



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

Sungbin Youk¹ · Hee Sun Park²

Received: 25 February 2019 / Published online: 1 July 2019
© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary 2019

Abstract

This study examined the geographical diversity and publication patterns of editors and editorial board members in communication journals. The results indicated that the diversity of the editorial community was related to the journal's affiliated association, international orientation, and interdisciplinary nature. As for the publications, publishing in the editors' and editorial board members' own journals was not a norm. In addition, the type of their publications was related to the number of authors; an editor or an editorial board member is more likely to publish an empirical paper than a non-empirical one when it is written with other scholars. As for citations, the average citation count of the endogenous publications was below the journals' citation count per publication. Furthermore, the endogenous publication's total number of citations was not related to whether the editors and editorial board members were affiliated to institutions located in the United States. However, the journals' affiliated associations, the number of authors, and the publication type and year were related to the total number of citations.

Keywords Communication · Editors · Editorial board members · World polity theory · Endogenous publication · Citation count

✉ Hee Sun Park
heesunpark321@gmail.com; heesunpark@korea.ac.kr

Sungbin Youk
youksb@gmail.com; sungbinyouk@korea.ac.kr

¹ School of Media and Communication, Korea University, 412-10, Bihaeng-ro, Sanseo-myeon, Jangsu-gun, Jeollabuk-do, Republic of Korea

² School of Media and Communication, Korea University, 606, 145 Anam-Ro, Seongbuk-Gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Introduction

Academic publications are important for both scholars and the academic field as a whole. As for researchers, their publications are used as markers for their academic performance and may affect their salary as well as employment status (Dusansky and Vernon 1998; Graves et al. 1982; Raelin 2008; Sauer 1988; Tuckman and Leahey 1975). In terms of academia, what gets published in the journal is pertinent to the accumulation of information and knowledge because an academic journal is an arena for communicating knowledge (Crosier 2004; Mort et al. 2004).

Editors and editorial board members collectively contribute to the publication process of their journals (Zsindely et al. 1982a). According to Corley and Schinoff (2017), they have additional responsibilities, which are different from that of an author. These are the duties of being the gatekeepers of knowledge (Forrester and Watson 1994). In particular, the editors and the editorial board members are responsible for evaluating manuscripts, monitoring the manuscripts' adherence to ethical standards, and controlling the quality of the journals' publications (Giménez-Toledo et al. 2009). Therefore, their contributions influence the scientific relevance of their journals (Pagel and Hudetz 2011).

Considering this influence, some scholars advocated diversifying the editorial board members. According to Demeter (2018a), the diversity of the editorial board members' affiliated institutions is related to that of the journals' publications. This may be because the way a scholar evaluates a manuscript is contingent on their academic backgrounds and perspectives (Harzing and Metz 2013). For instance, the editorial board members may emphasize certain citation system and favor literature from a specific country depending on their affiliated institutions (Lauf 2005). According to Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2005), an editorial board dominated by the United States may subconsciously prefer a certain type of submissions, such as the American style of research and writing. In other words, non-North American studies can be appreciated more by diversifying the editorial community (Tung 2006). The homogeneous editorial community may prevent not only the appreciation of certain manuscripts but also the development of social science. This is because examining theories and concepts from vastly different perspectives facilitate its development (Alatas 2003). Consequently, the homogeneity in editors and editorial board members may lead to "academic myopia and paradigmatic inertia" (Svensson 2005, p. 429).

Along with the editors' and editorial board members' affiliated institutions, their publications also merit an in-depth consideration. As advanced scholars are both the consumers and the producers of published research (Frey 2003), the scholars' roles as reviewers and researchers are intertwined when they publish in their affiliated journals. Having the judges and the judged come from an identical population is likely to develop norms that are specific to that community (Strang and Siler 2015). Furthermore, according to Campanario et al. (2006), the articles published by the journals' editorial board members (hereinafter referred to as endogenous publications) accounted for a substantial proportion of the journals' impact factors.

This paper focuses on the editorial communities' affiliated institutions and the endogenous publications of the journals published by two communication associations: the National Communication Association (NCA) and the International Communication Association (ICA). While ICA is an international organization recognized by the United Nations, NCA is based in the United States. The geographical dispersion of their affiliated institutions will provide a yardstick for measuring the diversity of their editorial communities. Regarding the endogenous publications, they are first categorized by publication

type (i.e., empirical or non-empirical) and authorship (i.e., sole author or multiple authors). Second, the number of citations per endogenous publications are compared to the journals' average impact factor. Third, the endogenous publication's total number of citations is analyzed in terms of the readability of their abstracts.

The diversity of editors and editorial board members

As a narrative of globalization, the world polity theory provides a theoretical framework for examining the diversity of communication journals' editorial community. According to Meyer (1999), the world polity perspective views the world as a cultural construction. This construction is influenced by rules and norms that are defined globally rather than those of individual nation-states (Thomas 2009). These cultural norms are fostered by international organizations (Caruso 2008). Thus, the world polity perspective enables the examination of societal phenomena, such as the diversity of a journal's editor and editorial board members, beyond the local and national boundaries.

The world polity theory addresses institutional isomorphism where the societies around the world become homogenized, mostly reflecting the norms of the Western institutions (Caruso 2008). The cultural hegemony diffuses across the globe via international organizations (Boli and Thomas 1997; Meyer 1999). In respect to science and knowledge, scientific practice become standardized as it spreads during academic interactions (Paasi 2005). Scientists may adopt a certain way of producing academic publications by benchmarking the research they have consumed. More precisely, according to Demeter (2018d), the international standard of science refers to the Western and, to a certain extent, American standard. This is because the publication spaces of social science journals are mostly limited to English-speaking countries. This standard of scientific research encompasses certain norms of scientific publications, such as having a clear method and examining the theory in the research (Demeter 2018c).

