Editorial Board Memberships: A Report on the Status of the Leading Information Systems Journals

Erastus Karanja
North Carolina Central University, merastus@gmail.com

Alisha D. Malloy
North Carolina Central University, amalloy@nccu.edu

Editorial Board Memberships: A Report on the Status of the Leading Information Systems Journals

Editorial Board Memberships: A Report on the Status of the Leading Information Systems Journals

Erastus Karanja
(*North Carolina Central University*)

Alisha D. Malloy
(*North Carolina Central University*)

ABSTRACT

Research journals play a significant role in the generation, dissemination, and sharing of knowledge in an academic discipline. To a great extent, the editorial board members of these research journals manage and control the generation, dissemination, and sharing of knowledge. They also act as policymakers, gatekeepers, and trendsetters. In their latter roles, editorial board members can influence several factors in a discipline; namely, the research topics, the research methods, the research scope, and whose articles are published. The primary goal of this study is to investigate and report on the status of the editorial boards memberships in a set of 14 leading Information Systems (IS) journals. The study does this along the following three main diversity elements namely titles, gender, academic institution, and the geographical location of the editorial boards' members. The set of 14 journals include the IS basket of 8 journal list.
Of the 14 reviewed journals, 7 are domiciled in the US and 7 in Europe.
Results reveal a lack of common editorial board classification criteria whereby members of the editorial boards were categorized into different groups and referred to using various titles such as senior editors, associate editors, editorial board members, editorial review board members, and board of editors. Also, the results show that, as of June 2020, the 14 IS journals' editorial boards had 1214 instances (988 unique occurrences) of editorial board members who came from 44 unique countries. Of those 988 editorial board members, 253 (26%) were females while 736 (74%) were males. In addition, out of the 988 editorial board members, 48% were from US and Canada, 26% were from Europe, and 26% were from the rest of the world. The results also reveal the schools and faculty with the highest number of editorial board memberships.

Having significant number of editorial board members from US and Europe (74%) fits with what Kubota (2019) called epistemological racism; a practice in which the Western world has an upper hand in determining and controlling knowledge and academic practices.

Given the roles of the editorial boards in the review process and setting the research agenda for a journal, a more diverse editorial board might publish a more diverse research output. Furthermore, a more diverse editorial board is likely to have a repertoire of internal reviewers who speed up and lower the review process costs, which are challenges inherent in a less diverse editorial board.

Keywords: Diversity, editorial board, information systems, gender, social identity theory, homosocial reproduction theory, social information processing theory, decision making theory, content analysis

INTRODUCTION

The Information System (IS) academic discipline has existed for more than 60 years (Davis & Olson, 1985; Karanja & Zaveri, 2012). The discipline is characterized by research journals (Galliers & Meadows, 2003), research topics (Palvia *et al*., 2015; Vessey *et al.,* 2002), research methods (Chen & Hirschheim, 2004), theoretical orientations and paradigms (Gregor, 2006; Larsen & Eargle, 2015), researchers from different related disciplines (Everard, Pierre, & Heck, 2017), professionals and practitioners (Levin, 2020), and academic programs (Sherer, 2020).

The aforementioned characteristics embody some of the diversity variables and elements in the IS discipline (Robey, 1996). Various researchers have investigated these diversity variables and elements and reported their findings through several forums and outlets (Bernroider *et al*., 2015; Karanja, Sharma, & Salama, 2020; Taylor *et al*., 2010).

Research journals are an important embodiment of an academic discipline because they provide the avenues for the generation, dissemination, and sharing of peer reviewed knowledge within and outside the discipline (Abedin *et al*., 2020; Jeyaraj & Zadeh, 2020). A salient characteristic of a research journal is the editorial board whose members serve as policymakers, gatekeepers, trendsetters, and guardians (Metz *et al*., 2016; Willett, 2013). Usually, editorial boards are comprised of one editor-in-chief and other members that assume several titles, such as senior editors, associate editors, editorial board, or review board members.

The members of the editorial boards assist the editor-in-chief by taking on several roles.

The roles include promoting the journal, acting as referees and reviewers for submitted articles, establishing the journals norms, guidelines, culture, policies and

.

values, and determining the strategic and tactical developmental path taken by the journal (Metz *et al*., 2016; Willet, 2013). Through their various roles and services, the editorial boards also act as gatekeepers during the manuscript review process and thus safeguard the quality and credibility of the journals (Braun, 2004).

Although no universal metric for selecting editorial board members exist, there is evidence pointing to the fact that editorial board members are selected based on their academic visibility, prestige, research productivity, and academic experience (Crane, 1967). An ideal editorial board should exhibit diversity commensurate with the discipline to minimize the biases inherent in a monolithic grouping (Payton, Yarger, & Mbarika, 2021). Traditionally, the diversity of the editorial board was conceptualized as gender, academic experience, research productivity, academic institutions, and country of residence of the board members. Those factors have been investigated and reported in other disciplines, such as accounting (Dhanani & Jones, 2017), library and information science (Willett, 2013), management (Metz & Harzing, 2012, 2009), marketing (Pan & Zhang, 2014), communications (Goyanes & Demeter, 2020), mathematical sciences (Topaz & Sen, 2016), psychology (Greenbaum *et al*., 2018; Over, 1981), economics (Wu *et al*., 2020), medicine (Amrein *et al*., 2011), global health (Bhaumik & Jagnoor, 2019), ecology and evolution (Fox *et al*., 2019), and political science (Stegmaier *et al*., 2011). Except for Cabanac (2012) and the several editorial reports, such as the CAIS editorial task force report (Beath *et al*., 2021), there is a dearth of empirical research addressing the issue of editorial board memberships in the Information Systems (IS) discipline (IS will hereafter be used to refer to Information Systems, Management/Computer Information Systems, Information Science, or Information Technology). The primary goal of this exploratory study is to investigate and report on the diversity elements inherent in the editorial boards of 14 major IS journals (see Table 1). In the current study, the diversity characteristics analyzed are titles, gender, academic institution, and country of residence of the members of the editorial boards. The 14 journals chosen for this study include those from the Association for Information Systems (AIS) IS Basket of 8 journal lists.

.

Table 1. Journal Information

Journal Name	Publication History	Publisher	Publisher Location	Frequency	Impact Factor (2019)
Accounting, Management, and Information Technologies/Information and Organization (AM/IO)	1991 - 2000 (AM) 2001 - Present (IO)	Elsevier	Netherlands	Quarterly	3.3 [IO]
Communications of the Association for Information Systems (CAIS)	1999 - Present	Association for IS	United States	Semiannual	1.8
Decision Support Systems (DSS)	1985 - Present	Elsevier	Netherlands	Monthly	6.7
European Journal of Information Systems (EJIS)*	1991 - Present	Taylor & Francis Group	United Kingdom	Bimonthly	2.6
Information and Management (I&M)	1977 - Present	Elsevier	Netherlands	Bimonthly	7.9
Information Systems Journal (ISJ)*	1991 - Present	Wiley-Blackwell	United States	Bimonthly	4.2
Information Systems Research (ISR)*	1990 - Present	INFORMS	United States	Quarterly	3.6
International Journal of Information Management (IJIM)	1981 - Present	Elsevier Ltd.	United Kingdom	Bimonthly	11.5
Journal of Information Systems (JIS)	1991 - Present	American Accounting Association	United States	Spring, Summer, and Fall	3.2
Journal of Information Technology (JIT)*	1986 - Present	Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.	United Kingdom	Quarterly	5.1
Journal of Management IS (JMIS)*	1984 - Present	M.E. Sharpe Inc.	United States	Quarterly	3.9
Journal of Strategic Information Systems (JSIS)*	1991 - Present	Elsevier	Netherlands	Quarterly	6.7
Journal of the Association for IS (JAIS)*	2000 - Present	Association for IS	United States	Bimonthly	2.9
MIS Quarterly (MISQ)*	1977 - Present	Management IS Research Center	United States	Quarterly	5.47

The Association for Information Systems (AIS) is the "premier professional association for individuals and organizations who lead the research, teaching, practice, and the study of information systems worldwide" (AIS, 2020). Table 1 provides information for the 14 IS journals used for this study, which includes the journal name, publication history, publisher, publisher location, frequency of publications, and journal impact factor for 2019.

This study makes several meaningful contributions. The current study is among the few that have addressed the status of editorial board membership in the IS discipline. The results can guide research policies by providing journal-based indicators of diversity, such as gender, academic institutions, and countries in the IS research community. The study also sheds more light on the roles played by the various stakeholders in the creation and dissemination of knowledge through their participation in the editorial boards. Editorial board membership is a significant factor in the tenure and promotions decision making process serving as a proxy of influence in the academic community. Moreover, the study provides results that can be used by the respective journals and/or other journals to evaluate their diversity metrics vis-a-vis formulating remedial strategies where applicable.

The results can also be used to assess whether the past recommendations on how to address the gender imbalances in the academic community are bearing any fruit or not. For instance, the persistent gender imbalance and underrepresentation of females in the academic field may stifle females' ability to attain academic recognitions and advancement and carries the risk of narrowing the academic discourse in the IS field. The study also replicates and extends the work of CAIS task force (Beath *et al*., 2021).

Replication studies are important because they confirm, reinforce, extend, and provide reliability to the paradigms and knowledge in the discipline as well as offer reliability of the results upon which scientific progress is premised (Compeau *et al*., 2012).

The structure of the rest of the paper is as follows. The next section contains a brief review on diversity in the IS field, followed by the research methodology, a data analysis, and the research results.

This paper concludes with a discussion on the limitations of this study and recommendations for future studies.)

BACKGROUND ON DIVERSITY IN THE IS DISCIPLINE

Several IS researchers have advocated for diversity in the IS discipline (Galliers & Land, 1987; Landry & Banville, 1992; Robey, 1996). Extant research reveals that diversity is a multifaceted concept which can be conceptualized and measured under several factors (Yadav & Lenka, 2020). Several prior studies have focused on some of the salient diversity factors in the IS discipline. Some of those studies concentrated on research problems, theoretical foundations, reference disciplines, and the research methods (Benbasat & Weber, 1986; Keller & Coulthard, 2013). Others have sought to study diversity through several factors, such as research topics, units of analysis, names of authors, gender of authors, schools of authors, countries of authors, and sources of data among others (Galliers & Meadows, 2003; Karanja, Sharma & Salama, 2020).

