Explaining geographic diversity of editorial boards: The role of conference participation and English language skills

Anne-Wil Harzing
Isabel Metz

Version January 2012

To be published in European Journal of International Management, 2012

Prof. Anne-Wil Harzing
University of Melbourne
Department of Management & Marketing
Faculty of Economics & Commerce
Parkville Campus
Melbourne, VIC 3010
Australia

Email: anne-wil@harzing.com
Web: www.harzing.com

EXPLAINING GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY OF EDITORIAL BOARDS: THE ROLE OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS

Anne-Wil Harzing

Department of Management, Faculty of Business & Economics,

University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

e-mail: harzing@unimelb.edu.au

Isabel Metz

Melbourne Business School,

University of Melbourne, Carlton, Australia

Email: I.Metz@mbs.edu

Anne-Wil Harzing is Professor in International Management at the University of Melbourne, Australia. Her research interests include international HRM, expatriate management, HQ-subsidiary relationships, the role of language in international business and the quality and impact of research. Since 1999 she maintains an extensive website (www.harzing.com) with resources for international and cross-cultural management as well as academic publishing and bibliometrics. Her latest book is *The Publish or Perish Book: your guide to effective and responsible citation analysis.*

Isabel Metz is Associate Professor of Organisational Behaviour at the Melbourne Business School, Australia. Her research interests are in the areas of gender and careers, diversity

management, work and family, and employment relationships. Current research projects focus on diversity practices and organisational outcomes, women's turnover, work family conflict, and psychological contracts. She has published in leading academic journals and has won prizes for conference papers.

ABSTRACT

As the academic world has become smaller through developments such as international exchanges and electronic communication, editorial boards of management journals should have become more geographically diverse. However, we do not know what contributes to increased geographic diversity in editorial boards. This paper examines geographic diversity in editorial boards in Management through secondary data from 57 journals over 20 years, covering approximately 16,000 editorial board members. We found that two factors partly predict the geographic diversity of editorial boards of management journals: a country's representation in a top US and in a top European management conference, and a country's use of the English language.

Keywords: Editorial boards, geographic diversity, internationalisation, management journals, conference, (English) language

INTRODUCTION

There is increased pressure for academics around the world to publish in a set of management journals printed in English (Segalla 2008). But are they able to do so? Traditionally, the editorial boards of this set of management journals have been dominated by North American scholars (Baruch 2001; Stremersch & Verhoef 2005). Such lack of heterogeneity in editorial board (EB) membership is thought to restrict what is published (e.g., Svensson 2005; Tung 2006). Therefore, it is important to understand the factors that might influence editorial board diversity.

Based on diversity management theory, a team of individuals with a common background will share common experiences and paradigms. Such a team will thus lack the resources to be creative and innovative (Cox & Blake, 1991; Page, 2007; Robinson & Dechant 1997). Hence, teams with diverse experiences and perspectives are desirable, because they should enhance problem-solving, creativity and innovation (e.g., Robinson & Dechant 1997).

Similarly, editorial boards mostly or entirely composed of scholars from one country or culture are likely to share common research paradigms and methods, and thus less likely to be receptive to alternative ones (Özbilgin 2004; Feldman 2008). Yet, for knowledge to grow, one of the things we conceivably need is diversity in research paradigms and methodologies (Tung 2006). Thus, it is important to understand what influences diversity in editorial boards of management journals. Our current knowledge of this phenomenon is scanty, because past research in this area is mostly descriptive (e.g., Lukka & Kasanen 1996; Özbilgin 2004), precluding us from truly understanding what is happening.

We fill this gap in our knowledge by looking at one type of diversity: diversity in the country editorial board members come from or "geographic diversity". Geographic diversity has

been used in past studies as a proxy for diversity in points of view (e.g., Polonsky, Garma & Mittelstaedt 2006; Svensson 2005; Thomas, Shenkar & Clarke 1994) due to the difficulties in measuring the influence of other factors, such as the nature of research paradigms and scholarly tutelage across countries and institutions, on cognitive ability. Further, demographic characteristics are considered to be "reasonable proxies for underlying differences in cognitions, values, and perceptions" (Joshi, Liao & Rao 2010: 10). As country of origin (or nationality) is a demographic characteristic, albeit an "invisible" one (Mor Barak, 2005), it is a reasonable proxy of differences in cognitive ability. "Invisible" individual characteristics are defined as those characteristics of the individual that not readily observable or detectable (Mor Barak 2005). In this study we examine two factors that might influence the geographic diversity of editorial boards: a country's representation in a top US or top European management conference, and its use of the English language.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Previously suggested but not empirically tested is the belief that the increase in non-home editorial membership might be partly due to the increased internationalisation of academic associations and conferences (Baruch & Hall 2004; Tung 2006). "Non-home editorial board members" are defined as individuals who come from a country different to where the editor is located. Despite the improvement in communication technology, it is still important for people to meet face-to-face to forge networks (DiMaggio, Hargittai, Neuman & Robinson, 2001). In the academic world, one of the most common means to forge networks is conferences. As conference and travel allowances are limited, it seems reasonable to assume that academics will, more often than not, seek to participate in a top conference in their field rather than in a

conference that is less likely to attract well-regarded and established academics. Benefits of attending top conferences (in any field) include opportunities for interaction with a wide cadre of peers and a large number of colleagues (i.e., networking), self-development, and sharing of ideas and research findings (Jacobs & McFarlane 2005).