The international standard of science may be influenced by the diversity of journals' editors and editorial board members. For instance, an editorial community dominated by scholars working in the United States may prefer the American style of research and writing (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005). In addition, scholars may prefer certain methodology depending on their affiliated institutions (Bunz 2005). This may be because scholars work in institutions that reflect their academic training and paradigm, which not only influences how they conduct their own studies but also how they evaluate other scholars' research. Hence, the preference of editors and editorial board members may affect what gets published in their journal.

In communication journals, the homogeneity of editors and editorial board members was repeatedly documented. Lauf (2005) examined 40 leading communication journals from 1998 to 2002 and found that most of the editorial board members were affiliated to institutions located in the United States and other English-speaking countries. In addition, the proportion of non-U.S. editorial board members in the communication journals was negatively correlated to the proportion of authors from the United States. This may be because non-U.S. scholars are less familiar with the journals' standards and the editorial boards' expectations compared to U.S. scholars. Lauf's research was corroborated by Demeter (2018a). By examining 72 communication journals from 2013 to 2017, Demeter concluded that it is rare for scholars from Eastern Europe, Africa, and developing Asian countries to be editorial board members of leading journals. Consistent with the previous studies, Goyanes (2019) found that the United States, the United Kingdom,

Canada, Australia, Germany to dominate the editorial communities (79.4%) of 39 communication journals. According to Goyanes, the lack of diversity reflects a hegemonic view of research, such as the American style of research. This makes certain scholars more likely to be visible than others and to be appointed as editors and editorial board members. Thus, the journals with a skewed distribution of the editorial board members “are not prepared to review international manuscripts” (Lauf 2005, p. 148).

As the world polity theory emphasizes the role of an international organization, the diversity of the editorial board members should be considered with respect to the journals’ affiliated organizations. As for journals published by an international organization, their publishers and editors-in-chief may appoint editorial board members from a variety of countries to cover a broad range of cultures (Bakker and Rigter 1985). According to Flowerdew (2001), having adequate representation of a particular cultural or an ethnic group in the journal can ensure the submissions of authors from such groups to be treated fairly. Flowerdew also stated that a journal may have non-native English speakers in its editorial community to live up to its name as an international journal. For instance, ICA increased the proportion of non-U.S. membership, diversified its conference venues, and recruited international scholars to its top positions (i.e., presidency and fellowship) in attempt to be “a truly international organization” (Wiedemann and Meyen 2016, p. 1504). Despite the effort, the academic environment of non-U.S. countries might have changed instead of the association itself. Instead of diversifying the association, the non-U.S. scholars facilitated the diffusion of certain academic standards by being the role model of other researchers in their home countries. For instance, international scholars may believe that adherence to the U.S.-centered academic tradition is an implicit prerequisite for them to become a candidate for ICA presidency or fellowship. This is because the non-U.S. scholars in the top positions of ICA are closely connected to the United States (e.g., being educated at or being associated with institutions in the United States). Similarly, Demeter (2018d) stated that for scholars from the periphery countries to be globally recognized in academia, they need to be educated from the core countries (i.e., the United States or other Western countries). Furthermore, the scientific communities of the periphery countries may emulate that of the core in order to build a compatible social and academic capital (Toth 2018).

In addition to a journal’s affiliated institutions, there are other characteristics of a journal that are related to the diversity of its editorial community. To explain the diversity of the editorial community, Lauf (2005) hypothesized that the diversity was related to the journal’s affiliated association, impact factor, international orientation, age, and interdisciplinary nature. They found that the proportion of non-U.S. editors was related to the journal’s international orientation and age. To investigate the characteristics of the journals affecting the diversity of their editorial community, the following hypotheses are advanced:

H1 Communication journals affiliated to an international organization (i.e., ICA) will have more diverse editors and editorial board members than those affiliated to a national organization (i.e., NCA).

H2 The diversity of editors and editorial board members of a journal will be related to its impact factor.

H3 Communication journals with an international orientation will have more diverse editors and editorial board members than those without.

H4 The older communication journals will have less diverse editors and editorial board members than the younger ones.

H5 The journals with interdisciplinary nature will have more diverse editors and editorial board members than those without.

Endogenous publication

Along with the structure of editorial communities, this study also examines their publications. Scholars may publish in the journals they are affiliated to for different reasons. First, editors and editorial members are not only aware of the preferred styles of their affiliated journals but also the relative quality of the submissions (Frey 2003). Their familiarity with the journal may help with drafting their papers. Second, Luty et al. (2009) speculated that editors and editorial board members may expect their colleagues to be sympathetic to their publications. Such favoritism may appeal to them as the perquisite of being a part of the editorial community, which provides an incentive to engage in endogenous publications. Third, some endogenous publications were related to editors' and editorial board members' academic promotions according to Bošnjak et al. (2011). Fourth, the editors and editorial members may publish in their affiliated journals as a sign of their loyalty. With the aforementioned motivations for endogenous publication in mind, the following research questions are asked to investigate the frequency and types of endogenous publications:

RQ1 How often do editors and editorial board members publish in their affiliated journals?

RQ2 What types of paper do editors and editorial board members publish in their affiliated journals?

Along with the editors and editorial board members, the endogenous publications may influence the journal. For instance, the journals' impact factors were positively correlated to the proportion of papers written by one or more authors who were a part of the journals' editorial board (Campanario 1996). In addition, Mai et al. (2013) corroborated the relationship; a journal which had an increase in the number of endogenous publications also had an increase in its impact factor. The journals' impact factors are not only influenced by the number of endogenous publications but also their citation counts. According to Campanario et al. (2006), "a significant proportion of all citations that count toward the impact factor are from articles published by members of the journal's editorial board" (p. 53).

To further examine the citation counts of the endogenous publications, this paper takes the readability scores of their abstracts into account. According to Oliver et al. (1998), the readability of a research paper is positively correlated to its perceived quality. As scholars are motivated to cite a quality research paper, a readable manuscript is more likely to be cited than a less readable one. Furthermore, scholars cite literature which they can comprehend, and the contents and results of a readable manuscript are easily understood by its readers. Hence, the number of citations of a research paper may be related to its readability.