For example, Galliers & Meadows (2003) analyzed the major journals in the US and compared their research output to those in Europe. The results revealed that most of the US domiciled journals were edited by US based editors and that these US domiciled journals tended to publish research from authors working in US institutions.

That phenomenon was also observed in the European domiciled journals reiterating the lack of diversity, at least in the editorship and authorship in the IS research.

Several arguments have been fronted while making the case for diversity in the IS discipline. For instance, on the research front, proponents of diversity have advocated for a diverse research environment by arguing that it expands the foundations on which IS claims are based and thus lends more credibility to the research findings (Mingers, 2001). Researchers who come from diverse academic and industry backgrounds and use diverse theoretical foundations while studying IS phenomenon are important to the IS diversity debate.

The use of different theoretical lenses has the potential to yield diverse viewpoints and insights (Hardaway *et al*., 2016).

.

Others contend that understanding the state of diversity in the IS discipline presents opportunities that can be exploited to nurture, promote, and eventually create a more diverse discipline (Galliers & Meadows, 2003).

The current study builds on and extrapolates the prior diversity studies in the IS field through an evaluation of diversity in the IS journals' editorial boards.

In investigating the strategies that may lead to a more diverse IS workforce, researchers have addressed various issues, and except for several editorial reports, the diversity aspects in IS journals' editorial boards remain unexplored. This study seeks to contribute to the diversity debate by investigating and reporting on several aspects of diversity such as titles, gender, academic institutions, and geographical diversification factors of the members of the editorial boards.

Towards that end, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

   i.   *What is the gender distribution in editorial board memberships?*
   ii.   *Which academic institution(s) have the greatest number of editorial board members?*
   iii. *Who are the dominant editorial board members in the leading IS journals?*
   iv.   *Which countries are contributing the highest number of editorial board members?*

RESEARCH VARIABLES

In the current study, the diversity characteristics analyzed are gender, academic institution, and country (geographical) of the members of the editorial boards. Information on the most prolific editorial board members is also available.

Gender Diversity

In this study, the researchers acknowledge that gender is a socially constructed category used to group individuals. In the recent past, we have observed instances where gender is not a binary construct woven into the fabric of the universe, but it does change. This study adopts the traditional male and female gender categorization and acknowledges that this might not represent all the various gender terms and definitions prescribed with some overlapping or shifting across different environments.

Although gender issues in the IS discipline have been debated for quite some time, the discipline continues to experience a widening gender gap with implications for many stakeholders.

.

For instance, although the conclusive data on corporate gender workforce representation is elusive and not readily available to the public, the limited data that is available paints a dire picture in terms of corporate workforce gender diversity, equity, and inclusion. A case in point, in 2017, less than 25% of workers in the computing and mathematical occupations in the US were women (DuBow & Gonzalez, 2020).

Additionally, the most recently available data shows that the predominant employee demographic at the top technology companies in the Silicon Valley: namely, Google, LinkedIn, Yahoo, Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, eBay, and Apple was male with females accounting for less than 30% of the workforce (Fortune, 2015; Lev-Ram, 2015). That underrepresentation of women is daunting, given the fact that females have traditionally played important roles in the IS field.

For example, females worked as programmers and were instrumental in the development of the first electronic computer, the ENIAC (Light, 1999).

There is also other documented clear distinctions and demarcation between gender roles in the various parts of the globe. The roles are usually under the sociological and social-psychological conceptions of masculinity and femininity.

For instance, in the Western world, females are expected, supported, and encouraged to seek education and pursue leadership positions in society—feats vilified in some parts of the world. In fact, due to their culture, religious beliefs, or economic factors, some societies discourage female education as well as participation in the workforce and may even create a hostile working environment for women. The phenomenon of an imaginary glass ceiling that restricts the rise of women in upper levels of management is globally recognized. Several researchers have investigated and reported on the issue of disproportionately fewer women in the upper levels of corporate boards' membership (Dickersin *et al*., 1998; Mauleón *et al*., 2012).

Moreover, some studies have shown that there is a virtual maximum percentage of women among authors and that the value declines for first authors, editorial boards, and editors-in-chief (McSweeney *et al*., 2000; Porter *et al*., 2003).

To minimize those gender gaps, the IS discipline should attract and retain more females. One strategy that can potentially raise the number of females in academia is having role models and mentors who exhibit similar traits and with whom students can identify and relate with (NCWIT, 2019). However, this initiative has been hampered by sparse number of female faculty in the IS computing field. In line with that reasoning, the researchers sought to investigate one specific aspect of gender diversity, namely, the gender representation in the editorial boards of the leading IS journals.

.

Academic Institution and Country (Geographical) Diversity

Information Systems (IS) have significantly contributed to the flattening of the world—a process that has transformed the world into a global village. As a result of this transformation, there are many players in the IS arena who can now seamlessly interact without the previous limitations imposed by geographical distances. In a global village, there is a wider (academic) audience that contributes to and has access to the IS Journals and the knowledge therein. In the IS journals' editorial board membership, geographical diversification represents the academic institutions and countries of the editorial board members. Geographical diversification of the editorial board members can influence the diversity of the submitted, reviewed, and published research papers. Editorial board members are usually leading researchers in their respective academic disciplines who are also recognized for their contributions and influence on the scientific community. Thus, the presence and distribution of editorial board members in the research journals may provide a signal indicative of a country's international scientific visibility (García-Carpintero, Granadino, & Plaza, 2010).

On the global stage, research output plays a significant role whereby Universities and Colleges are classified under several tiers, e.g., R1 or R2 (Carnegie Classification) based on their research productivity. Editorial board members are usually a sought-after resource during national and international conferences where they host panel discussions—a service that bestows prestige and places their respective institutions on the national and global stage. Editorial board membership is a significant accomplishment, which is celebrated in many academic circles.

In addition, editorial board membership is associated with research productivity, a significant factor in the sought-after global academic institution rankings.

For the last 35 years, the US News and World Report (2020) has been issuing a ranking of the best universities and colleges in the world. The US News and World Report rankings are highly regarded and serve a wide audience ranging from prospective students and college administrators to faculty and government entities because they act as a proxy for the quality of education, graduation rates, or research programs.

There are other school ranking publications in the world, such as BusinessWeek, Fortune, and Financial Times, but the ranking criteria from the US News and World Report is adopted for this study due to its ease of access, usability, and interpretation as well as wider and prior application in academia (Alsmadi *et al*., 2020; Bowman & Bastedo, 2009). Although the ranking includes specific disciplines, such as computer science and economics, the US News and World Report does not have any for IS programs globally.

.

The authors used the global Economics and Business ranking (US News and World Report, 2020), which is closely aligned with information systems. Overall, most of the academic institutions and universities in the table have exceptionally good business academic disciplines with higher global rankings and are considered to have some of the best IS programs.

RESEARCH METHOD AND DATA COLLECTION

The current study is based on content analysis of data from the editorial boards of 14 IS journals. To ensure the relevancy and currency of the data, the researchers relied on the information published between March to June 2020 on the various journals' websites. The Association for Information Systems (AIS) is the "premier professional association for individuals and organizations who lead the research, teaching, practice, and the study of IS worldwide" (AIS, 2020).

One of the AIS's group, The College of Senior Scholars, consists of senior IS academics who have previously served as presidents of the AIS, AIS fellows, editors-in-chief, or programs and conference chairs of the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS). Globally, ICIS is considered the most prestigious annual gathering of IS academics and research-oriented practitioners in the world. The College of Senior Scholars generated a list of eight journals known as the *Basket of 8* and advised Deans and Department Chairs to treat those eight (8) journals as the premier IS journals in the IS field during tenure and promotion decisions. The current study expanded on that list by including six (6) other major IS journals that have wider international readership and contributions. Those six (6) journals also acknowledge topical, methodological, and geographical diversity, and adhere to a stringent review process, which is conducted by highly recognized and respected editorial board members.

Although the list of fourteen (14) journals comprises some of the main repositories for IS research (Stewart *et al*., 2017), the list is not a random sample and may not reflect the full spectrum of all published research in the IS discipline (many other high-quality journals are left out of scope e.g. the Chinese, French and Spanish language IS journals). However, those 14 journals are research oriented, publish a high number of IS research articles, cover a wide spectrum of research topics in the IS field, and are all anchored by well-established research and publication policies. Additionally, these journals were selected because they were ranked among the top in IS research by various researchers, such as Hardgrave and Walstrom (1997), Lowry *et al*. (2004), Rainer and Miller (2005), Walstrom *et al*. (1995), and thus reflect mainstream topics, research methods, and editorial policies adopted in the IS discipline.

.

Furthermore, the inherent characteristics and practices embodied by the sampled journals are likely to be adopted by other journals in the IS discipline.

Based on the journal's publisher location, the list of the 14 journals that were selected for this study were further grouped into two regions as shown in Table 2. One group includes journals domiciled in Europe (EUR) while the second group includes journals domiciled in the United States (US).

Table 2. The List of Journals

#	Europe (EUR)	#	United States (US)
1	Accounting, Management, and Information Technologies/Information and Organization (AM/IO)	1	Communications of the Association for Information Systems (CAIS)
2	Decision Support Systems (DSS)	2	Information Systems Journal (ISJ)*
3	European Journal of Information Systems (EJIS)*	3	Information Systems Research (ISR)*
4	International Journal of Information Management (IJIM)	4	Journal of the Association for IS (JAIS)*
5	Information and Management (I&M)	5	Journal of Management IS (JMIS)*
6	Journal of Information Technology (JIT)*	6	Journal of Information Systems (JIS)
7	Journal of Strategic Information Systems (JSIS)*	7	MIS Quarterly (MISQ)*
* Indicates the Basket of eight (8) journals			

After identifying the IS journals, data on the editorial boards of those journals was extracted and saved in MS Excel worksheets. The collected data included the names, editorial board positions, titles, academic institutions, publishers, and country of residence of the members of the editorial boards. After data collection, the researchers proceeded with data analysis as explained below.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Like in the prior study by Mauleón *et al.* (2012), gender identification followed several strategies. To start with, the researchers used traditional gender specific names, such as Suzanne, Dorothy, Alice, or Anna to categorize an editorial board member as female. Likewise, the authors used traditional gender specific names such as Gregory, Andrew, David, or Mohammad to categorize an editorial board member as male. In addition, the pronouns, he or she, found in the descriptions of

.

the editorial board member's biography or writings were used in gender categorization.

