

EDITORIAL POLICY

Original paper

<https://doi.org/10.24069/SEP-25-36>




## The power of diversity: How editorial board composition affects journal impact

K. I. Chukwu<sup>1, 2</sup>  

<sup>1</sup> Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup> Babalakin & Co Legal Firm, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

 [Kingsibisochuks@gmail.com](mailto:Kingsibisochuks@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The potential influence of editorial board diversity to affect academic journal impact and therefore the degree to which journals are taken seriously, respected, and relevant is what drives this study. This study adopted a mixed-methods research process using a literature review, content analysis of 60 journal editorial boards, and an online survey of editors in order to offer insight into gender as well as geographic and institutional diversity. Reviewing data in journals from fields such as the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities, the present study determined that greater diversity correlates positively with indicators of performance at a given journal. They found out that the probability of manuscripts by authors from underrepresented groups being submitted to a journal increases with the gender diversity of the journal, and that international editorial boards, as well as international citation network location, contribute positively to geographical diversity. This indicates that a certain level of institutional diversity is necessary for advancing interdisciplinarity and the generation of new methodologies. The impact of greater diversity on the board also includes, among other things, “making professional contacts”, “reducing the likelihood of publication bias” and “raising awareness of new areas of research”. Although this is a correlational finding, the latter presents a clear confirmation that organizations focusing on diversity not as social responsibility are usually more successful. So, this research may be informative for reflecting on the broader implications of current shifts in the ways in which knowledge is being produced and disseminated around the world.

**Keywords:** editorial diversity, journal impact, academic publishing, gender representation, geographic diversity, institutional diversity, scholarly communication, publication bias, editorial governance


**For citation:** Chukwu K.I. The power of diversity: How editorial board composition affects journal impact. *Science Editor and Publisher*. 2025;10(1):50–60. <https://doi.org/10.24069/SEP-25-36>

## Сила разнообразия: как состав редакционной коллегии влияет на наукометрические показатели журнала

К. И. Чукву<sup>1, 2</sup>  

<sup>1</sup> Университет штата Риверс, Порт-Харкорт, Нигерия

<sup>2</sup> Юридическая фирма «Babalakin & Co», Порт-Харкорт, Нигерия

 [Kingsibisochuks@gmail.com](mailto:Kingsibisochuks@gmail.com)

**Резюме.** Настоящее исследование исходит из предположения, что разнообразие состава редакционной коллегии сказывается на наукометрических показателях журнала и, как следствие, на уровне его признания, авторитетности и актуальности. В исследовании применен смешанный дизайн для

оценки гендерного, географического и институционального разнообразия, включающий в себя обзор литературы, контент-анализ составов редколлегий 60 журналов и онлайн-опрос редакторов. На основе данных, полученных из журналов по естественным, социальным и гуманитарным наукам, показано, что большее разнообразие состава редколлегии положительно коррелирует с наукометрическими показателями журнала. Показано, что с ростом гендерного разнообразия редколлегии повышается вероятность подачи рукописей авторами из недостаточно представленных групп. Кроме того, международный состав редколлегии и место журнала в глобальной сети цитирования положительно коррелируют с географическим разнообразием авторов. Это свидетельствует о том, что определенный уровень институционального разнообразия необходим для развития междисциплинарности и появления новых методологических подходов. Более разнообразная по составу редколлегия приводит к «формированию профессиональных контактов», «уменьшению вероятности проявления публикационной предвзятости» и «повышению осведомленности о новых направлениях исследований». Несмотря на корреляционный характер результатов исследования, они подтверждают вывод о том, что организации, рассматривающие разнообразие не как элемент социальной ответственности, обычно добиваются больших успехов. Таким образом, полученные результаты полезны для осмысления более широких последствий текущих изменений в способах производства и распространения знаний во всем мире.