This research analyzes the readability of its abstracts instead of the entire text of a research paper for the following reasons. First, readers have easier access to a research paper's abstract than its entire text. For that reason, readers often decide whether to read the rest of an article based on its abstract (VandenBos 2010). Because a well-written abstract can grab the readers' attention (Hartley 2003), it is an important aspect of a

research paper. Second, an abstract is not only what the readers first see, but also the most important paragraph of a research paper according to the publication manual of the American Psychological Association (VandenBos 2010). This is because an abstract provides a concise summary of the entire text (Baue 1979). Last, although an abstract may be slightly more difficult to read than the entire text because the former is more likely to include compound sentences, their readability scores are similar (Lei and Yan 2016). Having comparable readability scores indicate that the analysis of abstracts is an efficient alternative to the entire research paper.

This study investigates the endogenous publications of communication journals. This is because the frequency of endogenous publications varies depending on the research area of the journals (Bošnjak et al. 2011). Communication journals have yet to examine the prevalence of their endogenous publications. This study focuses on the relationships between the frequency of endogenous publications, the readability of abstracts, and their citation counts. In addition to the frequency, endogenous publications are categorized by their publication types. According to Bošnjak et al. (2011), endogenous publications include original articles, professional articles, and review articles. The different types of publications can provide a cornerstone for the patterns of endogenous publications in communication journals. In addition to the readability of abstracts, their lengths in words are also considered because a longer abstract may contain more information (Didegah and Thelwall 2013). In that regards, the following hypothesis is proposed and the third research question is asked:

H6 The papers written by a journal's editors and editorial board members will be cited more than the journal's average number of citations per paper.

RQ3 Are the readability and the length of a paper's abstract related to its number of citations?

Methods

All of the 17 journals published by NCA and ICA were analyzed (See Table 1 for the names and ISSN of each journal). These two associations have a long history and are renowned in the field of communication. The researchers recorded and categorized the editors, the editorial board members, and their affiliated institutions listed on the websites of these associations in the end of 2016. Individuals associated with multiple journals were recorded separately as the editors and editorial board members of each journal are the focus of this research.

The institutional affiliations are classified into nine categories: the United States, the United Kingdom, other English-speaking countries (i.e., Australia, Canada, and New Zealand), Western Europe, developed Asia (i.e., China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan), Central and South America, developing Asia, the Middle East (including Israel), and Africa. This closely reflects Lauf's (2005) and Demeter's (2018a) classification, but Eastern Europe is excluded in this study because none of the identified editors and editorial board members were affiliated to institutions located in that region. As justified by Demeter, all Western European countries, regardless of their membership to the European Union, are classified into a single category because of their cultural, geographical, political, and economic similarities. The Asian countries are divided into two

Table 1 List of the analyzed journals

Title	Affiliated institution	Print ISSN	Online ISSN
Annals of the International Communication	ICA	2380-8985	2380-8977
Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies	NCA	1479-1420	1479-4233
Communication Education	NCA	0363-4523	1479-5795
Communication Monographs	NCA	0363-7751	1479-5787
Communication Teacher	NCA	1740-4622	1740-4630
Communication Theory	ICA	1468-2885	1050-3293
Communication, Culture, and Critique	ICA	1753-9137	1753-9129
Critical studies in Media Communication	NCA	1529-5036	1479-5809
First amendment Studies	NCA	2168-9725	2168-9733
Human Communication Research	ICA	1468-2958	0360-3989
Journal of Applied Communication Research	NCA	0090-9882	1479-5752
Journal of Communication	ICA	1460-2466	0021-9916
Journal of Compute-Mediated Communication	ICA	N/A	1083-6101
Journal of International and Intercultural Communication	NCA	1751-3057	1751-3065
Quarterly Journal of Speech	NCA	0033-5630	1479-5779
Review of Communication	NCA	N/A	1535-8593
Text and Performance Quarterly	NCA	1046-2937	1479-5760

The journals are listed in alphabetical order

groups because the publication patterns of the countries are related to their per capita GDP (Demeter 2018d). Instead of grouping the following regions into a single category (i.e., *others*), Central and South America, the Middle East, Africa, and developing Asia are classified into discrete categories as these regions are vastly different from each other (Demeter 2018a). It should be noted that scholars whose institutional affiliation was either unidentified or a private company (e.g., Microsoft Research and Ubisoft) were omitted when analyzing the diversity of the editorial board members.

Along with the proportion of non-U.S. editorial board members, the national diversity score (Simpson's *D*) is calculated to examine the diversity of editors and editorial board members for each journal. This is because the dichotomous categorization is an insufficient measurement of diversity. According to Demeter (2018a), "it is not clear why, for example, an African [editorial board member] could evaluate a Malaysian or Romanian article more adeptly than an American professional" (p. 2907). Simpson's index refers to the probability of randomly selecting two elements (i.e., editors or editorial board members) that come from the same category (McDonald and Dimmick 2003). This index ranges from 0 to 1 where a higher score indicates a greater degree of diversity.

The measurement of other characteristics of the journals closely reflects Lauf's research (2005). The journals published by ICA were considered to be affiliated to an international organization, while those by NCA were national. In terms of the journal's international orientation, this study used the journal's name, description on its website, and its publications as the yardstick. The journals with the word 'international' in their title or their description were given the score of 1 to indicate a high level of international orientation. Those with some degree of international focus, such as including some manuscripts regarding cultural diversity, were given the score of 0.5. All other journals were given the score of 0 to reflect

the low level of international orientation. This study used the journals' volume number in 2016 as its age. The researchers obtained the information regarding the impact factors and the degrees of interdisciplinary for the journals from SCImago Journal and Country Rank portal (<https://www.scimagojr.com>). The impact factors were retrieved from the 2016 SCImago Journal Rank indicator. This calculates a journal's impact factor by averaging the number of weighted citations its documents, which were published in the three previous years, received in 2016. The number of subject areas and categories listed in the portal indicated the journal's degree of interdisciplinary. For example, *Communication Education* was given the score of 2 for its interdisciplinary nature because its subject areas were communication and education.