Few would dispute that top conferences in *management* can be found in the US (e.g., the Academy of Management) and in Europe (e.g., the European Academy of Management). Editors and editorial board members – who are generally top researchers in their fields – are likely to attend these conferences. Networking at these meetings is, therefore, more likely to increase an academic's chances of being invited to join editorial boards than networking at other management conferences. For non-US academics (only, as US academics are already part of US based networks; Burgess & Shaw, 2010) active networking at a top American management conference could partially "compensate" for not living in the US, in terms of being known to US editors of management journals. "Being known" (and conversely "knowing whom", [Arthur, Claman & DeFillippi 1995]) is thought to be important for academic career success (Baruch & Hall 2004; Burgess & Shaw, 2010). In this case, "being known" might enhance the chances of non-US academics of being invited to join editorial boards of US based journals. For example, Burgess and Shaw (2010) found that the large majority of editorial board members of 36 journals in the FT40 list worked in US Universities. Using social network analysis Burgess and Shaw also found that groups of these individuals were "connected" and, thus, conceptualised "editorial boards as a self-producing elite" (p.642). It is possible that academics from non-US Universities can increase their chances of participating in this editorial board selection process by presenting their work at a top American management conference and personally meeting "the academic management elite" (p.642). A similar argument can be made for attendance at a top European management conference (for non-US and US academics) and editorial board

membership in European based journals. As a result, the higher the number of academics from a particular country at a top US or European conference, the higher might eventually be that country's representation of editorial board members in US based or European based journals, respectively.

> ***Hypothesis 1a:*** *For journals with a US editor, there will be a significant positive relationship between a country's conference attendance in a top US management conference and its number of editorial board members.*

> ***Hypothesis 1b:*** *For journals with a continental European or British editor, there will be a significant positive relationship between a country's conference attendance in a top European management conference and its number of editorial board members.*

Intertwined with the above reasoning based on network theory, is the critical role played by the English language in the internationalisation of editorial boards. For example, Harzing and Metz (in press) investigated the influence of an editor's country of origin and a journal's field of research on the geographic diversity of the editorial board. They found that the editorial boards of journals with US–based editors comprised approximately 80% of US-based scholars (i.e., individuals from the editors' local networks and who were English speaking). In contrast, scholars from non-English speaking countries, such as China and India, were massively under-represented on editorial boards of management journals (Harzing & Metz, in press). That said, Harzing and Metz (in press) still found that editorial boards of 57 management journals had become more geographically diverse over time.

We propose that the internationalisation of editorial boards over time might only extend to scholars from *native English speaking* countries or from countries where *English language skills are excellent*. People build networks more easily with people who share the same characteristics (Portes 1998). Spoken language is a very salient individual characteristic and sociolinguistics shows that sharing the same language is a powerful source of identity (e.g. Giles & Johnson 1981). Spoken language is also understood to be an important practical way to facilitate communication (Banks, Ge & Baker 1991). English is considered to be the international language of science, and in most countries academics are now expected to publish in English-language journals (Segalla, 2008). As most of the management journals in the international arena are published in English, proficiency in the English language would be a necessary skill to publish in these journals and be considered for editorial board membership. Poor English language skills would likely hinder communication and, thus, one's ability to fulfill the role of editorial board member of an English-based journal. For example, journal editors and editorial board members are expected to communicate clearly with one another, and with authors, during the review process (e.g., DeNisi 2008, Rynes 2008). In conclusion, we propose that the gradual internationalisation of editorial boards is chiefly due to an increase in the geographic diversity of scholars from countries where English is the native language or a commonly used language than from non-English speaking countries. Testing this proposition is important, because it might counterbalance some of the past suggestions of European or US dominance and ethnocentrism.