For the remaining data set, the researchers used the previously collected data on the editorial board member to visit their academic institution or personal websites looking for a picture or more self-identifying information. Furthermore, the researchers used LinkedIn and Google Scholar pages to look for editorial board member's self-identifying information. Those two latter techniques were particularly important in identifying the gender of most of the editors from Asian nations, such as China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea, and India, where names are not easily gender relatable. For the other variables, namely title, school/university, and country, the data was readily available. Throughout the data collection and analysis process, the researchers applied triangulation techniques to ensure the validity and consistency of the resultant data.

Descriptive Statistics

As shown in Table 3, of those 1214 editorial board members, 326 (27%) were females while 888 (73%) were males. For those journals domiciled in the US, there were 537 editorial board members of which 144 (27%) were females and 393 (73%) were males. Conversely, there were 677 editorial board members from the European domiciled journals of which 182 (27%) were females and 495 (73%) were males.

.

Table 3. Summary of IS Journals' Editorial Board Members

Journals by Regions	Female		Male		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	
US	*144*	*27%*	*393*	*73%*	*537*
CAIS	13	25%	40	75%	53
ISJ	36	38%	59	62%	95
ISR	13	19%	54	81%	67
JAIS	33	32%	71	68%	104
JIS	20	25%	60	75%	80
JMIS	11	16%	57	84%	68
MISQ	18	26%	52	74%	70
EUR	*182*	*27%*	*495*	*73%*	*677*
AM/IO	26	37%	45	63%	71
DSS	29	19%	121	81%	150
EJIS	12	24%	37	76%	49
I&M	30	21%	113	79%	143
IJIM	45	28%	117	72%	162
JIT	18	41%	26	59%	44
JSIS	22	38%	36	62%	58
Grand Total	*326*	*27%*	*888*	*73%*	*1214*

Titles Designating Editorial Board Members

Two cannot walk together less they agree (Amos 3:3). The IS journals' list seems to differ in several ways in the titles and numbers for the members of the editorial boards. The members of the editorial boards adopted various titles that included Editor, Editor in Chief, Senior Editor, Editorial Board, Advisory Board, Associate Editor, among others. Table 4 shows the variations in titles used in the various journals to designate the members of the editorial boards. Overall, there were more males than females in the editorial board membership (73% vs 27%). The most diverse group was Editorial Advisory board (36% females and 64% males) while the least diverse group was Board of Editors (16% females and 84% males). Conversely, females dominated in only one category, namely Managing Editor (88% females and 12% males).

.

Table 4. Combined Numeric Values and Titles of the Members of the Editorial Boards

Titles	US					EUR					OVERALL				Total
	Female		Male		All	Female		Male		All	Female		Male		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%	#
Editor	3	23%	10	77%	13	-	0%	3	100%	3	3	**19%**	13	**81%**	16
Editor In Chief	1	14%	6	86%	7	2	25%	6	75%	8	3	**20%**	12	**80%**	15
Senior Editor	22	22%	78	78%	100	34	31%	76	69%	110	56	**27%**	154	**73%**	210
Editorial Board	16	26%	46	74%	62	54	36%	97	64%	151	70	**33%**	143	**67%**	213
Advisory Board	1	14%	6	86%	7	6	20%	24	80%	30	7	**19%**	30	**81%**	37
Associate Editor	50	27%	137	73%	187	43	20%	176	80%	219	93	**23%**	313	77%	406
Board of Editors	11	16%	56	84%	67	-	0%	-	0%	-	11	**16%**	56	**84%**	67
Editorial Advisory Board	14	45%	17	55%	31	19	32%	41	68%	60	33	**36%**	58	**64%**	91
Editorial Review Board	19	34%	37	66%	56	24	25%	71	75%	95	43	**28%**	108	**72%**	151
Managing Editor	7	100%	-	0%	7	-	0%	1	100%	1	7	**88%**	1	**12%**	8
Grand Total	144	**27%**	393	**73%**	537	182	**27%**	495	**73%**	677	326	**27%**	888	73%	1214

Specific Journal Editorial Board Memberships by Gender and Regions

Table 5 (US) and Table 6 (EUR) provide a more specific representation of the editorial board memberships in each of the 14 IS journals, categorized under each specific journal. In the US domiciled journals, the most diverse journal was ISJ (62% males and 38% females) while the least diverse journal was JMIS (84% males and 16% females). As shown in Table 6, among the EUR domiciled journals, JIT was the most diverse journal (59% males and 41% females), and the least diverse journal was DSS (81% males and 19% females).

.

Table 5: The Titles and Numeric Values of the Members of the Editorial Review Boards of the US Based IS Journals

Titles	US CAIS F	CAIS M	CAIS All	ISJ F	ISJ M	ISJ All	ISR F	ISR M	ISR All	JAIS F	JAIS M	JAIS All	JIS F	JIS M	JIS All	JMIS F	JMIS M	JMIS All	MISQ F	MISQ M	MISQ All	Overall
Editor													3	10	13							13
Editor-In-Chief		1	1		1	1		1	1	1		1		1	1		1	1		1	1	7
Senior Editor				8	14	22	5	21	26	2	18	20		2	2				7	23	30	100
Editorial Board													16	46	62							62
Advisory Board	1	6	7		11	11																18
Associate Editor	12	33	45	14	27	41	8	32	40	5	16	21		1	1				11	28	39	187
Board of Editors				14	17	31										11	56	67				98
Editorial Advisory Board																						0
Editorial Review Board										19	37	56										56
Managing Editor							6		6				1		1							7
Totals per journal	13	40	53	36	59	95	13	54	67	33	71	104	20	60	80	11	57	68	18	52	70	537
% per journal	25%	75%		38%	62%		19%	81%		32%	68%		25%	75%		16%	84%		26%	74%		

F=Female, M=Male ···· CAIS=Communications of the Association for Information Systems, ISJ=Information Systems Journal,
ISR=Information Systems Research, JAIS=Journal of the Association for Information Systems,
JMIS=Journal of Management Information Systems, JIS= Journal of Information Systems, *MISQ=Management Information Systems Quarterly*

Table 6: The Titles and Numeric Values of the Members of the Editorial Review Boards of the Europe Based IS Journals

	EUR AM/IO F	AM/IO M	AM/IO All	DSS F	DSS M	DSS All	EJIS F	EJIS M	EJIS All	I&M F	I&M M	I&M All	IJIM F	IJIM M	IJIM All	JIT F	JIT M	JIT All	JSIS F	JSIS M	JSIS All	Overall
Editor					1	1		1	1					1	1							3
Editor-In-Chief	1	1	2					1	1		1	1				1	2	3		1	1	8
Senior Editor	7	16	23	14	40	54	3	4	7		1	1				7	13	20	3	2	5	110
Editorial Board	10	12	22							15	41	56				10	11	21	19	33	52	151
Advisory Board	6	13	19		11	11																30
Associate Editor	2	2	4	15	69	84	9	31	40	15	70	85	2	4	6							219
Editorial Advisory Board													19	41	60							60
Editorial Review Board													24	71	95							95
Managing Editor		1	1																			1
Grand Total	26	45	71	29	121	150	12	37	49	30	113	143	45	117	162	18	26	44	22	36	58	677
%	37%	63%		19%	81%		24%	76%		21%	79%		28%	72%		41%	59%		38%	62%		

F=Female, M=Male ···· AM/IO=Accounting, Management, and Information Technologies/Information and Organization,
DSS=Decision Support Systems, EJIS=*European Journal of Information Systems,*
IJIM=International Journal of Information Management, I&M= Information and Management, JIT= Journal of Information

IS Editor/Editor in Chief Editorial Board Memberships by Gender and Regions

The editor or editor-in-chief position is the topmost role in an academic journal. As such, they are usually listed first and are the journal's contact point to the academic community. However, there is no set rule as to the number of editor/editors-in-chief in a journal. The majority of the reviewed journals had one editor/editor-in-chief. Similar to the masculinity and femininity aspects of society that dictate gender roles, the norms and practices of research journals may be influenced by the geographical location of the academic institution affiliated with the editor/editor-in-chiefs. Thus, the researchers sought to investigate the geographical location of the academic institution affiliated with the editor/editor-in-chiefs. Most of the journals included explicit information identifying the academic institutions affiliated with the editor/editor-in-chiefs and that data was triangulated to generate the names of the countries.

When data was unavailable, the name of the academic institution was used to generate the name of the country through a Google search.

Table 7 shows the breakdown of the Editor/Editor-in-chief in each journal by gender, region, country, and affiliated academic institution. Out of the 14 journals, there were 31 instances of editor/editor-in-chiefs (some individuals served multiple roles in several journals) but only 17 unique individuals.

Of these 17 editors/editor-in-chiefs, 14 (82%) were males and three (18%) were females (shaded entries). One female was from the US domiciled journal (JAIS) and two females were from EUR domiciled journals (AM/IO and JIT).

The Editor/Editor-in-chiefs from the US domiciled journals came from US based academic institutions-except ISJ and IJIM who are from Hong Kong and UK respectively.

The editor or editor-in-chief position is the topmost role in an academic journal. As such, they are usually listed first and are the journal's contact point to the academic community. However, there is no set rule as to the number of editor/editors-in-chief in a journal. The majority of the reviewed journals had one editor/editor-in-chief. Similar to the masculinity and femininity aspects of society that dictate gender roles, the norms and practices of research journals may be influenced by the geographical location of the academic institution affiliated with the editor/editor-in-chiefs. Thus, the researchers sought to investigate the geographical location of the academic institution affiliated with the editor/editor-in-chiefs.

Most of the journals included explicit information identifying the academic institutions affiliated with the editor/editor-in-chiefs and that data was triangulated to generate the names of the countries.

.

When data was unavailable, the name of the academic institution was used to generate the name of the country through a Google search.

Table 7 shows the breakdown of the Editor/Editor-in-chief in each journal by gender, region, country, and affiliated academic institution. Out of the 14 journals, there were 31 instances of editor/editor-in-chiefs (some individuals served multiple roles in several journals) but only 17 unique individuals. Of these 17 editors/editor-in-chiefs, 14 (82%) were males and three (18%) were females (shaded entries).