By using Python's Selenium library and Regex library, the researchers wrote a Python code to automatically search for editors' and editorial board members' endogenous publications on Taylor and Francis Online (www.tandfonline.com) and Wiley Online Library (onlinelibrary.wiley.com). The search was restricted to publications from 2007 to 2016. With the Regex library, the number of authors, the number of citations, the publication date, and the abstract of the publications were recorded by searching for the relevant information from the website's source code (see Figs. 1, 2 for the relevant information that is displayed on the websites). It should be noted that the number of citations suggested by both websites uses Crossref citations.

These libraries were used to further analyze the abstracts. The number of words, the average number of words per sentence, and the average of readability scores (i.e., Gunning Fog Index, Coleman-Liau Index, Flesch–Kincaid Grade Level, Automated

The screenshot shows the Taylor & Francis Online interface. At the top, the journal 'Communication Monographs' is displayed with volume 77, 2010, issue 4. A search bar is present. The main article is 'A Measure of Weak-Tie/Strong-Tie Support Network Preference' by Kevin B. Wright and Claude H. Miller. The abstract describes two studies designed to develop and test a weak-tie/strong-tie support network preference scale. Below the abstract, the 'Citations' section lists a citation by Xi Pan and Kyong Hee Chee (2019) from 'Aging & Mental Health'. The page is annotated with numbers 1 through 4, indicating specific data points extracted for analysis: (1) the journal volume number, (2) the number of authors, (3) the abstract text, and (4) the citations.

Fig. 1 The modified screenshot example for the endogenous publication on Taylor & Francis Online is shown. The publication date is derived from the year as indicated in (1). The number of authors was calculated by counting the number of scholars as shown in (2). The abstract of the publication is recorded by using the text in (3). The citations were counted by using the date of the citing documents as shown in (4)

Wiley Online Library

Search

Q

Login / Register

JOURNAL OF
COMMUNICATION

Original Article | Full Access

Digital Games Research: A Survey Study on an Emerging Field and Its Prevalent Debates

Thorsten Quandt, Jan Van Looy, Jens Vogelgesang, Malte Elson, James D. Ivory, Mia Consalvo, Frans Mayra

First published: 30 October 2015 | <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12182> | Cited by: 2

SECTIONS PDF TOOLS SHARE

Volume 65, Issue 6
December 2015
Pages 975-996

1

Abstract

Digital games have become a popular form of media entertainment. However, it remains unclear whether a canon of accepted knowledge and research practices has emerged that may define an independent field of research. This study is a collaborative effort to analyze the outlines of digital games research (DGR) through a survey among the membership of 3 institutionalized structures focusing on the study of digital games (International Communication Association Game Studies Interest Group, European Communication Research and Education Association Temporary Working Group DGR, and Digital Games Research Association). The study reveals relatively homogeneous viewpoints among games researchers, even regarding controversial aspects of digital games. It mirrors the mainstream scholarly views on contentious issues of a recently emerged field within communication studies.

3

References

Citing Literature

Number of times cited according to CrossRef: 2

Sven Smith, Christopher J. Ferguson and Kevin M. Beaver, Learning to blast a way into crime, or just good clean fun? Examining aggressive play with toy weapons and its relation with crime, *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, **28**, 4, (313-323), (2018).
Wiley Online Library

Christopher J. Ferguson and John Colwell, Understanding Why Scholars Hold Different Views on the Influences of Video Games on Public Health, *Journal of Communication*, **67**, 3, (305-327), (2017).
Wiley Online Library

4

Fig. 2 The modified screenshot example for the endogenous publication on Wiley Online Library is shown. The publication date is derived from the year as indicated in (1). The number of authors was calculated by counting the number of scholars as shown in (2). The abstract of the publication is recorded by using the text in (3). The citations were counted by using the date of the citing documents as shown in (4)

Readability Index, and SMOG) of each abstract were calculated using the readability calculator on Online-Utility.org (https://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp). This website is widely used to calculate the readability of not only academic texts, but also websites (Cheng and Dunn 2015; Kitchenham et al. 2008; McInnes and Haglund 2011). According to Online-Utility.org, Gunning Fog Index indicates the amount of formal education (in years) the reader needs to easily comprehend the text, while the other four refers to the grade level that is needed to understand the text. Considering their strong correlation with each other (Didegah and Thelwall 2013; Sawyer et al. 2008), the scores on the five indexes were standardized and then averaged. The reliability of the average readability score was high ($\alpha = .93$). A higher score indicates that the abstract is more difficult to read.

To validate the results obtained using Python and to categorize the publications by their type, the researchers also manually searched for the endogenous publications. After resolving discrepancies in the results of the two methods, the resulting publications were categorized as either empirical or non-empirical papers. By adopting the definition of empirical studies as suggested in the publication manual of the American Psychological Association (VandenBos 2010), the inclusion of hypothesis testing, research questions, and empirical data were used as a yardstick for empirical studies. Furthermore, the important components of empirical studies suggested by San Martín-Rodríguez et al. (2005), such as a clear research aim, were also considered. Without these components, a paper is a “lesson learned paper” which is largely based on expert opinions (Dybå and Dingsøy 2008). In this study, the “lesson learned” papers were classified as non-empirical publications.

Results

Out of 17 journals, 11 of them were published by NCA. On average, each journal had 75.71 scholars in its editorial community ($SD=21.92$) at the end of 2016. In terms of scholars, there were 1063 individuals and 261 of them were affiliated to more than one journals with various responsibilities. As this study focuses on the editors and editorial board members of each journal, scholars who were affiliated to multiple journals were recorded multiple times, yielding a total of 1287 editors and editorial board members. The most prevalent position was editorial board members ($n=1139$, 88.5%), followed by editors-in-chief ($n=18$, 1.4%), assistant editors ($n=10$, 0.8%), and consultant editors ($n=8$, 0.6%). The remaining 112 individuals held various positions which could not be classified into a single category. It should be noted that *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* had two editors-in-chief at the time of data collection.