Hypothesis 2: *Countries that are native English-speaking will have a higher number of editorial board members per capita than countries where English language skills are average. Countries that are non-native English-speaking, but where English language skills are excellent will fall in between these two extremes.*

METHOD

Sample and Data Collection Procedures

Our study was based on archival data for 57 journals. In order to provide a comprehensive coverage, we included journals in five areas of Management commonly taught at business schools: Operations Management, International Business, General Management & Strategy, Human Resource Management/Organisational Behavior/Industrial Relations (HRM/OB/IR), and Marketing. We acknowledge that Marketing is not universally considered to be part of Management. However, many universities have combined Management and Marketing departments. Therefore, we felt it was important to include this related discipline. Nevertheless, we also run the analyses without Marketing journals for completeness (see below). Further, for each of the five areas of Management we included around ten journals, generally focusing on the top-ranked journals in each field. However, we also took care to ensure a spread of North American and European journals; European journals include both continental European and British journals. These criteria meant that we could not rely on existing lists of journals. For example, using only the list of Management journals in the ISI Journal Citation Reports would have excluded most Operations, International Business and Marketing journals.

Data were collected at five year intervals: 1989, 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009. Five-year gaps in the data allow time for changes to occur, while generating enough data points over the 20 year period studied. The country of each editorial board member's current university affiliation was coded by a research assistant, based on the editorial board information in the first issue for each of the five data collection years. We are cognisant that the country of affiliation

does not always reflect the nationality of the editorial board member in question. However, the grounding of our hypotheses in network theory led us to assume that current location would be a more important determinant of embeddedness in particular networks than the academic's country of origin. Supporting this assumption is the literature on the challenges in virtual team work (Kirkman, Rosen, Gibson, Tesluk & McPherson 2002). We should also realise that the Internet was not yet used to a great extent in three of our observation years. In addition, as our analysis takes places at the level of the individual journal, our results are unlikely to be strongly influenced by individual idiosyncrasies for board members. Hence, we believe that in a large-scale study like ours, country of affiliation can be considered a sufficient proxy for the academic's current network.

Measures

The dependent variable in our study is the *number of editorial board members (from a particular country or region)* averaged over 57 journals, as we were interested in the relationship between this variable and the *number* of conference participants for each country as well as the country's English language competence. We controlled for country size by dividing the number of editorial board members by the size of the country's population. To facilitate the interpretation of these infinitely small numbers, we then multiplied each of them by one million to create the number of editorial board members per 1,000,000 inhabitants. Of course it would have been ideal to use the size of the actual academic community in Management rather than the size of the population as such. However, despite our very best efforts we were unable to source reliable comparative information about this. We have therefore settled for country size, because

even though business education has a longer history in some countries (e.g. the US) than in others, all countries in our sample have offered business or related degrees for some time.

A country's conference attendance at a top US conference was measured as the number of conference participants from each country at the Academy of Management (AoM) conference. The AoM is generally regarded as a top international conference in the field of Management and has specific divisions focusing on four of the five major research areas in our study. Data were provided by the AoM membership services. We would have preferred to use participation at the Academy of Marketing for Marketing journals. However, despite our best effort the Academy of Marketing did not assist with our requests for information. We therefore used AoM participation as a proxy for both disciplines. In our view, there is no reason to expect that country participation would diverge substantially between the two conferences. In addition, we ran the analyses for H1a and H1b for both the entire sample and the sample without the Marketing journals and did not find the correlation coefficients to be significantly different.

Given that invitations to join editorial boards cannot be expected to occur as soon as people meet at conferences, we lagged the conference attendance data by two years in relation to the editorial board data. Further, we only included countries with, on average, at least 0.10 board member(s) per journal, as results for countries with fewer board members would be too idiosyncratic to be reliable. This meant that 16 countries with four or fewer editorial board members across the 57 journals were excluded from the analysis. This included countries such as Belarus, Indonesia, Kuwait and Russia. An extensive email exchange with the Academy of Management membership services revealed that detailed information on conference attendance by country was not available prior to the year 2000. Hence, we were only able to conduct these analyses for the last two time periods. Similarly to the number of editorial members, we calculated conference participation per million inhabitants.

A country's conference attendance at a top European conference was not as easy to operationalise. The European Academy of Management (EURAM) conference is the closest parallel to the Academy of Management in terms of representation of the sub-disciplines in our sample. However, this organisation has only a very short history and its membership has been rather volatile over the years. We therefore considered two alternatives: EIASM (European Institute of Advanced Studies in Management) membership data and EGOS conference data. The latter alternative was not feasible as the EGOS secretariat was only able to provide conference participation data for the last couple of years. Therefore, we used EIASM membership data instead. EIASM membership data had the added advantage of being available for both 2002 and 2007 (the same years we used for AoM conference participation). Incidentally, the correlation between EURAM 2004-2007 membership and EIASM membership was 0.90 for 2002 and 0.92 for 2009. Hence, both could be seen to be good proxies of research active European scholars.