One female was from the US domiciled journal (JAIS) and two females were from EUR domiciled journals (AM/IO and JIT). The Editor/Editor-in-chiefs from the US domiciled journals came from US based academic institutions-except ISJ and IJIM who are from Hong Kong and UK respectively.

Table 5. Names of Editors/Editors-in-Chief by Country, Region, & Academic Institution in Each of the Reviewed IS Journal

#	Editors/Editors-in-Chief Country	Journal	Journal Region	Editor Names	Gender	Editor Academic institution
1	United States	CAIS	US	Fred Niederman	Male	Saint Louis University
2	United States	ISR	US	Alok Gupta	Male	University of Minnesota
3	United States	MISQ	US	Arun Rai	Male	Georgia State University
4	United States	JIS	US	Alexander Kogan	Male	Rutgers University
5	United States	JAIS	US	Dorothy E. Leidner	Female	Baylor University
6	United States	JMIS	US	Vladimir Zwass	Male	Fairleigh Dickinson University
7	United States	AM/IO	EUR	Elizabeth Davidson	Female	University of Hawaii at Manoa
8	United States	DSS	EUR	James R. Marsden	Male	University of Connecticut
1	United Kingdom	AM/IO	EUR	Michael Barrett	Male	University of Cambridge-JBS
2	United Kingdom	IJIM	US	Yogesh Dwivedi	Male	Swansea University
3	United Kingdom	JIT	EUR	Chris Saue	Male	University of Oxford
4	United Kingdom	JIT	EUR	Leslie P. Willcocks	Female	London School of Econ. & PS
1	Australia	JIT	EUR	Daniel Schlagwein	Male	University of Sydney
2	Australia	JSIS	EUR	Guy Gable	Male	Queensland Univer. of Tech.
1	Hong Kong	ISJ	US	Robert M. Davison	Male	City University of Hong Kong
1	Sweden	EJIS	EUR	Pär Ågerfalk	Male	Uppsala University
1	China	I&M	EUR	Patrick Chau	Male	University of Nottingham-China

.

As shown in Table 7, the 7 EUR domiciled journals had a diverse set of Editor/Editor-in-chiefs who came from academic institutions in six geographical regions; namely, the US, Australia, China, Hong Kong, Sweden, and the UK. Table 8 provides a more specific breakdown of the roles and affiliations of those Editors/Editors-in-chiefs.

Table 8: Editors/Editors-in-Chief by Country and Academic institution in Each of the Reviewed IS Journal

Editor/Editor-in-chief Countries and Academic institutions	US Female		US Male							US Tot	EUR Female			EUR Male								EUR Tot	Grand Total
	JAIS	All	CAIS	ISJ	ISR	JIS	JMIS	MISQ	All		AIO	JIT	All	AIO	DSS	EJIS	IJIM	I&M	JIT	JSIS	All		
US	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	5	6	1		1		1						1	2	8
Baylor University	x	x								x													
Fairleigh Dickinson University							x		x	x													
Georgia State University								x	x	x													
Rutgers University						x			x	x													
Saint Louis University			x						x	x													
University of Hawaii at Manoa											x		x									1	x
University of Connecticut															x						x		x
University of Minnesota					x				x	x													x
UK												1	1	1			1		1		3	4	4
London School of Economics												x	x									x	x
Swansea University																x					x	x	x
University of Cambridge														x							x	x	x
University of Oxford																			1		x	x	x
Australia																		1	1	2	2	2
Queensland Univer. of Technology																				x	x	x
The University of Sydney																		x		x	x	x
China																	1			1	1	1
University of Nottingham															x					x	x	x
Hong Kong				1					1	1													
City University of Hong Kong				x					x	x													
Sweden																1				1	1	1
Uppsala University															x					x	x	x
Grand Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	8	10	17

Does the Home Country (Where the Journal is Domiciled) Have a Relationship with Where the Editorial Board Members Come from?

The 988 editorial board members came from 44 unique countries as shown in Table 9. The US had the highest number of editorial board members at 515 (42.4%) followed by the UK at 119 (9.8%) while Australia was third at 81 (6.7%). Out of the 44 countries, 26 (59%) had less than 1% representation.

Table 6. Academic Institution and Numerical Values of the Editorial Board Members With Gender Representations

	Home Countries	Female		Male		Total			Home Countries	Female		Male		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	US	125	24%	390	76%	515	42.4%	23	South Africa	4	57%	3	43%	7	0.6%
2	UK	52	44%	67	56%	119	9.8%	24	Greece	6	86%	1	14%	7	0.6%
3	Australia	27	33%	54	67%	81	6.7%	25	Brazil	3	50%	3	50%	6	0.5%
4	China	14	30%	33	70%	47	3.9%	26	Belgium	-	0%	5	100%	5	0.4%
5	Canada	16	38%	26	62%	42	3.5%	27	Austria	1	20%	4	80%	5	0.4%
6	Hong Kong	6	16%	31	84%	37	3.0%	28	Ireland	-	0%	4	100%	4	0.3%
7	Germany	3	8%	33	92%	36	3.0%	29	Japan	-	0%	4	100%	4	0.3%
8	New Zealand	6	21%	23	79%	29	2.4%	30	UAE	1	50%	1	50%	2	0.2%
9	India	4	14%	25	86%	29	2.4%	31	Malaysia	-	0%	2	100%	2	0.2%
10	Denmark	8	30%	19	70%	27	2.2%	32	Egypt	1	50%	1	50%	2	0.2%
11	France	5	19%	21	81%	26	2.1%	33	Lebanon	-	0%	2	100%	2	0.2%
12	Taiwan	6	25%	18	75%	24	2.0%	34	Portugal	-	0%	2	100%	2	0.2%
13	Singapore	7	29%	17	71%	24	2.0%	35	Jordan	1	50%	1	50%	2	0.2%
14	Sweden	5	23%	17	77%	22	1.8%	36	Saudi Arabia	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
15	Finland	5	29%	12	71%	17	1.4%	37	Mauritius	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
16	Norway	3	18%	14	82%	17	1.4%	38	Hungary	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
17	Spain	2	13%	14	88%	16	1.3%	39	Fiji	1	100%	-	0%	1	0.1%
18	Netherlands	3	25%	9	75%	12	1.0%	40	Qatar	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
19	South Korea	1	11%	8	89%	9	0.7%	41	China	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
20	Israel	3	33%	6	67%	9	0.7%	42	Mexico	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
21	Switzerland	1	11%	8	89%	9	0.7%	43	Oman	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%
22	Italy	6	75%	2	25%	8	0.7%	44	Poland	-	0%	1	100%	1	0.1%

The 988 Editorial board members came from 44 countries

As mentioned earlier, of the reviewed journals, seven (7) are domiciled in US and seven (7) in Europe. To evaluate whether there is a relationship between the home country of the journals and the home country of the editorial board members, the 44 unique countries were categorized into six (6) main groups. US and Canada were grouped together under North America (NAM).

Countries in Europe, such as the UK, Sweden, Norway, Spain, etc. were grouped under European Union (EU) while countries such as South Africa, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, etc. were grouped under Middle East and Africa (MEA).

Table 10 shows the country groupings in more detail along with the numerical and percentage values of the editorial board members from each group who are members of a specific journal's editorial board.

Table 7. Regional (Country) Affiliations of the IS Journals' Editorial Board Members

Journals by Region		NAM			EU			ASI			AUS			MEA			SA			Total	# of Countries		
		F	M	All	F	M	All	F	M	All	F	M	All	F	M	All	F	M	All		F	M	All
US	#	82	291	*373*	26	81	*107*	15	53	*68*	11	25	*36*	2	4	*6*	1	1	*2*	592	20	31	32
	%	22	78	*63*	24	76	*18*	22	78	*11*	31	69	*6*	33	67	*1*	50	50	*0.3*	-			
1 JAIS	#	15	41	56	11	16	27	2	10	12	5	3	8	-	1	1	-	-	-	104	10	18	21
	%	27	73	*54*	41	59	*26*	17	83	*12*	63	38	*8*	0	100	*1*	-	-	*0*	-			
2 ISJ	#	10	18	28	12	25	37	3	6	9	8	10	18	3	-	3	-	-	-	95	14	24	26
	%	36	64	*29*	32	68	*39*	33	67	*9*	44	56	*19*	100	0	*3*	-	-	*0*	-			
3 JIS	#	18	45	63	1	7	8	-	1	1	1	5	6	-	1	1	-	1	1	80	5	10	11
	%	29	71	*79*	13	88	*10*	0	100	*1*	17	83	*8*	0	100	*1*	0	100	*1*	-			
4 MISQ	#	10	36	46	3	7	10	3	5	8	1	3	4	1	1	2	-	-	-	70	12	17	19
	%	22	78	*66*	30	70	*14*	38	63	*11*	25	75	*6*	50	50	*3*	--	-	*0*	-			
5 JMIS	#	8	44	52	1	8	9	2	4	6	-	-	-	1		1	-	-	-	68	3	12	13
	%	15	85	*76*	11	89	*13*	33	67	*9*	-	-	*0*	0	100	*1*	-	-	*0*	-			
6 ISR	#	8	40	48	2	4	6	3	9	12		1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	67	5	10	12
	%	17	83	*72*	33	67	*9*	25	75	*18*	0	100	*1*	-	-	*0*	-	-	*0*				
7 CAIS	#	7	15	22	2	14	16	1	5	6	2	6	8	1	-	1	-	-	-	53	6	14	14
	%	32	68	*42*	13	88	*30*	17	83	*11*	25	75	*15*	100	0	*2*	-	-	*0*	-			
EUR	#	59	125	*184*	74	154	*228*	23	86	*109*	23	52	*75*	8	13	*21*	2	3	*5*	622	29	38	41
	%	32	68	*30*	32	68	*37*	21	79	*18*	31	69	*12*	38	62	*3*	40	60	*1*	-			
1 IJIM	#	5	18	23	18	46	64	11	39	50	7	8	15	2	5	7	2	1	3	162	7	15	15
	%	22	78	*14*	28	72	*40*	22	78	*31*	47	53	*9*	29	71	*4*	67	33	*2*	-			
2 DSS	#	16	70	86	6	25	31	4	19	23	2	7	9	-	-	-	1	-	1	150	7	14	17
	%	19	81	*57*	19	81	*21*	17	83	*15*	22	78	*6*	-	-	*0*	100		*0*	1	-		
3 I&M	#	11	38	49	7	24	31	7	33	40	3	13	16	2	3	5	-	2	2	143	7	17	26
	%	22	78	*34*	23	77	*22*	18	83	*28*	19	81	*11*	40	60	*3*	-	100	*1*	-			
4 AIO	#	15	20	35	9	18	27		2	2	2	3	5	-	2	2	-	-	-	71	19	32	36
	%	43	57	*49*	33	67	*38*	0	100	*3*	40	60	*7*	0	100	*3*	-	-	*0*	-			
5 JSIS	#	9	12	21	12	11	23	1	4	5	-	8	8	-	1	1	-	-	-	58	13	18	21
	%	43	57	*36*	52	48	*40*	20	80	*9*	0	100	*14*	0	100	*2*	-	-	*0*	-			
6 EJIS	#	5	13	18	3	18	21	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	2	3	-	-	-	49	6	8	11
	%	28	72	*37*	14	86	*43*	33	67	*6*	50	50	*8*	33	67	*6*	-	-	*0*	-			
7 JIT	#	4	6	10	13	12	25	-	-	-	1	8	9	-	-		-	-		44	10	12	16
	%	40	60	*23*	52	48	*57*	-	-	*0*	11	89	*20*	-	-	*0*	-	-	*0*	-			
Total	#	141	416	557	100	235	335	38	139	177	34	77	111	10	17	27	3	4	7	**1214**	30	43	44
	%	25	75	46	30	70	28	21	79	15	31	69	9	37	63	2	43	57	1	-			