Prior to examining the diversity of editors and editorial board members for each journal, their institutional affiliations were examined in terms of ICA and NCA. A total of 38 countries were identified. The editors and editorial board members were affiliated to institutions located in 21 countries for NCA and 35 for ICA. For both associations, the United States was the most common category of location for the editors’ and editorial board members’ institutional affiliations. When the journals were aggregated, there were 768 (93.43%) scholars affiliated to institutions located in the United States for NCA and 287 (61.72%) for ICA. English-speaking countries other than the United States and the United Kingdom followed with 25 scholars (3.0%) for NCA and 33 (7.1%) for ICA. The next most common regional category was the United Kingdom followed by Western Europe. The aforementioned regions accounted for 98.2% of NCA’s and 88.2% of ICA’s editors and editorial board members.

To examine the relationship between the diversity of a journal’s editorial community and its affiliated organization (H1), impact factor (H2), international orientation (H3), age (H4), and degree of interdisciplinary (H5), two multiple regressions were conducted with the proportion of non-U.S. editors and editorial board members and the national diversity score (i.e., Simpson’s D) of the editorial community as the dependent variables. Although two dependent variables had a near-perfect correlation (See Table 2), separate analyses were conducted as previous literature (e.g., Demeter 2018a; Lauf 2005) examined the proportion of non-U.S. scholar for the editorial community, while the national diversity score was calculated in terms of the authors, not the editors and the editorial board members. To prepare for the analyses, the affiliated organization was dummy coded with NCA as

Table 2 The means, standard deviations, and correlations of journals' characteristics and the diversity of its editorial community

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Affiliated association (NCA=0, ICA=1)							
2. National diversity score	.82***						
3. Proportion of non-U.S. scholars	.78***	.99***					
4. Age	-.19	-.44*	-.43*				
5. International orientation score	.31	.67**	.69**	-.55*			
6. Impact factor	.68**	.46*	.35	.05	-.02		
7. Interdisciplinary score	.41	.11	.12	<.01	.16	.13	
ICA (n=6)							
Means		0.54	0.38	34.00	0.50	3.24	2.20
Standard deviations		0.19	0.18	19.91	0.55	2.18	0.45
NCA (n=11)							
Means		0.12	0.06	43.73	0.14	3.24	2.20
Standard deviations		0.11	0.06	29.52	0.32	2.18	0.45
ICA + NCA (n=17)							
Means		0.24	0.16	40.31	0.22	1.62	1.81
Standard deviations		0.24	0.18	27.16	0.41	1.65	0.66

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

the referent group (NCA=0 and ICA=1). The journal's impact factor, age, international orientation score, and interdisciplinary score were also included as predictors. Multicollinearity was not an issue in both analyses with the highest VIF being 1.54. See Table 2 for the correlations, means, and standard deviation of the variables.

For the proportion of the non-U.S. editors and editorial board members, the overall regression model was significant, $F(5, 15) = 20.27$, $p < .001$, $adj R^2 = .87$. Among the journals' characteristics, the affiliated association ($\beta = .92$, $p < .001$, *semi-partial* $r = .54$), international orientation score ($\beta = .45$, $p = .004$, *semi-partial* $r = .36$), and the degree of interdisciplinary ($\beta = -.31$, $p = .02$, *semi-partial* $r = -.27$) were significantly related to the dependent variable. The journals' age ($\beta = .01$, $p = .95$, *semi-partial* $r = .01$) and impact factors ($\beta = -.24$, $p = .14$, *semi-partial* $r = -.15$) were not significant predictors.

As the dependent variables have a strong correlation, the overall model predicting the diversity scores of the editorial community was also significant [$F(5, 15) = 27.28$, $p < .001$, $adj R^2 = .90$]. Moreover, the journals' affiliated association ($\beta = .85$, $p < .001$, *semi-partial* $r = .50$), international orientation score ($\beta = .43$, $p = .002$, *semi-partial* $r = .34$), and the interdisciplinary score ($\beta = -.30$, $p = .01$, *semi-partial* $r = -.26$) were significant predictors, while its age ($\beta = -.04$, $p = .70$, *semi-partial* $r = -.30$) and impact factor ($\beta = -.07$, $p = .60$, *semi-partial* $r = -.05$) were not. Hence, the data were consistent with H1 and H3 but not with H2 and H4. Regarding H5, the journal's interdisciplinary nature was related to the diversity of its editorial community but the opposite direction. The journal with a stronger interdisciplinary nature had a less diverse editorial community.

The first research question asked how frequently editors and editorial board members publish in their affiliated journals. The frequency of endogenous publications was low. In the span of 10 years, a scholar had 1.10 (SD = 1.94) endogenous publications on average. More than half of the scholars had no endogenous publications ($n = 703$, 54.6%)

during the examined decade. More than a fifth of the scholars had only one publication ($n=275$, 22.4%). There were 301 (23.4%) scholars who had more than one but less than 11 endogenous publications. The maximum number of endogenous publications was 20 ($n=1$). To break down the aforementioned numbers by affiliated associations, out of 822 editors and editorial board members affiliated to NCA, around half of them had at least one endogenous publication ($M=1.27$, $SD=2.14$). This indicates that 418 (50.9%) of them did not publish in the journals they were working for. As for ICA, endogenous publications were less frequent ($M=0.81$, $SD=1.49$). Of the 465 scholars, 285 (61.3%) of them did not publish in their affiliated ICA journals. Hence, the data indicated that the editors and editorial board members were not likely to publish in their affiliated journals.