English/non-English speaking countries was measured by a variable with three values: 3 if the country was native English speaking (USA, UK, Australia/NZ, Canada, Ireland), 2 if English was designated an official language alongside the original language (Hong Kong, Singapore, India), and 1 for all other countries (France, Germany, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Hungary, Poland, Japan, Korea, Austria, China, Greece). Code 2 was also used for countries where the English-language skills of academics in Management can be considered to be excellent (Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Israel and the Netherlands). In these countries, postgraduate teaching more often takes place in English than in the other countries (Wächter & Maiworm, 2008), with the Netherlands and Finland being the European leaders. In addition, in these countries academics more often publish in English (Kheimets &

Epstein 2005), which is partly caused by the lack of local, discipline specific, native-language journals.

A strong correlation between a country's representation at a conference and its editorial board membership is to be expected, as both measures are to a large extent driven by the same variable: the level of active researchers in a country. To isolate the impact of conference attendance on the number of editorial board members, we control for the *number of peer reviewed journal articles published* (per 1,000,000 inhabitants) in the country in question. This variable was sourced from the Reuters Thomson Essential Science Indicators database and provides the number of journal articles published in the general field of Economics & Business in the last 10 years (1999-2009) divided by the size of the population. Hong Kong had to be excluded as it is not tracked separately since it became part of the People's Republic of China. As native English language skills are likely to influence publications in ISI listed journals (which are largely English-language publications), *number of peer reviewed journal articles published* per 1,000,000 inhabitants is also appropriate as a control variable for Hypothesis 2.

RESULTS

The proportion of non-home country editorial board membership varies substantially by journal, ranging from a low of 0% to a high of 98%. On average the proportion of non-home country editorial board membership lies around 35%, increasing from 26% in 1989 to 41% in 2009. Table 1 provides a correlation matrix of the variables included in our study.

(Table 1 goes about here)

In this study we examined two specific factors that might influence the geographic diversity of editorial board membership: conference attendance and having native or near-native English-language skills. Hypothesis 1a suggested that for journals with a US editor, there would be a significant positive relationship between a country's conference attendance in a top US management conference and its number of editorial board members. In order to test this hypothesis, we correlated the number of participants at the AoM conference per million inhabitants for each country with the number of editorial board members per million inhabitants for the same country two years later, controlling for the number of papers published in ISI listed journals between 1999 and 2009.

As Table 2 shows, there is strong confirmation for this hypothesis for both time periods, with partial correlations ranging from .845 (p=0.000) to .885 (p=0.000). In fact, based on the 2002 observations, the relationship between conference attendance and editorial board membership is stronger the greater the time lag between conference attendance and measurement of editorial board membership. Interestingly, there is also a strong and significant correlation between participation in US conferences and European editorial board membership. The correlation is not as strong as for US editorial board membership, but it is stronger than the correlation between EIASM membership and European editorial board membership.

(Table 2 goes about here)

Hypothesis 1b proposed that for journals with a continental European or British editor, there would be a significant positive relationship between a country's conference attendance in a top European management conference and its number of editorial board members. To test this hypothesis, the number of EIASM members per million inhabitants for each country was

correlated with the number of editorial board members per million inhabitants for the same country in 2009, after controlling for the number of papers published in ISI listed journals in Economics & Business between 1999 and 2009. Table 2 shows confirmation for this hypothesis, with a partial correlation of .453 (p=0.023) for 2002 and .543 (p=0.005) for 2007. Table 2 also shows that conference attendance at the European Academy of Management is not significantly related to editorial board membership for journals with a US editor.

Hypothesis 2 proposed a positive relationship between English language skills and editorial board membership. Specifically, Hypothesis 2 proposed that countries that are native English-speaking would have a higher number of editorial board members per capita than countries where English language skills are not as good. Countries that are non native English-speaking, but where English language skills are excellent were expected to fall in between these two extremes. As Hypothesis 2 involves testing for mean differences between countries, we controlled for country size by dividing the number of editorial board members by the size of the country's population. As is evident from Table 3, Hypothesis 2 is fully supported. For each year of data collection, countries that are native English-speaking have the highest proportion of editorial board members, followed by countries where English language skills are excellent; countries with average English language skills have the lowest proportion of editorial board members.

(Table 3 goes about here)

In the first two years of data collection, native English-speaking countries differed significantly from the other two categories. Further, in 1989 and 1994, countries where English language skills are excellent differ significantly from countries where English language skills

are only average in terms of editorial board membership. Editorial board membership in countries with average English language skills has not systematically improved over the years, relative to the group of countries with native English language skills. However, from 1999 onwards editorial board representation in countries with excellent English language skills started to rise relative to countries that are native English-speaking and the two groups are no longer significantly different. Further, both groups have significantly higher levels of editorial board membership than the group of countries with average English language skills.

