs for SE/AEs from underrepresented groups (boot camps, coaching, feedback opportunities). Include online options that do not require participants to spend time and money traveling and/or attending conferences.

- Host reviewer and AE development workshops as webinars. *MISQ* and other journals have conducted such workshops as face-to-face events, but that limits who can attend. Readers can

---

[7] See https://cdn.ymaws.com/aisnet.org/resource/resmgr/insider/AISCommunityReport_final.pdf

refer to documents describing *MISQ*'s reviewer-development workshop for ideas about how to structure such workshops[8].

- Offer one-on-one reviewer and associate editor "tryouts" with editorial board members willing to act as mentors, especially for scholars from medium or low human development countries, from which travel to conferences can be prohibitively expensive.

- Provide regular substantive feedback to new AEs and SEs to build their confidence in their abilities and their value to the journal.

- Identify and provide appropriate developmental opportunities to high-performing AEs and SEs in underrepresented groups.

- Ask individuals who lead all AIS special interest groups (SIGs) and chapters to identify reviewer candidates.

- Create recruiting mechanisms for reviewer candidates who do not have mentors, especially from diverse communities.

- Encourage SEs to participate in the PhD Project ISDSA to become acquainted with underrepresented faculty (one can reach the ISDSA leadership at @IsdsaPhd on Twitter).

- Partner with the AIS Women's Network to offer reviewer, AE, and SE training designed for female scholars.

- Solicit demographic data (along with research domain data) from candidate reviewers or candidate editorial board members to help create an inclusive review process.

- Set diversity and inclusion key performance indicators (KPIs) for SEs and AEs and measure outcomes. Share these metrics among board members. Use the results when making AE or SE decisions.

- State clearly on journal websites that you seek submissions from all regions, all ethnicities, and all genders and that you commit to fairly treating all submissions. Ensure your journal does not implicitly or explicitly exhibit bias for or against research conducted in any country or region.

- Report gender, region, and ethnicity statistics in public listings of your boards to illustrate inclusivity. Work with publishers as necessary.

- Designate someone on your editorial board to focus on inclusion of diverse editors or editor candidates.

- Solicit feedback on diversity and inclusion from board members.

4.3   Recommendations for AIS and Other Organizations of IS Scholars

- Offer reviewer qualification and certification to researchers who lack mentors.

- Curate a public repository of reviewer and author resources.

- Create additional mentoring programs for scholars in underrepresented groups who aspire to review for top journals.

- Customize your review systems (e.g., Scholar One, PCS) to request demographic data from submitters and reviewers for the explicit purpose of assessing progress on your diversity and inclusion goals.

- Set diversity targets and introduce new diversity programs for the association. Collect gender, ethnicity, and region data from members for the explicit purpose of assessing progress on your diversity and inclusion goals.

---

[8] For example, see https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57d860b2ff7c5058ba601cb7/t/5d9964393b8a443ed0f00f3e/15703337535 27/2019_MISQ_ICIS_Workshop.pdf

References

American Psychological Association. (2019). *Racial and ethnic identity*. Retrieved from https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/bias-free-language/racial-ethnic-minorities

Association for Information Systems. (n.d.). *Diversity and inclusion*. Retrieved from https://aisnet.org/general/custom.asp?page=DiversityInclusion

Canadian Institutes of Health Research. (2020). *What is gender? What is sex?* Retrieved from https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48642.html

Appendix: The AIS Diversity and Inclusion Statement

In July, 2018, the AIS Council voted to adopt a diversity and inclusion statement that AIS's standing committee on diversity and inclusion had proposed.

In part, it states:

> *The open exchange of ideas and the freedom of thought and expression are central to the aims and goals of the AIS community. These require an environment that recognizes the inherent worth of every person and a group that fosters dignity, understanding, mutual respect, and that embraces diversity. The AIS community is committed to enabling and promoting all AIS members' full participation in the activities, groups, and decision-making of the AIS without distinction and/or discrimination on the basis of individual or group differences.* (Association for Information Systems, n.d.)