The second research question asked about the different types of endogenous publications. To further examine the research question, the types of publications (i.e., empirical and non-empirical) and authorship (sole author and multiple authors) were both considered. A Chi squared test was conducted on these two variables. The result showed that publication type was not independent of authorship, $\chi^2(1, n=1416)=352.69$, $p<.001$. In addition, the standard residuals were analyzed. To adjust for multiple statistical tests, Bonferroni correction was used. Because the p value was adjusted to $p=.0125$, a standard residual (z -value) smaller than -2.5 or more than 2.5 was statistically significant. When endogenous publications were written alone, significantly more papers than expected were non-empirical papers ($z=9.8$) and significantly fewer papers than expected were empirical papers ($z=-10.5$). When endogenous publications were co-authored, the pattern reversed; significantly more papers were empirical papers ($z=8.8$) and fewer papers were non-empirical papers ($z=-8.3$) than expected.

Two Chi squared tests were conducted for each association by authorship and publication type, $\chi^2_{NCA}(1, n=1100)=266.16$, $p<.001$, $\chi^2_{ICA}(1, n=316)=47.35$, $p<.001$. The analysis of standard residuals with Bonferroni corrections indicated that the pattern of endogenous publications in NCA journals was consistent with the previous analysis of all 17 journals. As for ICA, when authors were publishing alone significantly more papers than expected were non-empirical ($z=5.1$) and significantly less papers than expected were empirical ($z=-3.0$). For co-authored endogenous publications, significantly less papers than expected were non-empirical ($z=-2.9$), while empirical ones did not differ significantly from expectation ($z=1.7$). See Table 3 for details.

To examine the relationship between publication types and the location of institutional affiliation, endogenous publications by scholars affiliated to institutions in the United States were compared to the rest. Four Chi square tests were conducted. The results indicated that publication type and authorship were not independent for endogenous publications done by scholars affiliated to institutions located in the United States: $\chi^2_{USA}(1, n=1074)=255.23$, $p<.001$ for NCA and $\chi^2_{USA}(1, n=232)=38.44$, $p<.001$ for ICA. The relationship was significant for scholars affiliated to institutions outside the United States as well: $\chi^2_{non-USA}(1, n=26)=12.40$, $p<.001$ for NCA and $\chi^2_{non-USA}(1, n=84)=11.33$, $p=.001$ for ICA. See Table 4 for standard residuals and frequencies.

The data indicated that endogenous publications are related to publication type and authorship despite the locations of the scholars' institutional affiliations. In general, there were more non-empirical endogenous publications than empirical ones when the editor or editorial board member was the only author. When the editor or editorial board member was one of the authors, empirical endogenous publications were more prevalent than non-empirical ones. In terms of the associations, this pattern was more prominent in journals published by NCA than ICA.

Table 3 The χ^2 tests of endogenous publications sorted by associations

	Sole author	Multiple authors	Total
NCA + ICA			
Empirical	102 (− 10.5)	560 (8.8)	662
Non-Empirical	488 (9.8)	266 (− 8.3)	754
Total	590	826	1416
$\chi^2(1) = 352.69, p < .001$			
NCA			
Empirical	68 (− 9.3)	360 (8.7)	428
Non-Empirical	445 (7.4)	227 (− 6.9)	672
Total	513	587	1100
$\chi^2(1) = 266.16, p < .001$			
ICA			
Empirical	34 (− 3.0)	200 (1.7)	234
Non-Empirical	43 (5.1)	39 (− 2.9)	82
Total	77	239	316
$\chi^2(1) = 47.35, p < .001$			

Standardized residuals are shown in parenthesis

Hypothesis 6 predicted that endogenous publications would have a higher number of citations per paper than the journals' average. The journals' average numbers of citations per paper, which are equivalent to the journals' impact factors on Thomson Reuters metric, were obtained from SCImago Journal and Country Rank portal. The Thomson Reuters metric for a specific year averages the number of citations received by a journal's documents published in the past 2 years. For example, *Journal of Communication's* impact factor in 2017 calculates the average number of times its papers published in 2015 and 2016 were cited in 2017. The average impact factor of the 16 journals from 2009 to 2017 was 1.56 (SD = 1.44, $n = 131$). It should be noted that the SCImago Journal and Country Rank portal did not provide the impact factors for some of the journals.

To compare the citations of endogenous publications with the journals' average, the Thomson Reuters impact factors for the endogenous publications were calculated. For instance, *Journal of Communication's* impact factor for endogenous publications in 2017 averages the number of times its papers that are written by one of the editors or editorial board members in 2015 and 2016 were cited in 2017. The average impact factor for the endogenous publications was 0.61 (SD = 0.71, $n = 152$).

H6 was tested with a paired sample t -test. The results indicated that the average number of citations for the endogenous publications was significantly lower than the journals' average, $t(130) = 6.67, p < .001$. Although the number of citations is significantly different, they are positively correlated, $r(131) = .21, p = .02$. Thus, the data were inconsistent with the hypothesis. It is unlikely for an endogenous publication to receive more citations than

Table 4 The χ^2 tests of endogenous publications sorted by affiliated institutions

	Sole author	Multiple authors	Total
NCA			
USA			
Empirical	66 (−9.1)	348 (8.6)	414
Non-Empirical	435 (7.2)	225 (−6.8)	660
	501	573	1074
$\chi^2(1) = 255.23, p < .001$			
Non-USA			
Empirical	2 (−1.8)	12 (1.6)	14
Non-Empirical	10 (1.9)	2 (−1.8)	12
Total	12	14	26
$\chi^2(1) = 12.40, p < .001$			
ICA			
USA			
Empirical	28 (−2.5)	154 (1.4)	182
Non-Empirical	29 (4.8)	21 (−2.7)	50
Total	57	175	232
$\chi^2(1) = 38.44, p < .001$			
Non-USA			
Empirical	6 (−1.8)	46 (1.0)	52
Non-Empirical	14 (2.3)	18 (−1.3)	32
Total	20	64	84
$\chi^2(1) = 11.33, p = .001$			

Standardized residuals are shown in parenthesis

other publications in the journal. However, the endogenous publications of a journal with a higher impact factor are more likely to be cited than those of a journal with a lower impact factor.