Table 4 lists the countries in our sample by the number of editorial board members per 1,000,000 inhabitants. With one exception, countries in the left-hand column are either native English speaking or have excellent English language skills, and countries in the right-hand column have average English language skills. The only exception is India. The rationale for India's average performance might lie in the substantial brain drain of Indian academics (Wildavsky, 2010). Many academics of Indian nationality and origin that would qualify as editorial board members, work in US or UK institutions.

(Table 4 goes about here)

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to our current understanding of the internationalisation of editorial boards of academic journals, which is considered to be an important phenomenon for the growth of management knowledge (Baruch 2001; Hodgson & Rothman 1999; Feldman 2008; Özbilgin 2004; Stremersch & Verhoef 2005; Tung 2006). We achieved this by using a large sample over

a long period of time to examine the influence of two insidious factors on the geographic diversity of editorial boards: the internationalisation of academic conferences and the use of the English language. The sample comprised the editorial boards of 57 journals, spanning five management fields and a period of 20 years. We found that the internationalisation of academic conferences and the use of the English language partly predict the geographic diversity of editorial boards of management journals.

Specifically, geographic diversity in editorial boards of Management journals is partly due to the internationalisation of top US and European academic conferences. This study found a positive relationship between a country's conference attendance at a top US or European management conference and its representation on editorial boards, even when controlling for a country's research output. Interestingly, attendance at a top US conference was strongly related to **both** US and European editorial board membership, whilst attendance at a European conference was only related to editorial board membership of European journals. This finding supports Burgess and Shaw's (2010) conceptualisation of an academic management elite dominated by US academics in the editorial boards of the FT40 journals. As the selection of academics to editorial boards seems to be based on patronage as much as on merit (Burgess & Shaw, 2010), attending a top US conference would enhance the chances of non-US academics being invited to serve in both US and European editorial boards. Further, precisely because the "academic management elite" is dominated by US academics, it is possible that even editors and editorial board members of European journals are more likely to attend and network at US conferences than at European conferences.

As academics from underrepresented countries increase their presence at top conferences, they also increase the likelihood of establishing relationships with editors and editorial board members and of becoming part of an international academic network in their research areas. As

the geographic diversity of academic networks increases, so does the likelihood that editors will invite scholars from other countries to join the editorial boards of their journals. Thus, the internationalisation of top academic conferences might contribute to the geographic diversification of the networks of editors and, ultimately, the composition of editorial boards of journals.

The internationalisation of conferences might also increase journal editors' level of comfort with scholars from countries where English is not first or second official language. Our study shows that the representation of countries with average English language skills continues to be abysmally low. This result is in line with the relationships previously found between continent (e.g., North America versus Africa or South America; Burgess & Shaw 2010) and editorial board membership, and between country or region (e.g., US vs continental Europe; Harzing & Metz in press) and geographic diversity of editorial boards. Yet, it is reasonable to assume that at least some scholars from countries with average English language skills would have sufficient English literacy skills to serve as editorial board members of English journals, because they read academic articles in their field in the English language and they present their work at (English based) international conferences. As opportunities for face-to-face interaction between English-speaking editors and scholars from the group of countries with average English language skills increase, both journal editors and non-native English speaking scholars might use these opportunities to become more comfortable with working with one another.

Study's strengths and limitations and suggestions for further research

This study has three main strengths: its sample size, the statistical approach and the inclusion of "unspoken" explanatory factors. In the realm of diversity management in organisations, it is

important to give a name to insidious obstacles to inclusion and diversity (Myerson & Fletcher 2000). Further, with the exception of Burgess and Shaw's (2010) and Harzing and Metz's studies, past research (in management and non-management fields) has been chiefly descriptive (e.g., Lukka & Kasanen 1996; Özbilgin 2004), based on few journals (e.g, Baruch 2001; Stremersch & Verhoef 2005; Svensson 2005; Uzun 2004) and/or short periods of time (e.g., Özbilgin 2004; Polonsky, Garma & Mittelstaedt 2006). In contrast, we performed more sophisticated statistical analyses than previous studies, partly by using control variables and partly by drawing on a large sample of editorial board members. Controlling for the effects of important variables allows us to understand how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Proportion of geographically diverse editorial members) is explained by the independent variables (Conference attendance and English language skills). Our analysis is also performed at a different level from that in past studies. For example, the analysis in this study is conducted at the **country** level whilst Burgess and Shaw (2010) and Harzing and Metz (in press) performed analyses at the **journal** level. The study of phenomena at different levels of analysis allows for a more comprehensive understanding of their occurrence. Further, the very large sample of more than 16,000 editorial board members minimises the probability of Type I errors (Cohen & Cohen 1983). Finally, we examined the role of factors previously not explicitly acknowledged as contributing to the geographic diversity of editorial boards, such as the use of the English language and the internationalisation of top management conferences. Hence, we brought to the fore "unspoken" explanatory factors that might help the academic community understand and overcome the challenges in managing the geographic diversity editorial boards of academic journals.