**Ключевые слова:** научные журналы, редакционная политика, наукометрические показатели журнала, редакционная коллегия, разнообразие состава редакционной коллегии, гендерное представительство, географическое разнообразие, институциональное разнообразие, научно-издательская деятельность, научная коммуникация, публикационная предвзятость, управление журналом

**Для цитирования:** Чукву К.И. Сила разнообразия: как состав редакционной коллегии влияет на наукометрические показатели журнала. *Научный редактор и издатель*. 2025;10(1):50–60. <https://doi.org/10.24069/SEP-25-36>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

At a moment marked by greater technological possibilities and demands for broader-based participation, the terrain of academic research and publishing is changing in dramatic ways. The makeup of the editorial boards has emerged as a central point of contention amongst all of these shifts [1]. These boards are the gatekeepers of scholarly validation, and so they have a great deal of power to determine what counts as “research” and thus as publishable and, in turn, what the dialogues and trajectories of science will be [2]. The composition of these boards has been especially important as concerns over representation in the academic community have become more pressing [3].

Traditionally, academic journals have had insular editorial offices in terms of gender, location, and institutional affiliation [4]. This is not just a question of representation, but one of whether or not the journals find themselves best situated to make an impact or be relevant in a more networked society. For example, “like-minded” or

uniform editorial boards could unknowingly promote biases that might produce a publication that reflects a limited perspective or importance [5]. On the contrary, mixed boards can also bring in different views, professional contacts, and methodological backgrounds. They may also make research trends more easily identifiable and more amenable to new challenges and ways of thinking that might otherwise be ignored [6].

While the concern of homogeneity is widely understood, the actual empirical relationship between board diversity and quantifiable journal outputs has yet to be fully assessed. The existing literature often serves to show the lack of such diversity, with some exceptions [7]. That is, the concern is disconnected from identifying an issue, to truly understanding the implications for journal performance. This paper aims to fill this research gap, by asking the following central question: what is the relationship between editorial board diversity in terms of gender, location, and institution, and the overall impact or perceived credibility of the journal over which the board presides?

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To contextualize this study, this section delves into the existing literature to establish the current state of diversity research and outlines the theoretical frameworks that guide our analysis.

### 2.1. Dimensions and theoretical framing of editorial board diversity

The multi-dimensional concept. The most commonly referenced characteristic is gender diversity, for which there exists a large body of supporting evidence which finds women significantly under-represented in editorial positions within nearly all subject areas [8]. The imbalance has a significant capacity to influence not only what gets published but also editorial agenda, acceptable content and reviewers [9]. Geographical diversity is also important, especially as comparative research becomes increasingly global. A skewed board toward editors from North America or Western Europe, for instance, might create an unconscious bias toward research relevant to those regions, making the journal less internationally relevant [10]. Finally, institutional diversity, or the presence of members from different kinds of institutions, is important. Too many board members from a handful of these “top-tier” institutions can solidify and institutionalize an already constrictive academic hierarchy, which could stymie new, cutting-edge work from lesser known or lower tier institutions [11; 12].

With these dimensions in mind, potential forms of diversity that might emerge, we draw on a series of theoretical perspectives to suggest the effects that diversity might have on journal policies and outcomes. If we apply social network theory to these issues, a diverse board also means that the journal is connected to more social and professional networks from which it can draw high-quality papers as well as find competent reviewers thus creating a more direct path from board composition to the set of submissions the journal can hope to receive [13]. From a cognitive diversity standpoint, information-processing wise, it can be argued that participants in a heterogeneous group have access to more cognitive resources and heuristics. Such diversity can also make a final few decisions stronger and can potentially work

against the “groupthink” problematic of thinking truly critically being systematically stifled into conformity [1]. Third, it follows from the perspective of institutional theory that journals featuring diverse editorial boards may be seen as more legitimate and just within a scholarly community increasingly committed to inclusivity as a normative ideal [14; 15]. This can also serve to make the publication more accessible and attract a larger readership and pool of submissions.