Regarding the third research question, which asked whether the abstracts of the endogenous publications are related to their citation counts, a multiple regression was conducted with the total number of citations as the dependent variable. To prepare for the analysis, the following variables were dummy coded: the locations of authors' affiliated institutions (USA = 1, the rest = 0), the journals' affiliated associations (ICA = 1, NCA = 0), the authorship (multiple authors = 1, sole author = 0), and the type (empirical = 1, non-empirical = 0) of the endogenous publications. The continuous variables (i.e., the publication year, the number of words, the average sentence length in words, and the average readability of the abstract) were mean centered. The multicollinearity was not an issue; the largest VIF was 1.48. The product terms of the variables, which captures their interactions, were omitted

in the regression model because multicollinearity became a problem and there were neither substantial nor practical interpretations that could be made from them. The means and standard deviations for the raw scores of the five readability indexes are the following: Gunning Fog Index ($M=19.56$, $SD=3.85$), Coleman-Liau Index ($M=17.88$, $SD=3.14$), Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level ($M=17.60$, $SD=3.40$), Automated Readability Index ($M=18.21$, $SD=4.25$), and SMOG ($M=17.35$, $SD=2.72$). See Table 5 for the correlations and descriptive statistics of the variables.

The overall model predicting the citation counts of the endogenous publications was significant, $F(8, 1006)=26.81$, $p<.001$. The significant predictors were the affiliated associations ($\beta=-.20$), the authorship ($\beta=.10$), the type ($\beta=.15$) of the publications, and its publication year ($\beta=-.33$). Hence, an endogenous publication is more likely to be cited when published in a journal associated with NCA than ICA or written by multiple scholars instead of one. In addition, empirical papers are more likely to be cited than non-empirical ones. The negative coefficient for the publication year indicates that the citation count is likely to accumulate with time. However, the number of citations for endogenous publications written by scholars affiliated to institutions located in the United States was not significantly different from the rest. The readability and the length of abstracts did not have significant effects on the citation count. See Table 6 for more details.

Discussion

This paper examined the diversity of communication journals' editorial community as well as the editors' and editorial board members' endogenous publications. These journals were published by two renowned associations in the field of communication (i.e., NCA and ICA). The results indicated that the diversity of a journal's editorial community was related to its affiliated institution, international orientation, and interdisciplinary nature. Furthermore, publishing in the journals the editors and editorial board members were working for was not popular; on average, a scholar wrote one endogenous publication in 10 years. In terms of the citation counts, the journals' impact factors were positively related to the citation counts of endogenous publications. However, the average number of citations for endogenous publications were significantly smaller than that of the journals' average. The total number of citations for the endogenous publications was not related to the characteristics of its abstract. However, the journal's affiliated associations, the number of authors, and the publication year and type were related to the total number of citations.

For the diversity of the editorial community, this study measured the proportion of non-U.S. editors and editorial board members as well as the national diversity score (i.e., Simpson's D). Although Simpson's D was used in Lauf's (2005) and Demeter's (2018a) research for investigating the authors, this study demonstrated that it is also applicable for measuring the diversity of the editorial community. According to Demeter (2018a), the proportion of non-U.S. scholars is an insufficient measure of a journal's internationality as the non-U.S. editorial board members are not homogeneous. However, its strong correlation with Simpson's index ($r=.99$) may indicate that the proportion of non-U.S. scholars can be used as a proxy for measuring diversity. This may be because the proportion of U.S. editors and editorial board members are larger than any other categories, which reduced the variance of both measures.

This study showed that the proportion of editors and editorial board members based in the United States is different according to the journals' affiliated associations. The editorial

Table 5 The correlations and descriptive statistics of predictors for the regression model

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Location of affiliated institutions (Non-USA = 0, USA = 1)									
2. Affiliated association (NCA = 0, ICA = 1)	-.36***								
3. Authorship (Sole author = 0, Multiple authors = 1)	-.07*	.16***							
4. Publication type (Non-empirical = 0, Empirical = 1)	-.09**	.25***	.46***						
5. Publication year	.04	-.09**	.09**	-.06*					
6. Length of abstract (in words)	-.14***	.18***	.20***	.35***	-.16***				
7. Average sentence length of the abstract (in words)	.01	-.10**	-.09**	-.14***	.03	.17***			
8. Average readability of abstract	.07	-.15***	.04	-.02	.07*	.02	.48***		
9. Citation count	.05	-.12***	.12***	.18***	-.31***	.12***	-.03	.05*	
n^a	1306	316	826	662					
Means					2010.35	105.31	24.88	-0.01	6.43
Standard deviations					48.15	40.63	8.07	0.91	14.55

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ ^aFor the dummy variables, n refers to the number of cases for the comparison group (when the variable is 1)

Table 6 Regression results for the citation counts of endogenous publications

	<i>B</i>	SE	β	<i>t</i>	r_{sp}
Location of affiliated institutions (Non-USA = 0, USA = 1)	0.86	1.85	.01	0.46	.01
Affiliated association (NCA = 0, ICA = 1)	− 7.43	1.19	− .20	− 6.24***	− .18
Authorship (Sole author = 0, Multiple authors = 1)	3.59	1.17	.10	3.06**	.09
Publication type (Non-empirical = 0, Empirical = 1)	5.03	1.20	.15	4.20***	.12
Publication year	− 1.93	0.17	− .33	− 11.14***	− .32
Length of abstract (in words)	0.02	0.01	.04	1.32	.04
Average sentence length of the abstract (in words)	− 0.09	0.07	− .05	− 1.33	− .04
Average readability of abstract	1.16	0.60	.06	1.93	.06

r_{sp} is semi-partial correlation

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

community of NCA as a whole (93.43%) comprised more scholars affiliated to institutions in the United States than ICA (61.72%). Regarding the proportion of non-U.S. editors and editorial board members, the average proportion for NCA journals was 6%, while that of ICA was 38%. Moreover, the location of their affiliated institutions was more diverse for ICA ($n = 35$) than NCA ($n = 21$). As shown by the average national diversity score, there is .54 chance of selecting two editors or editorial board members from different regions for ICA journals, while that of NCA is .12.