Despite its strengths, the study also has several limitations. We have conducted the analyses at country level and not at the individual level. Individual level analyses would be impossible to

do for 16,000 editorial board members. However, conducting analyses at country level might mean that we are making misattributions to the proportion of US/Anglo editorial board members, as there will be US/Anglo academics who work in other countries. However, the reverse is true as well, so hopefully the two effects will balance out.

In addition, one could say that our analysis is flawed because "research productivity" reflects productivity in English language journals and, thus, it should be correlated to English skills. To our knowledge there are no published non-English productivity measures. Therefore, we used research productivity in English language journals as a proxy of research productivity of the management academics in all countries included in this study. We felt that using a proxy was preferable to not using a control variable of research productivity for two reasons: the journals included in this study are all printed in English, and we needed to account for possible variations in research productivity from country to country.

It can be further asserted that it makes sense to use English speaking scholars on editorial boards if the articles submitted to and published in a particular journal are printed in English. However, English is supposed to be the international language of science, and in most countries academics are now expected to publish in English-language journals. If we were to limit editorial board membership to native (or near native) English speakers we might introduce a bias towards accepting manuscripts from these countries. One can also suggest that English literacy is simply a reflection of general cultural similarity and similarity of academic cultures. However, this is a chicken-and-egg debate as it could also be asserted that it is English literacy that, for instance, leads Northern European countries to more easily assimilate Anglophone academic practices. As the measurement of language is much less ambiguous than other measures, we have chosen to focus on English language.

In addition, we recognised that there are factors that influence the geographic diversity of editorial boards that were not included in this study. For example, as a reviewer pointed out, this study does not measure why academics seek to join editorial boards. Being a member of editorial boards might be a more important criterion for promotion or tenure in some countries than in others. However, information on a country's advancement and compensation policies for academics is likely to be challenging to operationalise, because of the variability in these policies across higher institutions within countries. Further, by controlling for a country's research output, we partly account for the effect that variability across countries in advancement and compensation policies might have had on the study's results.

Finally, future research is needed to enhance our understanding of the advantages and disadvantages, and the facilitators and obstacles to editorial board geographic diversity. This understanding can be gained by, for example, interviewing journal editors to get insights on their editorial board selection process. However, journal editors only represent the "demand" side of this situation. On the "supply" side, future research could similarly interview authors and editorial board members to obtain information on, for example, the major obstacles to becoming editorial board members of management journals with editors from a different country to their country of residence. Future research could also investigate personal strategies to circumvent those obstacles, and the frequency in and reasons for declining (or accepting) invitations to serve on editorial boards. Interviews allow researchers to obtain testimonies from academics on the "demand" and "supply" sides of editorial board membership. Those testimonies would constitute the perspective of academics regarding the obstacles to becoming editorial board members. Such information would inform the implementation of effective interventions to increase the geographic diversity of editorial boards of management journals.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, enhanced understanding of what drives the geographic diversity of the editorial boards of our management journals is desirable for the growth of management knowledge. This study contributes to such an understanding, but more needs to be done. In the meantime, journal editors and professional associations can actively monitor the internationalisation of the editorial boards of their journals. Individual academics can also actively pursue editorial board membership goals through, for example, ad-hoc reviewing (see Baruch, Konrad, Aguinins & Starbuck, 2008) and networking at conferences.

REFERENCES

Arthur, M.B., Claman, P.H., & DeFillippi, R.J. (1995). Intelligent enterprise, intelligent careers. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9(4), 7-22.

Banks, S.P., Ge G., & Baker, J. (1991). Intercultural encounters and miscommunication. In N. Coupland, H. Giles & J.M. Wiemann (Eds.), *"Miscommunication" and problematic talk* (pp. 103-120). California: Sage Publications.

Baruch, Y. (2001). Global or North American? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 1(1),109-126.

Baruch, Y. & Hall, D.T. (2004). The academic career: A model for future careers in other sectors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(2), 241-262.

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, 627-648.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cox, T., Jr., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive,* 5(3), 45-56.

DeNisi, A.S. (2008). Managing the editorial review process. In Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinins, & Starbuck, W.H. (Eds.), *Opening the black box of editorship* (pp. 75-87). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Neuman, W.R. & Robinson, J.P. (2001). Social implications of the Internet. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 307-36.

Feldman, D.C. (2008). Building and maintaining a strong editorial board and cadre of ad hoc reviewers. In Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinins, & Starbuck, W.H. (Eds.), *Opening the black box of editorship* (pp. 68-74). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1981). The Role of Language in Ethnic Group Relations, In J.C Turner & H. Giles (Eds), *Intergroup Behavior* (pp. 199-243). Oxford: Blackwell.