NAM = North America (US, Canada), EU = Europe (UK, Sweden, Norway, etc), ASI = Asia (China, India, Hong Kong etc), AUS = Australia (Australia, New Zealand, Fiji), MEA = Middle East & Africa, (South Africa, Egypt, Israel, etc) SA = South America (Brazil, Mexico, Chile), # of Countries = number of unique countries represented

From Table 10, the intersection of the NAM column and the US row has six (6) values (**82**,22,**291**,78,*373*,*63*), which can be interpreted thus: 82 (22%) represents all the female editorial board members of the US domiciled journals, while 291

(78%) represents the male counterparts. The 373 (63%) shows the total of the 82 females and 291 males from US and Canada (NAM). Thus, there were 592 editorial board members (total column) in the US domiciled journals of which 373 (63%) came from US and Canada. Conversely, the intersection of the EU column and the EUR row has 6 values (**74**,32,**154**,68,*228,37*), which can be interpreted as, 74 (32%) represents all the female editorial board members of the EUR domiciled journals, while 154 (68%) represents the male counterparts. There were 622 editorial board members in the EUR domiciled journals of which 228 (37%) came from the EU group (European countries).

The results from Table 10 indicate that the editorial boards of the US domiciled journals are dominated by members from the same region with the US and Canada at 63%, while 18% come from the EU group (UK, Sweden, Norway, etc.) and 11% come from the ASI group (China, India, Hong Kong, etc.). The editorial board members of the Europe based journals are more diverse whereby 37% come from the EU group (UK, Sweden, Norway, etc.), 30% from the NAM group (US and Canada) group, and 18% from the ASI group (China, India, Hong Kong, etc.).

In Table 10 and under the # of countries column and the US row, the values indicate that, all the female editorial board members in the US domiciled journals came from 20 different countries while the males came from 31 countries and 32 overall. Similarly, under the # of countries column and the EUR row, the values indicate that all the female editorial board members in the EUR domiciled journals came from 29 different countries while males came from 38 countries and 42 overall.

The results indicate that the EUR domiciled journals are more diverse (41 unique countries) than the US domiciled journals (32).

.

ACADEMIC INSTITUTION REPRESNTATION IN THE EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARDS

Which are the Dominant Academic Institutions in the IS Journals' Editorial Board Membership?

In total, the editorial board members in the reviewed IS journals came from 494 academic institutions (some editors were associated with more than one academic institution- spread across 44 countries). The researchers sought to find out the most dominant academic institutions in the IS editorial board membership and the respective global rankings of those institutions. Table 11 shows a summary of the editorial board membership by academic institutions, rankings, and gender distribution for the academic institutions with at least four (4) faculty members in the 14 IS journal's editorial boards.

Table 11: Academic institutions With At Least 4 Members in the Leading IS Journals' Editorial Boards

Academic institution	Country	Rank	F#	F-%	M#	M%	All	Academic institution	Country	Rank	F#	F-%	M#	M%	All
City University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	60	1	8%	12	92%	13	London School of Economics	UK	8	2	40%	3	60%	5
Georgia State University	US	80	1	8%	11	92%	12	University of Cambridge	UK	19	1	20%	4	80%	5
Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	23	2	33%	8	67%	12	University of Nottingham	UK	74	0	0%	5	100%	5
University of New South Wales	Australia	41	4	36%	7	64%	11	Hong Kong Univer. of Sci. & Tech	Hong Kong	38	1	20%	4	80%	5
Virginia Tech	US	199	3	30%	7	70%	10	University of Delaware	US	311*	0	0%	5	100%	5
University of Connecticut	US	184	3	30%	7	70%	10	Victoria University of Wellington	New Zealand	485*	2	40%	3	60%	5
Arizona State University	US	25	1	11%	8	89%	9	University of Florida	US	115	0	0%	5	100%	5
Bentley University	US	NA	4	50%	4	50%	8	Texas Tech University	US	250	0	0%	5	100%	5
National Univer. of Singapore	Singapore	18	1	13%	7	88%	8	University of Notre Dame	US	114	1	20%	4	80%	5
University of Sydney	Australia	53	1	13%	7	88%	8	Indian Institute of Tech. —Delhi	India	654*	0	0%	5	100%	5
University of Queensland	Australia	57	3	38%	5	63%	8	Virginia Commonwealth Univer.	US	402*	2	40%	3	60%	5
University of Minnesota	US	29	1	13%	7	88%	8	University of Virginia	US	104	0	0%	4	100%	4
Iowa State University	US	159	4	50%	4	50%	8	HEC Montreal	Canada	NA	2	50%	2	50%	4
University of Auckland	New Zealand	102	1	14%	6	86%	7	University of Groningen	Germany	33	1	25%	3	75%	4
University of Texas at Austin	US	58	2	29%	5	71%	7	Aalto University	Finland	50	2	50%	2	50%	4
University of Arkansas	US	179	3	43%	4	57%	7	University of South Florida	US	310*	0	0%	4	100%	4
University of Texas at Dallas	US	88	0	0%	7	100%	7	Michigan State University	US	36	1	25%	3	75%	4
University of Agder	Norway	NA	1	14%	6	86%	7	University of Nevada	US	NA	1	25%	3	75%	4
Georgia Institute of Technology	US	93	1	17%	5	83%	6	Royal Holloway Univer. of London	UK	358*	2	50%	2	50%	4
University of Warwick	UK	28	2	33%	4	67%	6	University of Sussex	UK	127	2	50%	2	50%	4
Loughborough University	UK	181	3	50%	3	50%	6	Indian Institute of Mgmt-Calcutta	India	NA	2	50%	3	75%	4
University of Georgia	US	119	2	33%	4	67%	6	University of Arizona	US	97	0	0%	4	100%	4
Temple University	US	96	0	0%	6	100%	6	Singapore Management University	Singapore	61	1	25%	3	75%	4
Rutgers University	US	70	1	17%	5	83%	6	University of St Gallen	Switzerland	87	0	0%	4	100%	4
Australian National University	Australia	75	3	50%	3	50%	6	Tsinghua University	China	63	0	0%	4	100%	4
University of Illinois-Chicago	US	175	1	17%	5	83%	6	Florida Atlantic University	US	NA	0	0%	4	100%	4
Monash University	Australia	32	2	33%	4	67%	6	Indian Institute of Management	India	NA	1	25%	3	75%	4
Nanyang Techn. University	Singapore	107	3	50%	3	50%	6	McGill University	Canada	138	2	50%	2	50%	4
RMIT University	Australia	143	2	33%	4	67%	6	University of Waterloo	Canada	203	0	0%	4	100%	4
Carnegie Mellon University	US	89	2	33%	4	67%	6	University of Maryland	US	31	1	25%	3	75%	4
University at Albany	US	290*	2	33%	4	67%	6	Brigham Young University	US	NA	0	0%	4	100%	4

Rank = Academic institution rank (Economics and Business) from the US News and World Report. Rankings with an asterisk (*) are from global rankings.
NA implies that the rankings for these academic institutions were not available in either the E&B or global rankings

City University of Hong Kong from Hong Kong, which is ranked 60th in the US News and World Report, had the highest number of faculty (13) serving on the IS journals' editorial boards. Second was Georgia State University from the US which ranked 80th with 12 faculty members. In position three (3), Copenhagen Business School in Denmark, which was ranked 23rd in US News and World Report, had 11 faculty members. The 13 faculty members from City University of Hong Kong served in 20 editorial board positions while the 12 and 11 from Georgia State University and Copenhagen Business School served in 15 and 22 editorial board positions, respectively.

Although Copenhagen Business School is ranked 624th in the best global universities ranking in 2020, the business school is ranked 23rd under the economics and business category. Overall, most of the schools and universities in the table have very good business schools with higher global rankings and are considered some of the best in the IS programs.