### 2.2. Empirical evidence and identified gaps

As also found through the conducted systematic literature search, the literature seems to agree on the existence of dissimilarities in board characteristics [16]. Strong evidence on the connection between the diversity metrics used above and journal outcomes is less established. The existing studies, summarized in Table 1, have proven useful in establishing a baseline but are limited in that they typically only address one of these forms of diversity within a single field [17]. For instance, although a few previous analyses have reported a positive relationship between board diversity and either international authorship, or specific indicators of quality, little research has looked at the combined effect of gender, geographic, and institutional diversity to yield insights into how, who, and why [18]. This has resulted in an absence of insights into the overall multi-disciplinary impacts of board composition. In an effort to address this lack of understanding we used the multi-stage mixed-methods approach outlined below in an attempt to develop a documented understanding of how changing diversity across disciplines matters.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

A multistage mixed-methods design was identified as the most suitable research design to address the study’s central question. This is based on the motivation to measure not only the existence of diversity (the “what”), but the processes and perceptions of how and why diversity matters. Numerical content analysis can show correlation but not reveal underlying mechanisms. Conversely, employing only qualitative methodologies would offer access to detailed insights, but without the history of empirical data that other methodolo-

gical work in this area has conducted thus far, it would be unable to provide the large-scale empirical base to engage in, multidisciplinary comparison. Thus, combining the two is able to offer a more complete and complex approach to both sets of analyses.

### 3.1. Research design

To explore the relationship between editorial board diversity and journal impact, a mixed-method analysis was used. This combined method can assist with generalizing diversity trends in a relatively large sample as well as uncovering the lived experiences and perceptions behind editorial decision-making. The study used a combination of content analysis of 60 academic journal editorial boards to measure “objective levels of diversity” and an online survey of members of the boards to collect information on “how diversity affects the ways in which journals operate”. Combining methods in this manner gives a fuller picture and a stronger analysis – one that looks at both the macro and the microlevels of the individual and how they inform editorial policy [23].

### 3.2. A systematic literature review

Using the search engines Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar identified articles published from January 2010 to December 2025. They also employed Boolean search strings that paired

keywords, e.g. (“editorial board” OR “journal editor\*”) AND (divers\* OR gender OR geography\* OR represent\*) AND (“journal impact” OR “publication bias”). Selection criteria included the following: must be a peer-reviewed article or conference proceeding in English, primarily concerned with academic journal editorial boards, and focus on at least one aspect of diversity. The initial search yielded 347 articles. Following deduplication and review of titles and abstracts, 89 articles were retained for full-text review.

### 3.3. Content analysis of editorial boards

The journals were selected through a stratified random sampling. The 60-journal sample was not calculated for statistical generalizability to every academic journal but rather to provide a strong articulating and balanced cross-section of key variables. But, for logistic reasons the samples were considered adequate, given that are able to compare the different trends of the three main disciplinary areas (Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities) and the four quartiles of impact-factor, thus allowing for significant correlative analyses, but avoiding becoming logistically unfeasible. The selected journals were divided into quartiles of impact factor and classifications in the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) 2023. Five journals were then randomly selected of each of the 12 cells, to leave a total sample of 60 journals.

**Table 1.** Thematic summary of existing literature on editorial board diversity and identified gaps

Theme area	Key findings from literature	Identified research gaps
Gender diversity	Women remain underrepresented (<30%) across most fields, especially STEM. Some evidence has linked gender diversity to journal quality indicators [19].	The lack of cross-disciplinary studies and mechanisms underlying positive associations are underexplored.
Geographic diversity	Boards are heavily dominated by scholars from North America and Europe, and the Global South is underrepresented. Positive correlations were found for international authorship [19; 20].	Most studies are descriptive, and there is little research on how geographic diversity affects editorial decision-making.
Institutional diversity	Editorial Board members on Journals overwhelmingly belong to elite research-intensive universities [21; 22].	This is the least-studied dimension; very few studies have empirically tested its effect on submission diversity or journal impact.