The statement pertains mainly to participation in AIS offerings, which includes conferences and other means of member engagement. It defines diversity and inclusion as follows:

> **Diversity** *means all the individual or group differences that characterize current and future membership of the Association for Information Systems (AIS) community. These include, but are not limited to, differences in career or employment status, academic rank, geographic location, age, biological sex, citizenship, disability, ethnicity, gender identity or expression, language, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, skin color, and socioeconomic status.*

> **Inclusion** *means that all AIS members can be involved and participate in any and all AIS activities and groups, depending on their interests and wishes. All AIS members will have their voices heard and valued and have fair and reasonable opportunities to influence AIS policies and decision-making.* (Association for Information Systems, n.d.)

About the Authors

Cynthia M. Beath is a Professor Emerita of Information Systems at the McCombs School of Business at UT Austin and an AIS Fellow. She received her MBA and PhD degrees from UCLA. Before embarking on her academic career, Cynthia worked in private industry in information systems development and consulting positions. She recently published *Designed for Digital*, a book about how organizations redesign themselves for the digital era, with colleagues at the Center for Information Systems Research (CISR) at MIT. Her research has been published in the leading information systems research journals, and she has served as senior editor for the top academic journals in her field. An active advocate for her professional community, she initiated the field's first junior faculty consortium, served as chair of a division of the Academy of Management, held a number of positions on the Council of the AIS, and helped found *MISQ Executive*.

Yolande Chan is Associate Dean (Research and PhD-MSc Programs) and E. Marie Shantz Professor of IT Management at Queen's University in Canada. She holds a Ph.D. in Business Administration from Western University, an M.Phil. in Management Studies from Oxford University, and S.M. and S.B. degrees in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from MIT. She is a Rhodes Scholar. Yolande studies IT strategy, knowledge strategy, digital innovation, and digital entrepreneurship, and publishes in leading journals such as *MIS Quarterly, Information Systems Research, Information Systems Journal, Journal of the AIS, Journal of Information Technology, Journal of Management Information Systems,* and *Journal of Strategic Information Systems.* Yolande has served on boards of journals such as *Information Systems Journal*, as an associate editor for journals such as *MIS Quarterly*, and as senior editor for *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* and *MISQ Executive*. Yolande is a Fellow of the Association for Information Systems.

Robert M. Davison is a Professor of Information Systems at the City University of Hong Kong. His research focuses on the use and misuse of information systems, with respect to problem solving, guanxi formation and knowledge management, in Chinese organisations. He has published over 200 articles in a wide variety of our premier journals and conferences. He is particularly known for his scholarship in the domain of action research. Robert currently chairs the IFIP's WG 9.4 (Social Implications of Computing in Developing Countries) and is the Editor-in-Chief of both the *Information Systems Journal* and the *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries.* Robert seeks to enhance the inclusion of scholars from the global south within our community, and frequently visits developing countries where he offers research seminars and workshops, engaging with PhD students and scholars. As a researcher and as an editor, he champions local and indigenous perspectives.

Alan R. Dennis is Professor of Information Systems and holds the John T. Chambers Chair of Internet Systems in the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University. He was named a Fellow of the Association for Information Systems in 2012. Professor Dennis has written more than 150 research papers, and has won numerous awards for his theoretical and applied research. His research focuses on three main themes: team collaboration; fake news on social media; and information security. His research has been reported in the popular press almost 1000 times, including the *Wall Street Journal*, *Forbes, USA Today*, *The Atlantic*, CBS, Fox Business Network, PBS, Canada's CBC and CTV, UK's *Daily Mail* and the *Telegrap*h, Australia's ABC, France's *Le Figaro*, South Africa's *Sowetan Live*, Chile's *El Mercurio*, *China Daily*, India's *Hindustan Times*, and Indonesia's *Tribune News*. He is the Past President of the Association for Information Systems.

Jan Recker is an AIS Fellow, Alexander-von-Humboldt Fellow, chaired professor of Information Systems and Digital Innovation at the University of Hamburg, and adjunct professor at Queensland University of Technology. His research focuses on systems analysis and design, digital innovation and entrepreneurship, and digital solutions for sustainability challenges.