Table 12 shows how the academic institutions are represented in each specific journal's editorial board. The values are ranked according to the number of journals (column C*) served by the editorial board members from each academic institution. For instance, Copenhagen Business School's 12 (Table 11) faculty members are serving in 22 editorial board positions (column GT) in 12 (C* column) of the 14 IS Journal's editorial boards

- **Table 12: The Academic institutions with at Least 8 Faculty on the Editorial Boards Shown Against Respective Journals**

Academic institutions	US Female								US Male								T*	EUR Female								EUR Male								T*	GT =T*+T*	C*
	CAIS	ISJ	ISR	JAIS	JIS	JMIS	MISQ	All	CAIS	ISJ	ISR	JAIS	JIS	JMIS	MISQ	All		AIO	EJIS	I&M	IJIM	DSS	JIT	JSIS	All	AIO	EJIS	I&M	IJIM	DSS	JIT	JSIS	All			
Copenhagen Business School	1	1		2				4		3		2		2	1	8	12	2			1			1	4	1	1	1		1	1	1	6	10	22	12
Georgia State University					1			1		1	1			2	4	8	9									2	1		1	1	1		6	6	15	10
City University of Hong Kong			1					1	1	3	3	1			1	9	10											2	2	4		2	10	10	20	9
University of Auckland				1				1		2					1	3	4					1		1	1	1	1	1			2		6	7	11	8
National Univer. of Singapore						1		1			2	1		1	1	5	6									1	1	1	2				5	5	11	8
Univer. of New South Wales		3		2				5		2	1	1				4	9			1					1		1	3	2			2	10	11	18	7
University of Georgia				1				1	1					2	1	4	5	1						1			1		1			1	2	3	8	7
Virginia Tech				1	1			2		3	1	1		1		6	8		1		1			2			1		2			3	4	13	6
Bentley University	2			2	1			6	1	2		1				3	9	1			1				1		1	2			2	1	4	5	11	6
University of Sydney									2	2		1		3		5	5				1			1			2			2		4	5	10	6
University of Texas at Austin		1	1					3					3	2		5	6	1						1	2			1			1	4	6	9	6
London School of Economics						1		1		1				1		2	3	1				1		1	2	1			2	1		4	6	9	6
University of Arkansas				1				1			2	2	1	3		5	6	1				1		1	2		1					1	3	9	6
University of Virginia											2	2			1	5	5									2			1			3	3	9	6
Georgia Institute of Tech.						1		1			3	1			1	5	6											1		1		2	2	8	6
University of Warwick					1			1		2						2	4	1			1				1	1		1			3	4	4	8	6
Australian National Univer.	1	1		1				4		1						1	5					1					1			2		2	7	6
Aalto University		1	1	1		1		5		1						2	7	1	1				1	3			1		1	2		5	7	6
Lancaster University		1	1	1		1	1	5									5			1			2	2							2	7	6
University of Illinois-Chicago		1		1				1	1						1	2			1				1	1	1	1		1	4	5	7	6
Nanyang Tech. University			1		1	1	2			2						3	5			1		1		1							2	7	6

T* = Total for each region. GT = grand total for both regions (T* + T*). C* = count of number of journals covered by a specific academic institution

Specifically, the table shows that under the US domiciled journals, Copenhagen Business School has one female each in the CAIS and ISJ editorial boards, two females in the JAIS editorial board, three males in the ISJ editorial board, two males each in the JAIS and JMIS editorial boards, and one male on the MISQ editorial board among others. Georgia State University has 12 (Table 11) unique faculty members who serve on 15 editorial board positions in 10 of the 14 IS Journal's editorial boards.

City University of Hong Kong has 13 (Table 11) unique faculty members who serve in 20 editorial board positions in nine (9) of the 14 IS Journal's editorial boards. Similar to the analysis of representation of academic institutions and universities at the editorial board levels, the researchers sought to find out the names of the most dominant faculty members in the editorial boards of the journals

(the names of the editorial board members are publicly available data and the coding process followed techniques established in other prior IS studies such as those investigating prolific authors and researchers).

Table 8. Editors Who are Members of at Least Four (4) Different Journals' Editorial Board and their Affiliated Academic institutions

Editors and Affiliated Academic institutions	Gender F	Gender M	AIO	CAIS	DSS	EJIS	I&M	IJIM	ISJ	ISR	JAIS	JIS	JIT	JMIS	JSIS	MISQ	Grand Total
Monideepa Tarafdar							1		1	1	1			1	1		6
Lancaster University									1	1	1			1	1		5
University of Toledo							1										1
Suprateek Sarker		x	1				1			1				1			4
University of Virginia			1				1			1				1			4
Shan L. Pan		x					1	1	1						1		4
University of New South Wales							1	1	1						1		4
Paul Lowry		x				1			1		1			1			4
University of Hong Kong						1											1
Virginia Tech									1		1			1			3
Yulin Fang		x					1		1	1					1		4
City University of Hong Kong							1		1	1					1		4
Michel Avital		x				1					1		1		1		4
Copenhagen Business School						1					1		1		1		4
Indranil Bose		x		1	1		1				1						4
Indian Institute of Mgmt.-Calcutta				1	1		1				1						4
Jose Benitez		x			1	1	1				1						4
Rennes School of Business					1	1	1				1						4
Christy Cheung	x				1		1		1		1						4
Hong Kong Baptist University					1		1		1		1						4
Carsten Sorensen		x	1						1					1	1		4
London School of Economics			1						1					1	1		4
Dubravka Cecez-Kecmanovic	x		1					1	1		1						4
University of New South Wales									1		1						2
UNSW Australia Business School			1					1									2
Carol Hsu	x						1		1		1				1		4
Tongji University							1		1		1				1		4

Table 13 shows the names and gender classification of the faculty members who served on at least four (4) journal editorial boards, their respective academic institutions, and the journals in which they serve.

.

Monideepa Tarafdar was associated with two academic institutions and served on six (6) journal editorial boards. Suprateek Sarker from the University of Virginia and Shan Pan from the University of New South Wales were among the several faculties who served on four (4) journal editorial boards.

DISCUSSIONS

The primary goal of this study is to investigate and report on the status of the editorial board memberships in a set of 14 leading Information Systems (IS) journals along the following three diversity elements: gender, academic institution, and journal location. The results revealed a lack of common language across the various journals as the members of the editorial boards were categorized into different groups and referred to using various titles, such as the senior editors, associate editors, editorial board members, editorial review board members, and board of editors. For instance, JMIS had one (1) editor-in-chief and 67 members on the Board of Editors while other journals, such as EJIS and ISR had one editor-in-chief, several senior editors, and numerous associate editors in their respective editorial boards.

A common language emerges following consensus, which is important in a discipline because it facilitates academic progress. Consensus in a discipline also facilitates communication and collaboration among the scholars, a key ingredient essential to the growth and progress of an academic discipline usually exemplified in theory building and testing (Pfeffer, 1993).

The lack of common language in the IS field has been an ongoing debate for quite some time, and although it is work in progress, IS journals should strive for a common language. The results also revealed that editorial board membership is domesticated in that the US based journals are predominantly associated with editorial board members from the US and vice-versa for the Europe domiciled journals reiterating the findings of Galliers and Meadows (2003).

Gender Representation in the Editorial Boards

Gender diversity is important because it promotes a multiplicity of ideas and different viewpoints, which can be useful in enriching decision making according to the decision-making theory (March & Simon, 1981). In the various groups and titles used to reference the members of the editorial boards, females were underrepresented. For instance, in the 14 IS journals, females accounted for 27% of all the editorial board membership.

.

Out of the 14 journals, there were 17 editor/editor-in-chiefs. Of these 17 editor/editor-in-chief, 14 (82%) were males and three (18%) were females.

Past research has shown that the percentage of women decreases as the prestige of the position or activities increases (Mauleón *et al*., 2012), a phenomenon known as the "glass ceiling", which may help explain the lower number of females at the editor/editor-in-chief's positions. IS has its roots in the engineering and computer science fields, which have been traditionally dominated by males and several theories; namely, the social identify theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2004), homosocial reproduction theory (Kanter, 1977), and the similarity-attraction theory (Byrne, 1971) may explain the higher number of males in the IS journals' editorial board. At the country level, European domiciled journals seem to be ahead based on the fact that all the editorial board members in the US domiciled journals came from 32 different countries while all the editorial board members from the EUR domiciled journals came from 41 different countries.

Editorial board membership is attained through invitations (Lee, 1997) or nominations, which implies that current or former editorial board members nominate or advocate for those with whom they are familiar with or share common traits (Feldman, 2008) according to the social identify theory. Similarly, the homosocial reproduction theory and the similarity attraction theory assert that people tend to work with and gravitate towards those with whom they share common traits. Through research collaborations, attending or serving at academic conferences, the members of the editorial boards create contacts and familiarity with a select group of individuals, a process that might unknowingly be propagating the vicious cycle of female underrepresentation.

In academia, earning a PhD, publishing in peer-reviewed journals, and serving on the editorial boards of research journals are some of the accomplishments that earn one the stripes and credibility in their field (Feldman, 2008). Usually, journal editors are individuals who have a well-established research agenda supported by a variety of published research articles in recognizable peer-reviewed journals (Teixeira & Oliveira, 2018). Membership on the editorial board is a significant and prestigious academic accomplishment, which is recognized positively during the hiring, tenure, and promotion processes (Mauleón *et al*., 2012).

According to the homosocial theory, female or male editor-in-chiefs will likely advocate for other females or males to be included in the editorial board, a phenomenon known as gender homogeneity in academic networks (Burgess & Shaw, 2010).

.

Academic Institutions Affiliated with the Editorial Board Members

There were 494 academic institutions affiliated with the editorial board members in the 14 IS journals. The highest number of editorial members came from Copenhagen Business School, which had 22 instances, followed by University of Hong Kong at 20, and University of New South Wales at 18.

Of the 494 unique universities, 266 (54%) had a single representation in the editorial board's memberships. Membership in the editorial board is celebrated because it puts the institutions affiliated with the editorial board members on the global stage and gives them visibility and representation. Given that most of the editorial board members have an established research output, editorial board membership may signal to the other stakeholders the quality of the programs and research rigor at the affiliated academic institutions. A significant number of the editors in the 14 IS journals came from academic institutions in the US, which were fairly ranked in the US and World Report Global Index.

IS academics are encouraged to use different forums and outlets to communicate their research and to not confine themselves to a select group of journals. However, IS researchers should be cognizant of the fact that the chosen publication avenues can have a significant impact on several career determining decisions, such as tenure, career advancement, funding opportunities, merit increases, professional prestige, academic visibility, and career security (Hodge *et al.*, 2019). Most of the academic institutions and Universities associated with the members of the various editorial boards in the 14 IS journals have exceptional business academic institutions with higher global rankings and are considered some of the best IS programs. The fact that data indicates that most of the members of the editorial boards come from a select few groups of academic institutions and universities may be confining the research in the IS field to a few institutions or entities.

A wider scope, without compromising the quality of the reviews, would be ideal in generating a multiplicity of ideas and research streams.