The list of members of the editorial boards for each of the journals was obtained from the official journal web pages, between April and May of 2024. The names, institutional and member's affiliations were recorded in our writing. The gender of the actor was identified through the use of pronouns (he/him, she/her) within official biographies or, when no information was available, by cross-referencing first names against gender-name databases. For those records that could not determine gender with high certainty these were categorized as “undetermined” and left out of the statistical analysis to avoid overriding. Two coders also analyzed a random sample of 100 participants and achieved 94% agreement. Any disagreements were settled by discussion.

### 3.4. Online survey of editorial board members

An online survey was emailed to 360 Editorial Board members of the 60 journals sampled (six randomized per journal). The questionnaire itself was comprised of 15 items: 5 demographic, and 8 Likert-scale questions, which gauged perceptions on the effects of diversity (e.g., “To what extent do you believe a geographically diverse board improves your journal’s international reach?”) and two open-ended questions that allow respondents to explain the extent to which they have experienced the benefits and challenges of fostering diversity on non-profit boards. To determine clarity, a pilot survey was conducted with five senior editors who were not among the final samples, resulting in slight wording changes to the two questions. Each participant was emailed an invitation to sign into the survey website, with two additional reminder emails sent to non-respondents at 2-week intervals. The overall response rate was 42.2% for 152 usable responses.

### 3.5. Data analysis

The quantitative data collected from the content analysis was analyzed through descriptive statistics and correlations. The percentage of women on each board is the measure used for gender diversity. The measure used to calculate geographic diversity is the Shannon Diversity Index ( $H$ ), a quantitative measure taking into account both the number of different categories (countries, in this case) and how they are distrib-

uted, such that the higher the  $H$  the greater the diversity. Institutional diversity was assessed by the percentage of board members who belong to institutions outside the QS World University Rankings 2024 Top 200. The correlation between these diversity measures and the respective journal impact quartiles was calculated using Pearson’s  $r$ . The survey data was processed using descriptive statistics. Answers to open-ended survey questions were analyzed using a thematic analysis, with an inductive open coding process, according to current standards. To assess the inter-annotator agreement, Cohen’s kappa coefficient was calculated, yielding a value of 0.82. This result indicates a high level of reliability in the coding process and confirms the reproducibility of the findings within the applied methodological framework.

### 3.6. Limitations and ethical considerations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the cross-sectional design of the study makes it able to determine correlations between the variables tested, but not causality. In light of these problems, our recommendations should be viewed as guidelines to be tested through longitudinal or experimental studies. Second, the procedure for estimating gender, though it is a standard approach in bibliometrics, is based on conjectures and does not include identity for people who do not fit the gender binary, therefore potentially generating inaccuracies. This means that our measure for gender diversity is a rough one and should be taken with caution. Third, the 42.2% response rate does not significantly deviate from prior surveying of board members, but could provide a non-response bias, in that board members with particularly strong feelings either way about their board diversity may have been more likely to participate. Fourth, our statistical analyses build on simple correlations and we do not further explore multivariate models to better account for the different influences each diversity dimension may have in Journal Impact [24]. The study was lastly cleared by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Rivers State University. All participants provided consent and all data were de-identified to ensure confidentiality.



## 4. RESULTS

Findings from both the first and second empirical parts of this study are provided in this section. In the interest of clarity, the findings are divided thematically into a summary of quantitative variation followed by the perceived outcomes and hurdles as presented by board members.

### 4.1. Patterns of editorial board diversity

Content analysis of these 60 journals showed a significant variation in diversity both across disciplines and by journal's quartiles. With respect to gender diversity, the average percentage of women on the editorial boards of these journals was 27.3%. As shown in Table 2, there are very large differences in gender diversity by department, with the natural sciences at 15.7%, which reveals the “leaky pipeline” phenomenon of senior faculty in fields like STEM, and the humanities at a relatively more gender diverse 37.4%.