Harzing, A.W.K., & Metz, I. (in press). Practicing what we preach: The geographic diversity of editorial boards. *Management International Review*.

Hodgson, G.M., & Rothman, H. (1999). The editors and authors in economics journals: A case of institutional oligopoly? *The Economics Journal,* 109, F165-F186.

Jacobs, N. & McFarlane, A. (2005). Conferences as communities of learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21, 317-329.

Joshi, A., Liao, H., & Rao, H. (2010). Bridging domains in workplace demography research. *Journal of Management published OnlineFirst*, DOI:10.1177/0149206310372969

Kheimets, N. G., & Epstein, A. D. (2005). Languages of higher education in contemporary Israel, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 37 (1), 55-70.

Kirkman, B. L., Rosen, B., Gibson, C. B., Tesluk, P. E., & McPherson, S. O. (2002). Five challenges to virtual team success. *Academy of Management Executive,* 16, 67-79.

Lukka, K., & Kasanen, E. (1996). Is accounting a global or a local discipline? *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 21, 755-773.

Mor Barak, M.E. (2005). *Managing diversity*. California: Sage.

Myerson, D.E. & Fletcher, J.K. (2000, January-February). A modest manifesto for shattering the glass ceiling. *Harvard Business Review,* 127-136.

Özbilgin, M. (2004). 'International' human resource management: Academic parochialism in editorial boards of the 'top'22 journals on international human resource management. *Personnel Review*, 33(2): 205-221.

Page, S. E. (2007). Making the difference: Applying a logic of diversity. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 6-20.

Polonsky, M.J., Garma, R., & Mittelstaedt, J.D. (2006). An examination of the globalization of authorship in publishing in 20 leading marketing journals. *European Business Review*, 18, 437-456.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1-24.

Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11(3), 21-31.

Rynes, S.L. (2008). Communicating with authors. In Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinins, & Starbuck, W.H. (Eds.), *Opening the black box of editorship* (pp. 56-67). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Segalla, M. (2008) Publishing in the right place or publishing the right thing: journal targeting and citations' strategies for promotion and tenure committees, *European Journal of International Management*, 2(2), 122-127.

Stremersch, S. & Verhoef, P.C. (2005). Globalization of authorship in the marketing discipline: Does it help or hinder the field? *Marketing Science*, 24(4), 585-594.

Svensson, G. (2005). Ethnocentricity in top marketing journals. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 23, 422-434.

Thomas, A.S., Shenkar, O., & Clarke, L. (1994). The Globalization of Our Mental Maps: Evaluating the Geographic Scope of JIBS Coverage**.** *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 675-686.

Tung, R.L. (2006). North American research agenda and methodologies: Past imperfect, future – limitless possibilities. *Asian Business & Management*, 5, 23-35.

Uzun, A. (2004). Assessing internationality of scholarly journals through foreign authorship patterns: The case of major journals in information science, and scientometrics. *Scientometrics*, 61(3), 457-465.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The Picture in 2007. Bonn: Lemmens.

Wildavsky, B. (2010). The Great Brain Race. How Global Universities are Reshaping the World. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Appendix A: List of journals included

Academy of Management Executive (Perspectives)
Academy of Management Journal
Academy of Management Review
Administrative Science Quarterly
Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources
Asia Pacific Journal of Management
Australasian Marketing Journal
British Journal of Management
California Management Review
Decision Sciences Journal
European Journal of Industrial Relations
European Journal of Marketing
European Journal of Operational Research
European Management Journal
Group & Organization Management
Human Resource Management
Industrial and Labor Relations Review
Industrial Marketing Management
Industrial Relations
International Business Review
International Journal of Research in Marketing
Intl Journal of Business Performance Management
Intl Journal of Cross-Cultural Management
Intl Journal of Human Resource Management
Intl Studies of Management & Organization
Jnl of Occupational and Organizational Psychology
Journal of Advertising
Journal of Applied Psychology
Journal of Business Research
Journal of Consumer Research