Serving on Multiple Editorial Boards

To serve on multiple journals' editorial boards is referred to as editorial board interlocking (Teixeira & Oliveira, 2018). Though a noble service, it can lead to the creation of an elite cohort of scholars that influence the use of certain research methods, publication of specific topics, and adoption of a limited set of theories and paradigms, among other delimiting parameters. The 14 IS journals had 1214 members (instances) in their editorial boards and some members (226 or 19%) served concurrently on multiple editorial boards of the 14 reviewed IS journals leaving 988 unique editorial board members, whereby 253 (26%) were females and 736 (74%) were males.

.

To serve on multiple journal editorial boards is considered detrimental to expanding the editorial board tent and advancing multiplicity of thoughts. When editors serve on multiple editorial boards, they might transfer the editorial practices and policies from one journal to another and hence contribute to shaping multiple journals. Editorial board members act as knowledge gatekeepers (Metz *et al*., 2016) in addition to playing significant roles in shaping the development of a discipline (Willet, 2013).

Thus, expanding the tent without comprising quality should yield a polygamous of ideas - a win for the discipline and general public.

Geographical (Academic Institution) Diversification of the Editorial Board Members

The results show that the US and Europe have an upper hand in the research in the IS field as shown by the overwhelming number of journals published in these regions. Most of those editor-in-chiefs and other members of the editorial boards came from the US and Europe. Of course, the US and Europe are pioneers in the IS field, and these regions lead the world in IS innovations, adoptions, and in creating and setting IS policies. Geographically, the three (3) female editors or editors-in-chief were from the US and Europe, regions that are considered more liberal and progressive than most of the world in advancing women rights and gender equality. Anecdotal evidence points to the fact that membership in an editorial board is preceded by a well-established research agenda with publications in prestigious, indexed, and peer-reviewed journals. Therefore, serving on an editorial board is a signal for academic success, status, and breakthrough scholarship (Kurmis, 2003). The IS journals should strive to attract editors in other global regions especially given the globally embedded nature of IS artefacts and the innovations in mobile banking (e.g. the case of M-Pesa in sub-Saharan Africa) and telemedicine that are emerging and transforming lives in the developing world. Those emerging IS artefacts may have cultural and regional aspects that impact their adoption and use, implying that undertaking research and reviewing the output may require familiarity with the environment.

Overall, the members of the editorial boards came from 44 countries, while males came from 43 countries and females from 30 countries. The fact that 13 of the 17 (76%) editors or editors-in-chief came from the US and Europe and none from neither the Middle East nor Africa is a cause for concern. To have a significant number of editorial board members from the US and Europe fits with what Kubota (2020) called epistemological racism, a practice in which the western world has an upper hand in determining and controlling knowledge and academic practices.

.

Given the roles of the editorial boards in the review process as well as setting the research agenda for a journal, a more diverse editorial board is more likely to publish a more diverse research output (Goyanes & Demeter, 2020).

A more diverse editorial board is likely to have a repertoire of internal reviewers who speed up and lower the review process costs - challenges inherent in a less diverse editorial boards (Demeter, 2018).

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The current study analyzes the editorial board membership in the leading IS journals. The study reveals an underrepresentation phenomenon of females in the editorial boards of the IS journals and that most board members came from a select few countries. Consequently, there are several implications of this study as follows.

Implications to Academia

Membership on the editorial board signals academic accomplishment and acceptance. Also, female membership in the editorial boards may be viewed as smashing the glass ceiling, which encourages and assures others that it is doable if they persist in the process. Therefore, increasing the gender representation of females on an editorial board has the potential to increase the females in academia. This is even direr in those regions of the world where girls' education is not well entrenched and encouraged culturally. Most of the reviewed journals were between 10 and 40-years old timeframes, which correspond to the age of the IS discipline. This time span is a reasonable time for the IS to have implemented some sort of policies and practices to encourage the near equal gender representation and participation of the various stakeholders.

The AIS asserts that the *Basket of 8* journals have wider international readership and contributions, acknowledge topical, methodological, and geographical diversity, and adhere to a stringent review process, which is conducted by highly recognized and respected editorial board members. Those are good characteristics, but more resources should be devoted to expanding the geographical diversity of the editorial board members. Moreover, that geographical diversity can bring different perspectives influenced by distinct cultures, legal, and social environments.

Implication to IS Theory and Research

Theory driven research signals an adherence to rigor in a discipline and is useful in advancing knowledge, adding value to the discipline, and enhancing credibility to the discipline's body of works (Lynham, 2000). Theory development and testing are important concepts in an academic discipline because they contribute to knowledge generation and propagation and are facilitated through replication studies with different data sets and research environments. The IS field can greatly benefit by incorporating a more diverse research community capable of developing, testing, confirming, and extending the IS research concepts and paradigms.

Given the gatekeeper role of the members of the editorial board in which they influence the general direction of research and shape the development of theory and research practices, a more diverse and inclusive editorial board has the potential to enrich the body of knowledge and theory development in a discipline.

Implications to the Industry and Practice

Very few journals had clearly identifiable industry or practice-based members in the editorial boards. Although this might be a bias because of the set of journals selected for this review, future studies should seek to include practitioner-oriented journals such as MISQ Executive, Harvard Business Review, or MIT Sloan Management Review among others to see if they will yield different perspective. The IS discipline should encourage industry and academic research and teaching collaborations in order to bring the industry concepts to the classroom and vice versa. There are other avenues where industry and academic partnerships can be accomplished, such as engaging industry partners as adjunct or guest lecturers and faculty internships and development workshops.

SHORTCOMINGS AND FUTURE STUDIES

The current study used data from 14 leading IS journals over a specific period. Although this study is informative and a starting point, future studies should seek to investigate the editorial board membership using a wider dataset, such as the Web of Science or Scopus. Editorial board membership is a very dynamic and fluid occurrence. Future studies should seek to study gender representation changes over an extended period by carrying out a time series-based study.

The factors that contribute to membership on the editorial board are not very clear. Future studies should seek to unravel this dilemma through for instance, querying the current and past board members to find out how they ended up on the boards.

.

For instance, future studies should also seek to gather objective experiential feedback and input from females who currently serve or have served on editorial boards.

Future studies should investigate if there are any relationships between the percentage of women authors and the percentage of women in the editorial boards. Future studies can also evaluate the relationship between a journal's editorial board composition and the commonly used journal key success factors, such as journal impact factor, cite score, eigen factor, article influence, and h-factor of the journal.

**Data Provided on Request

REFERENCES

Abedin, B., Jafarzadeh, H. & Olszak, C.M., (2021). Thirty-six years of information systems management: A bibliometric and thematic analysis. *Information Systems Management*, *38*(2), pp.151-164.

AIS, (2020), Senior Scholars' Basket of Journals, Retrieved on 8/1/2020 from https://aisnet.org/page/SeniorScholarBasket

Amrein, K., Langmann, A., Fahrleitner-Pammer, A., Pieber, T.R. & Zollner-Schwetz, I., (2011). Women underrepresented on editorial boards of 60 major medical journals. *Gender Medicine*, *8*(6), pp.378-387.

Benbasat, I. & Weber, R., (1996). Research commentary: Rethinking "diversity" in information systems research. *Information systems research*, *7*(4), pp.389-399.

Bernroider, E.W., Pilkington, A. & Córdoba, J.R., (2015). Research in information systems: a study of diversity and inter-disciplinary discourse in the AIS basket journals between 1995 and 2011. In *Formulating research methods for information systems* (pp. 11-47). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Beath, C., Chan, Y., Davison, R. M., Dennis, A. R., & Recker, J. C. (2021). Editorial board diversity at the basket of eight journals: A report to the college of senior scholars. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 48, pp. 236-247

Bhaumik, S. & Jagnoor, J., (2019). Diversity in the editorial boards of global health journals. *BMJ Global Health*, *4*(5), pp.e001909.

Bowen, G.A., (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), pp. 27-40

Braun, T., (2004). Keeping the gates of science journals. In *Handbook of quantitative science and technology research* (pp. 95-114). Springer, Dordrecht.

.

Burgess, T.F. & Shaw, N.E., (2010). Editorial board membership of management and business journals: A social network analysis study of the Financial Times 40. *British Journal of Management*, *21*(3), pp.627-648.

Byrne, D. E., (1971). *The attraction paradigm* (Vol. 462). Academic Press.

Cabanac, G., (2012). Shaping the landscape of research in information systems from the perspective of editorial boards: A scientometric study of 77 leading journals. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *63*(5), pp.977-996.

Chatman, J.A. & Flynn, F.J., (2001). The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in work teams. *Academy of management journal*, *44*(5), pp.956-974.

Chen, W. & Hirschheim, R., (2004). A paradigmatic and methodological examination of information systems research from 1991 to 2001. *Information systems journal*, *14*(3), pp.197-235.

Code, G.W., (2020). Girls who code. Retrieved on 10/09/2022 from https://girlswhocode.com/about-us

Compeau, D., Marcolin, B., Kelley, H., & Higgins, C. (2012). Research commentary-generalizability of information systems research using student subjects—A reflection on our practices and recommendations for future research. *Information Systems Research*, 23(4), pp.1093-1109

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A., (2014). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. Sage publications.

Coron, C., (2020). What does "gender equality" mean? Social representations of gender equality in the workplace among French workers. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *39*(8), pp.825-847

Costa, A.C., Fulmer, C.A. & Anderson, N.R., (2018). Trust in work teams: An integrative review, multilevel model, and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(2), pp.169-184.

Crane, D., (1967). The gatekeepers of science: Some factors affecting the selection of articles for scientific journals. *The American Sociologist*, pp. 195-201.

Davis, G. B. & Olson, M. H., (1985). Management Information Systems: Conceptual Foundation, Structure, and Development, *New York: McGraw-Hill*

Demeter, M., (2018). Changing center and stagnant periphery in communication and media studies: National diversity of major international journals in the field of communication from 2013 to 2017. *International Journal of Communication*, *12*, pp. 2893-2921.

Dhanani, A. & Jones, M.J., (2017). Editorial boards of accounting journals: gender diversity and internationalisation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 30*(5), pp.1008-1040.

.

Dickersin, K., Fredman, L., Flegal, K.M., Scott, J.D. & Crawley, B., (1998). Is there a sex bias in choosing editors?: Epidemiology journals as an example. *JAMA*, *280*(3), pp. 260-264.