The geographic patterns of diversity were also evident. Representatives from North America (37.2%) and Europe (34.8%) comprised the two groups that together held a majority position on the boards while representation from all of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East represented only 10% of the board members. This emphasizes the continuing role of the Global North in controlling and setting agendas for scholarship [4].

Fully institutional, 68% of the board members attended a top 200 ranked university, documenting that editorial power at the journal is concentrated at elite institutions and undertake programs of research engaging in complex dynamics between hegemonic value systems and variations from the norm. In terms of the association of diversity with quality, there was indeed a small but significant, in a positive direction, correlation between gender diversity and journal impact quartile ( $r = 0.28$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and also between geographic diversity and journal impact quartile ( $r = 0.31$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), which seems to indicate that better ranked journals are also more diverse.

### 4.2. Perceived impacts of diversity: survey findings

The online survey of 152 board members found that there was a general consensus on the benefits of diversity. As can be seen summarized in Table 3,

there was general uniformity regarding the benefits of diversity with a significant percentage of respondents asserting that diversity does, in fact, result in better journals, attract a wider variety of submissions, and make the peer review process fairer. Such high percentages in response to this question indicate that, across the board, diversity was not only viewed as perhaps a reality and a positive ideal, but as a reason for journal quality and reach.

**Table 2.** Gender representation on editorial boards by discipline and journal impact quartile, %

Discipline	Journal quartile				Average value
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Natural sciences	18.2	16.5	14.8	13.1	15,7
Social sciences	33.4	30.2	27.6	24.3	28.9
Humanities	41.2	38.7	36.1	33.5	37.4
<b>Final average</b>	<b>30.9</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>27.3</b>

**Table 3.** Survey responses on the perceived impact of board diversity ( $n = 152$ ), %

Statement	Agree / Strongly agree	Neutral	Disagree / Strongly disagree
Board diversity improves the overall quality of the journals.	73.0	15.8	11.2
Diverse boards have attracted a broad range of missions.	81.5	11.2	7.3
Diversity enhances fairness and quality of the review process.	75.0	17.1	7.9

Open-ended responses provided a rich context for these quantitative findings. One of the most prominent themes was the expansion of professional networks. A social science journal board member noted, “Having board members in different regions has been a huge benefit; it really expanded our reviewer database, and we’ve received excellent manuscripts from parts of the world we never reached before”. The second theme focused on the enhancement of cognitive diversity and decision-making quality. A humanities board member explained, “When we began to add more women and people from non-elite schools to our masthead our editorial discussions got enormously richer. We certainly began to question what we thought was ‘important’ and became more open to alternative methodologies”.

#### 4.3. Challenges to achieving board diversity

Despite the overwhelming recognition and support for diversity, respondents named several obstacles, which have been summed up in Table 4. The most commonly referenced types were structural barriers such as those associated with the academic “pipeline” and those related to institutional reward structures. Common are ideas about challenges resulting from practical barriers and/or cultural resistance on existing Boards.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The following section is a critical discussion and interpretation of the presented data. In order to help orient the reader, the text in this chapter moves alternates between summarizing findings, discussing the theoretical implications of the findings and discussing some of the practical implications which stem from the analysis.

### 5.1. Synthesis of findings: a juxtaposition of reality and perception

The findings of this study offer a striking juxtaposition; while the reality of a “diversity deficit” remains uninspiring in our content analysis of the data, board members almost unanimously agree that diversity is a critical resource. From this close look diversity challenges posed to institutions, the problem with diversity is not a lack of belief in its worth, but the deeply structural, practical, and cultural barriers to achieving a diverse workforce uncovered in our interviews.