Journal of International Business Studies

Journal of International Management

Journal of Management

Journal of Marketing

Journal of Marketing Management

Journal of Marketing Research

Journal of Operations Management

Journal of Organizational Behavior

Journal of Retailing

Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science

Journal of Vocational Behavior

Journal of World Business

Long Range Planning

Management International Review

Management Science

Marketing Science

MIT Sloan Management Review

Multinational Business Review

Operations Research

Org. Behavior and Human Decision Process

Organization Science

Organization Studies

Personnel Psychology

Production and Operations Management

Strategic Management Journal

Technovation

Thunderbird International Business Review

Table 1: Correlation matrix

		EIASM members per 2002/1m people	EIASM members per 2007/1m people	AoM participants 2002/1m people	AoM participants 2007/1m people	Papers/1m people in Economics & Business (1999-2009)	English language skills (average, excellent, native)	2004 EB members per capita (US journals)	2004 EB members per capita (European journals)	2009 EB members per capita (US journals)	2009 EB members per capita (European journals)
EIASM members per 2002/1m people	Pearson cor.	1	.907**	.104	.244	.545**	.177	-.044	.416*	-.038	.430*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.607	.220	.004	.378	.826	.031	.850	.025
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
EIASM members per 2007/1m people	Pearson cor.	.907**	1	.127	.202	.559**	.266	-.065	.540**	-.047	.487*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.528	.313	.003	.180	.748	.004	.815	.010
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
AoM participants 2002/1m people	Pearson cor.	.104	.127	1	.913**	.732**	.690**	.837**	.463*	.912**	.525**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.607	.528		.000	.000	.000	.000	.015	.000	.005
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
AoM participants 2007/1m people	Pearson cor.	.244	.202	.913**	1	.721**	.616**	.699**	.448*	.828**	.552**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.220	.313	.000		.000	.001	.000	.019	.000	.003
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
Papers/1m people in Economics & Business (1999-2009)	Pearson cor.	.545**	.559**	.732**	.721**	1	.704**	.566**	.794**	.668**	.872**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.003	.000	.000		.000	.003	.000	.000	.000
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
English language skils (average, excellent, native)	Pearson cor.	.177	.266	.690**	.616**	.704**	1	.633**	.636**	.601**	.639**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.378	.180	.000	.001	.000		.000	.000	.001	.000
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
2004 EB members per capita (US journals)	Pearson cor.	-.044	-.065	.837**	.699**	.566**	.633**	1	.327	.900**	.383*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.826	.748	.000	.000	.003	.000		.096	.000	.048
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
2004 EB members per capita (European journals)	Pearson cor.	.416*	.540**	.463*	.448*	.794**	.636**	.327	1	.438*	.938**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.031	.004	.015	.019	.000	.000	.096		.022	.000
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	28	28
2009 EB members per capita (US journals)	Pearson cor.	-.038	-.047	.912**	.828**	.668**	.601**	.900**	.438*	1	.517**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.850	.815	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.017		.004
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
2009 EB members per capita (European journals)	Pearson cor.	.430*	.487*	.525**	.552**	.872**	.639**	.383*	.938**	.517**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025	.010	.005	.003	.000	.000	.037	.000	.006	
	N	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2: Country level partial correlation between conference attendance and editorial board membership, controlling for the country's research activity[+] (n= 26)

Conference Attendance per capita	**2004 EB US journals per capita**	**2004 EB EUR/UK journals per capita**	**2009 EB US journals per capita**	**2009 EB EUR/UK journals per capita**
AoM 2002	**.885*** **	.595***	.943***	.692***
AoM 2007	---	**---**	**.845*** **	.673***
EIASM 2002	.225	**.453***	.130	.478*
EIASM 2007	---	---	.141	**.546** **

[+] Figures in bold display the hypothesised relationships

* $p<0.05$, ** p <0.01, *** $p<0.001$

Table 3: Number and proportion of editorial board members for different levels of English language skills (n=27)*

Year	Average[1] (n=12)	Excellent[1] (n=10)	Average divided by native[2]	Native[1] (n=5)	Excellent divided by native[2]
1989	0.0048[a]	0.0257[b]	10%	0.0471[c]	55%
1994	0.0089[a]	0.0326[b]	15%	0.0607[c]	54%
1999	0.0104[a]	0.0510[b]	14%	0.0757[b]	67%
2004	0.0109[a]	0.0734[b]	12%	0.0943[b]	78%
2009	0.0160[a]	0.1219[b]	12%	0.1284[b]	95%

Notes:

[1] Number of editorial board members per 1,000,000 inhabitants for different levels of English language skills (columns 2, 3 and 5);

[2] Proportion of editorial board members in countries with average/excellent English language skills in relation to countries with native English language skills (columns 4 and 6)

* Results with the same superscript in each year are not significantly different.

Table 4: Countries in descending order of the number of editorial members per 1,000,000 inhabitants (n=27)

Country	EB membership per 1,000,000 inhabitants	Country	EB membership per 1,000,000 inhabitants
USA	0.1396	Belgium	0.0359
Singapore	0.0951	France	0.0209
Hong Kong	0.0942	Austria	0.0169
Israel	0.0894	Germany	0.0101
ANZ	0.0863	Greece	0.0088
Switzerland	0.0727	Hungary	0.0084
UK	0.0678	Spain	0.0067
Canada	0.0677	Italy	0.0051
Netherlands	0.0625	South Korea	0.0046
Sweden	0.0570	Japan	0.0029
Finland	0.0525	Poland	0.0019
Denmark	0.0473	**India**	0.0001
Ireland	0.0448	China	0.0001
Norway	0.0385		