DOE., (2020). Women in the Manhattan Project. Retrieved on 10/09/2022, from https://www.energy.gov/women-manhattan-project

DuBow, W. & Gonzalez, J.J., (2020). NCWIT Scorecard: The Status of Women in Technology. Boulder, CO: NCWIT. Retrieved on 10/09/2022 from https://ncwit.org/resource/scorecard/

Everard, A., St Pierre, K. & Heck, J.L., (2017). Contributors to the high-impact is journals (1977-2014): an aid for setting research standards. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *40*(1), pp. 53-81.

Feldman, D.C., (2008). Building and maintaining a strong editorial board and cadre of ad hoc reviewers. In *Opening the black box of editorship* (pp. 68-74). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Fortune, (2015), Apple hired 11,000 female employees over the last 12 months, Retrieved on 8/17/2020 from http://fortune.com/2015/08/13/apple-hired11000-women/

Fox, C.W., Duffy, M.A., Fairbairn, D.J. & Meyer, J.A., (2019). Gender diversity of editorial boards and gender differences in the peer review process at six journals of ecology and evolution. *Ecology and Evolution*, *9*(24), pp.13636-13649.

Galliers, R.D. & L&, F.F., (1987). Choosing appropriate information systems research methodologies. *Communications of the ACM*, *30*(11), pp.901-902.

Galliers, R.D. & Meadows, M., (2003). A discipline divided: globalization and parochialism in information systems research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *11*(1), pp. 108-117.

García-Carpintero, E., Granadino, B., & Plaza, L. (2010). The representation of nationalities on the editorial boards of international journals and the promotion of the scientific output of the same countries. *Scientometrics*, 84(3), 799-811.

Goyanes, M., (2020). Editorial boards in communication sciences journals: Plurality or standardization?. *International communication gazette*, *82*(4), pp.342-364.

Goyanes, M. & Demeter, M., (2020). How the geographic diversity of editorial boards affects what is published in JCR-ranked communication journals. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *97*(4), pp.1123-1148.

Greenbaum, H.K., Goodsir, H.L., Smith, M.C. & Robinson, D.H., (2018). Female participation as top-producing authors, editors, and editorial board members in educational psychology journals from 2009 to 2016. *Educational Psychology Review*, *30*(4), pp.1283-1289.

Gregor, S., (2006). The nature of theory in information systems. MISQ, *30*(3) pp.611-642.

.

Hardaway, D., Harryvan, R., Wang, X.F. & Goodson, J., (2016). Partnering with practice: How partnerships can be developed, shared and managed. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *38*(1), pp. 145-156.

Hardgrave, B.C. & Walstrom, K.A., (1997). Forums for MIS scholars. *Communications of the ACM*, *40*(11), pp.119-124.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In *Political psychology* (pp. 276-293). Psychology Press.

Hodge, D.R., Yu, M. & Kim, A., (2020). Assessing the quality and prestige of disciplinary social work journals: A national study of faculty perceptions. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *30*(4), pp.451-459.

Jeyaraj, A. & Zadeh, A.H., (2020). Evolution of information systems research: Insights from topic modeling. *Information & Management*, 57(4), p.103207.

Kanter, R.M., (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life. In *The gender gap in psychotherapy* (pp. 53-78). Springer, Boston, MA.

Karanja, E. & Zaveri, J., (2012). IT leaders: Who are they and where do they come from?. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *23*(2), pp.143-164.

Karanja, E., Sharma, A. & Salama, I., (2020). What does MIS survey research reveal about diversity and representativeness in the MIS field? A content analysis approach. *Scientometrics*, *122*(3), pp.1583-1628

Keller, S. & Coulthard, D., (2013). Charting diversity and change in IS publications: A tri-continental journal analysis. *Australasian journal of information systems*, *18*(1), pp. 5-35

Kubota, R. (2020). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *41*(5), pp. 712-732.

Kurmis, A. P. ,(2003). Understanding the limitations of the journal impact factor. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, 85, pp. 2449–2454.

Landry, M. & Banville, C., (1992). A disciplined methodological pluralism for MIS research. *Accounting, Management and Information Technologies*, 2(2), pp.77-97.

Larsen, K. R., Eargle, D. (Eds.) (2015). Theories Used in IS Research Wiki. Retrieved 10/09/2022 from https://is.theorizeit.org/wiki/Main_Page

Lee, T.,(1997). The editorial gatekeepers of the accounting academy. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 10, pp. 11–30.

Levin, D., (2020). IT Professional Associations & Organizations. Retrieved 10/09/2022 from https://jobstars.com/it-professional-associations-organizations/

Lev-Ram, M., (2015). Apple Hired 11,000 Female Employees over the Last 12 Months.

.

Light, J. S., (1999). When Computers Were Women. *Technology and Culture*, 40(3), 1999, pp. 455-483.

Lowry, P. B., Romans, D., & Curtis, A., (2004). Global journal prestige and supporting disciplines: A scientometric study of Information Systems journals. *Journal of the Association of Information Systems*, *5*(2), pp. 29–80.

Lynham, S. A., (2000). Theory building in the human resource development profession. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 11*(2), pp. 159-178.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A., (1981). Decision-making theory. *The Sociology of Organizations*, 135-150.

Mauleón, E., Hillán, L., Moreno, L., Gómez, I., & Bordons, M., (2012). Assessing gender balance among journal authors and editorial board members. *Scientometrics*, *95*(1), pp. 87-114

McSweeney, F.K., Donahoe, P. & Swindell, S., (2000). Women in applied behavior analysis. *The Behavior Analyst*, 23(2), pp. 267-277.

Metz, I., & Harzing, A. W., (2012). An update of gender diversity in editorial boards: a longitudinal study of management journals. *Personnel Review*, 41(3), pp. 283-300..

Metz, I., Harzing, A. W., & Zyphur, M. J., (2016). Of journal editors and editorial boards: who are the trailblazers in increasing editorial board gender equality? *British Journal of Management*, *27*(4), pp. 712-726.

Metz, I. & Harzing, A.W., (2009). Gender diversity in editorial boards of management journals. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4), pp. 540-557.

Mingers, J. & Harzing, A. W., (2007). 'Ranking journals in business and management: a statistical analysis of the Harzing dataset', *European Journal of Information Systems*,16, pp. 303–316.

Mingers, J., (2001). Combining IS research methods: towards a pluralist methodology. *Information Systems Research*, 12(3), pp. 240-259.

NCWIT, (2019). Set Up a Mentoring Culture for Graduate Students: Roles of Faculty and Peers, Retrieved on 8/17/2020 from https://www.ncwit.org/resources/set-mentoring-culture-graduate-students-roles-faculty-and-peers

Olson, B. J., Parayitam, S., & Bao, Y., (2007). Strategic decision making: The effects of cognitive diversity, conflict, and trust on decision outcomes. *Journal of Management*, *33*(2), pp.196-222.

Over, R., (1981). Representation of women on the editorial boards of psychology journals. *American Psychologist*, *36*(8), 885.

Palvia, P., Kakhki, M. D., Ghoshal, T., Uppala, V., & Wang, W., (2015). Methodological and Topic Trends in Information Systems Research: A Meta-Analysis of IS Journals. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 37(1), 30.

.

Pan, Y., & Zhang, J. Q., (2014). The composition of the editorial boards of general marketing journals. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *36*(1), 33-44

Payton, F. C., Yarger, L., & Mbarika, V. (2021). Black Lives Matter: A perspective from three Black information systems scholars. *Information Systems Journal*, *32*(1), pp. 222-232

Pettigrew, K. E., & McKechnie, L., (2001). The use of theory in information science research. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *52*(1), pp. 62-73

Pfeffer, J., (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), pp. 599-620.

Porter, C.L., Christian, L. & Poling, A., (2003). Participation of women as authors and editors in journals concerned with mental retardation and related topics. *Mental Retardation*, 41(1), pp.1-6.

Rainer, R. K., & Miller, D. M., (2005). Examining differences across journal rankings. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(2), pp. 91–95.

Robey, D., (1996). Research commentary: diversity in information systems research: threat, promise, and responsibility. *Information Systems Research*, 7(4), pp. 400-408.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J., (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, pp. 224-253.

Sherer, S. A., (2020). Academic departments of information systems faculty in the US. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *13*(2), pp.105-116..

Soper, D. S., & Turel, O., (2016). Theory in North American information systems research: a culturomic analysis. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 38(5), pp. 477-500.

Stegmaier, M., Palmer, B. & Van Assendelft, L., (2011). Getting on the board: the presence of women in political science journal editorial positions. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(4), pp.799-804.

Stewart, A., Cotton, J. L., & Adya, M., (2017). Information systems: A house divided? *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 41(24), pp. 544–586.

Taylor, H., Dillon, S., & Van Wingen, M., (2010). Focus and diversity in information systems research: Meeting the dual demands of a healthy applied discipline. *MIS Quarterly*, 34(4), pp. 647-667.

Teixeira, E. K., & Oliveira, M., (2018). Editorial board interlocking in knowledge management and intellectual capital research field. *Scientometrics*, 117(3), 1853–1869

Topaz, C. M., & Sen, S., (2016). Gender representation on journal editorial boards in the mathematical sciences. *PLoS One*, *11*(8), e0161357

.

US Bureau of labor statistics, (2019), News Release, Bureau of labor statistics, Retrieved on 10/9/2022 from https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/empsit.pdf?mod=article_inline&mod=article_inline

US News and World Report, (2020). 2020 Best National University Rankings, Retrieved on 10/09/2022 from https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities

Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K., & Homan, A. C., (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(6), pp. 1008-1022.

Vessey, I., Ramesh, V., & Glass, R. L., (2002). Research in information systems: An empirical study of diversity in the discipline and its journals. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(2), pp. 129-174.

Walstrom, K. A., Hardgrave, B. C., & Wilson, R. L., (1995). Forums for management information systems scholars. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(3), pp. 93–107.

Willett, P., (2013). The characteristics of journal editorial boards in library and information science. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development and Technology*, *3*(1), pp. 5-17.

Wu, D., Lu, X., Li, J., & Li, J., (2020). Does the institutional diversity of editorial boards increase journal quality? The case economics field. *Scientometrics*, pp. 1-19

Yadav, S. & Lenka, U., (2020). Diversity management: a systematic review. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal.* Vol. 39 No. 8, pp. 901-929.

.