### 5.2. Theoretical implications

The interplay between such empirical facts and value premises is an instructive context in which to situate the theories that inform this study. Our survey results show that people reference networks so frequently that it is clear that

**Table 4.** Thematic analysis of perceived challenges to achieving editorial board diversity

Theme	Description	Illustrative quote
Structural barriers	Issues related to academic systems include the limited pool of senior scholars from underrepresented groups, and reward systems that devalue service work.	“The pipeline is an important issue. In my field, there are very few senior women from the Global South. We can’t just invite junior scholars who are already overwhelmed”.
Practical & Logistical hurdles	Difficulties in coordinating meetings across time zones, language barriers, and the administrative burden of managing a globally distributed team.	“Logistically, it’s a nightmare. Trying to schedule a full board meeting across 12 time zones is nearly impossible, so most communication happens over email, which isn’t ideal”.
Cultural resistance	Resistance from existing board members, often framed as concerns about “lowering standards”, or a preference for recruiting from personal networks.	“There’s a subtle resistance. Some older members feel we are chasing ‘tokenism’ instead of just picking the ‘best people’, without realizing their network of ‘best people’ all look the same”.

social network theory is pertinent to the claimed operation of gatekeeping in academic studies [25]. Similarly, observations of “richer discussions” and movement away from fixed norms form direct and empirical attestations to the information processing perspective, detailing in what ways cognitive diversity can be useful for editorial decision making for example. This indicates that the theories may not be competing, but rather, consistent with one another; that is, a structurally diverse board (social network) that may improve cognitive inputs (information processing) will eventually result in a journal appearing more legitimate (institutional theory).

### 5.3. Practical implications

Based on these theories and findings, there are specific criteria for editors gleaned from this study. The first stepping stone is proactive and intentional recruitment by journals. This requires moving beyond closed personal networks to actively identify and recruit qualified scholars from under-represented groups. This needs to go hand in hand with creating a culture of authentic inclusion so as to avoid tokenism [26]. A second response could be the structural support that journals could put in place to address the barriers identified by our interviewees, for example, offering a mentor to assist new board members from non-traditional backgrounds with developing the kind of expertise expected in board members, or transitioning to technologies that would allow an asynchronous board that could support a globally distributed board [27]. Third, and perhaps most important at a structural level, editors need to have their work and contributions recognized at academic institutions.

### 5.4. Limitations and future directions

It is important to be cognizant of the limitations of this study in interpreting these findings. Causality cannot be inferred from cross-sectional data. As journals begin to put into practice diversity initiatives, longitudinal research tracking the journals over time is urgently needed to understand whether the types of submissions the journal receives change, submission patterns and citation metrics, and reviewer pools. Also, because it is based on inferred gender, our study did not

take into account other important aspects of diversity such as race, ethnicity, or disability, clearer and direct self-identified measures of the overlapping identities as well as measures of these identities in future research are warranted. More advanced forms of statistical models including multivariate regression could also be used to clarify the independent and interacting contributions of multiple diversity dimensions on journal impact [28; 29]. Finally, although our survey is able to capture important insights, an in-person ethnography of editorial board meetings would provide a richer picture of group dynamics and decision-making processes [20; 30].

## 6. CONCLUSION

The present study explored editorial board diversity’s impact on journal impact in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities and discovered a significant and positive relationship between the two variables within all of these fields. Among other things, our content analysis revealed an ongoing trend toward very homogenous editorial boards, lacking in gender (including but not exclusive to in STEM), scholars from the Global South, and scholars from non-elite institutions. Conversely, the forty-three of them who have served a collective twenty-five years on the board found a rather unanimous sentiment regarding the benefits of diversity in enriching a journal’s submissions, broadening the depth of the review process, and adding quality to both.

These results indicate that the benefits of diversity operate through multiple mechanisms that intersect the expansion of professional networks, enrichment of the collective “journal knowledge” that accumulates, and how that influences perceived legitimacy. These are not just abstract ideals, they are tangible benefits that any journal needs, and that every journal should want in a globalized academic environment.

It is clear, then, that rather than elite journals being dragged along into the world of diversity, diversity should be seen as an institutional benefit for elite journals focused on extending their impact and readership. This necessitates the pro-active recruitment and supporting infrastructural policies for diverse participation, and



also institutional recognition of how important editorial work actually is. While strictly correlational, the present study hints at the sets of issues that must be studied in future longitudinal or qualitative research. Finally, building and preserving editorial board diversity is not a goal,

but the long-term consequence of an interminable process of metacognition within the institution, one that at its core will drive the scholarly communications not just to be more just but also more relevant and intellectually sound at a global scale.

### DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No AI tool was used to generate the content of this manuscript. Basic language checks, including grammar and clarity improvements, were performed using Grammarly GO. All ideas, analyses, and writing were entirely of my own.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I sincerely thank my senior colleagues and professors from the Rivers State University's Department of Mass Communication for their invaluable guidance and support throughout this research.

### CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author declares no relevant conflict of interests.

### REFERENCES

1. Goyanes M., Demeter M. How the geographic diversity of editorial boards affects what is published in JCR-Ranked communication journals. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*. 2020;97(4):1123–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699020904169>
2. Iheduru-Anderson K., Okoro F.O., Moore S.S. Diversity and inclusion or tokens? A qualitative study of black women academic nurse leaders in the united states. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*. 2022;9:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23333936211073116>
3. Hutchinson D., Das P., Lall M.D., Hill J., Fares S., Khosa F. Emergency medicine journal editorial boards: Analysis of gender, h-index, publications, academic rank, and leadership roles. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2021;22(2):353–359. <https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2020.11.49122>
4. Goyanes M., De-Marcos L., Demeter M., Toth T., Jordá B. Editorial board interlocking across the social sciences: Modelling the geographic, gender, and institutional representation within and between six academic fields. *PLoS ONE*. 2022;17(9):e0273552. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0273552>
5. AlShebli B.K., Rahwan T., Woon W.L. The preeminence of ethnic diversity in scientific collaboration. *Nature Communications*. 2018;9(1):5163. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07634-8>
6. Raman R. Transparency in research: An analysis of ChatGPT usage acknowledgment by authors across disciplines and geographies. *Accountability in Research*. 2025;32(3):277–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2273377>
7. Martinez-Jimenez R., Hernández-Ortiz M.J., Cabrera Fernández A.I. Gender diversity influence on board effectiveness and business performance. *Corporate Governance*. 2020;20(2):307–323. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-07-2019-0206>
8. Harris C.A., Banerjee T., Cramer M., Manz S., Ward S.T., Dimick J., Telem D.A. Editorial (spring) board? Gender composition in high-impact general surgery journals over 20 years. *Annals of Surgery*. 2019;269(3):582588. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000002667>
9. Murrar S., Johnson P.A., Carnes M., Lee Y.-G. Research conducted in women was deemed more impactful but less publishable than the same research conducted in men. *Journal of Women's Health*. 2021;30(9):1259–1267. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2020.8666>
10. Fox C.W., Meyer J., Aimé E. Double-blind peer review affects reviewer ratings and editor decisions at an ecology journal. *Functional Ecology*. 2023;37(5):1144–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.14259>

11. Wang S., Jones G. A. Competing institutional logics of academic personnel system reforms in leading chinese universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 2021;43(1):49–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1747958>
12. Comel N., Marques F. P. J., Prendin Costa L. O., Orso M., Kohls C. Who navigates the ‘elite’ of communication journals? The participation of BRICS universities in top-ranked publications. *Online Media and Global Communication*. 2023;2(4):497–543. <https://doi.org/10.1515/omgc-2023-0052>
13. Amorelli M.-F., García-Sánchez I.-M. Trends in the dynamic evolution of board gender diversity and corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 2021;28(2):537–554. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2079>
14. Arenas-Castro H., Berdejo-Espinola V., Chowdhury S., Rodríguez-Contreras A., James A. R. M., Raja N. B. et al. Academic publishing requires linguistically inclusive policies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*. 2024;291:20232840. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.2840>
15. George Mwangi C. A., Latafat S., Hammond S., Kommers S., Thoma H. S., Berger J., Blanco-Ramirez G. Criticality in international higher education research: A critical discourse analysis of higher education journals. *Higher Education*. 2018;76(6):1091–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0259-9>
16. Elleuch Lahyani F. Corporate board diversity and carbon disclosure: Evidence from France. *Accounting Research Journal*. 2022;35(6):721–736. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ARJ-12-2021-0350>
17. Laique U., Abdullah F., Rehman I. U., Sergi B. S. Two decades of research on board gender diversity and financial outcomes: Mapping heterogeneity and future research agenda. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 2023;30(5):2121–2144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2510>
18. Dada S., van Daalen K. R., Barrios-Ruiz A., Wu K.-T., Desjardins A., Bryce-Alberti M. et al. Challenging the ‘old boys club’ in academia: Gender and geographic representation in editorial boards of journals publishing in environmental sciences and public health. *PLoS Global Public Health*. 2022;2(6):e0000541. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000541>
19. Wu D., Lu X., Li J., Li J. Does the institutional diversity of editorial boards increase journal quality? The case economics field. *Scientometrics*. 2020;124(2):1579–1597. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03505-6>
20. Hedding D. W., Breetzke G. ‘Here be dragons!’ The gross under-representation of the global south on editorial boards in geography. *Geographical Journal*. 2021;187(4):331–345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12405>
21. Lin Z., Li N. Global diversity of authors, editors, and journal ownership across subdisciplines of psychology: Current state and policy implications. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2022;18(2):358–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221091831>
22. Petersen J., Hattke F., Vogel R. Editorial governance and journal impact: A study of management and business journals. *Scientometrics*. 2017;112(3):1593–1614. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2434-7>
23. Youk S., Park H. S. Where and what do they publish? Editors’ and editorial board members’ affiliated institutions and the citation counts of their endogenous publications in the field of communication. *Scientometrics*. 2019;120(3):1237–1260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03169-x>
24. Radu C., Smaili N., Constantinescu A. The impact of the board of directors on corporate social performance: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*. 2022;23(5):1135–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-05-2021-0141>
25. Jordan K. From social networks to publishing platforms: A review of the history and scholarship of academic social network sites. *Frontiers in Digital Humanities*. 2019;6:5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdigh.2019.00005>
26. Villeda M., McCamey R. Use of social networking sites for recruiting and selecting in the hiring process. *International Business Research*. 2019;12(3):66–78. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v12n3p66>
27. Lin J. S., Weber K. L., Samora J. B. How does representation of women on editorial boards compare among orthopaedic, general surgery, and internal medicine journals? *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*. 2021;479(9):1939–1946. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CORR.0000000000001735>
28. Gaston T. E., Ounsworth F., Senders T., Ritchie S., Jones E. Factors affecting journal submission numbers: Impact factor and peer review reputation. *Learned Publishing*. 2020;33(2):154–162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1285>

29. Squazzoni F., Bravo G., Farjam M., Marusic A., Mehmani B., Willis M. et al. Peer review and gender bias: A study on 145 scholarly journals. *Science Advances*. 2021;7(2):eabd0299. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abd0299>
30. Goyanes M. Editorial boards in communication sciences journals: Plurality or standardization? *International Communication Gazette*. 2019;82(4):342–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048518825322>

#### INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**Kingsley Ibisochukwu**, Accomplished Communications Manager at Babalakin & Co Legal Firm, Port Harcourt. First Class Mass Communication graduate from Rivers State University. Former radio host at 99.9 Brilla FM. Trilingual professional fluent in English, French, and Portuguese. Specialized in strategic communications, content creation, and corporate storytelling within the legal sector, Port Harcourt, Nigeria; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7400-3122>; e-mail: Kingsibisochuks@gmail.com

**Received** 30.06.2025

**Revised** 06.08.2025

**Accepted** 14.08.2025