The difference in the diversity of the editorial community may be attributable to the characteristics and missions of the related associations. Regarding their characteristics, NCA is a national association, while ICA is an international association. Although ICA started as an association with researchers from the United States, it is currently an international non-governmental association recognized by the United Nations (“About ICA,” n.d.). In terms of their mission statement, both associations advocate diversity in their faculty (“Guiding principles,” n.d.; “What is NCA?,” n.d.). However, only ICA explicitly states that it provides an *international* academic arena for scholars. The different aims of these associations may explain why an ICA journal tends to have a more diverse editorial community than an NCA journal.

The relationship between a journal’s characteristics and the diversity of its editorial community found in this study is inconsistent with the literature. In Lauf’s research (2005), a journal’s affiliated association was not related to the diversity of editors and editorial board members. This may be because only the journals from NCA and ICA were examined here. Thus, the effect of affiliated associations may have been more prominent in this research than in Lauf’s. For a journal’s impact factor, it did not have a significant relationship with the journals’ diversity of editors and editorial board members in this study. However, when the diversity is measured in terms of the authors, it was negatively related to the journal’s impact factor (Demeter 2018b). This may be because the impact factor is determined by the journal’s publication, which is more closely related to the authors than the members of the editorial community.

Even though the editorial community tends to be homogenous, other scholars are skeptical of blindly pursuing diversity in geography. According to Harzing and Metz (2013), diversity does not translate directly to maximizing academic innovations. This is consistent with Nisonger's research (2002); the diversity of institutional affiliation may not provide a direct measure of the journal's quality because of the non-linear relationship between the number of citations for a journal and the proportion of the editorial board members whose affiliated institutions are different from the publication location of the journals. Similarly, in this study, the number of citations for publications written by editors and editorial board members did not differ depending on the location of their affiliated institutions. Moreover, superficially pursuing a diverse editorial board may lead to reverse discrimination. The question of fairness can be asked when a more competent scholar based in the United States has to yield the editorial position to a relatively less qualified scholar who lives outside of the United States.

From 2007 to 2016, more than half of the editors and editorial board members (703 out of 1287) did not publish in the journals they were working for. For scholars who had more than one endogenous publication, publication type differed depending on authorship. As a sole author, scholars were more likely to publish non-empirical papers, such as lesson-learned papers, book reviews, and introductions to special editions. As a co-author, they were more likely to publish empirical papers than non-empirical ones. This pattern was more evident in the journals published by NCA than ICA and among scholars affiliated to institutions located in the United States.

Compared to other fields, the frequency of endogenous publications is lower in communication journals. According to Bošnjak et al. (2011), 45% of scholars affiliated to Croatian journals of various fields (e.g. social science, humanities, natural science, engineering, and medicine) did not publish any articles in their own journals from 2005 to 2008. In this study, 54.7% of editors and editorial board members had no endogenous publications from 2007 to 2016. In terms of the average number of endogenous publications, 17.2 articles were published by editorial board members of medical journals in 2006 (Luty et al. 2009). In this study, the average number of endogenous publications was 1.08 (SD=1.90) when considering all the editors and editorial board members ($n=1287$) and 2.39 (SD=2.21) when considering those with more than one endogenous publications ($n=583$). In both cases, the average number of endogenous publication was significantly less than 17.2 [$t(1286) = -303.73$, $p < .001$ and $t(582) = -161.75$, $p < .001$].

The low frequency of endogenous publications may be due to scholars preventing themselves from being accused of publishing in their own journals to show loyalty or to take advantage of their fellow editors' or editorial board member's sympathy. In addition, the relationship between authorship and publication type indicates that there may be different motivations for editors and editorial board members to publish in their own journals. The scholars (more likely as a sole-author) may be invited by the journal to write non-empirical papers, such as essays where they share their professional opinions and ideas. When publishing with other scholars, the members of the editorial community may recommend their journals to their co-authors because they may find their manuscript to have a good fit for the journal. In this case, the scholars are using their familiarity with the journal not to receive *special* treatment during the review process, but to decide on the most suitable outlet of their manuscript.

The rarity of endogenous publications may evoke the question of the editors and editorial board members' competence. The academic eminence and qualifications are important when appointing the editorial board members (Beyer 1978; Miller 2006; Raelin 2008). Having publications in their affiliated journal may indicate that scholars have experience

with the journal's expectations and standards. As 54.7% of the scholars had no endogenous publications in 10 years, their familiarity with their affiliated journals may be questioned. Nonetheless, using only the endogenous publications to evaluate the competence of the editors and editorial board members is ill-advised because there are many ways of measuring their aptitude in reviewing manuscripts.

As for the citation count, this study is consistent with previous findings. Similar to Zsindely et al. (1982a), the citation count of editors' and editorial board members' publications are positively correlated to the journals' impact factor. However, the number of citations for the former was significantly lower than the latter. As for the relationship between the number of citations and readability, there was no significant relationship, which corroborates Lei and Yan's (2016), and Didegah and Thelwall's (2013) findings. This may be because the readability scores do not take readers' perceived readability into account (Oliver et al. 1998). For instance, an abstract is considered more comprehensible to a reader who is familiar with the research topic than who is not.

The following concerns may be negligible as endogenous publications are not frequent in communication journals and their citation counts are significantly lower than the journals' average, which is inconsistent with Beattie and Ryan's research (1989). Although journals have limited publication spaces (Campanario 1998), the endogenous publications do not occupy a substantial proportion of the journals' publication space. In addition, it is unlikely for journals to use endogenous publications to inflate their citations.

In terms of the readability, the abstracts of communication journals are slightly more difficult to read than other journals. The mean readability score on SMOG was 16.52 for abstracts of information science papers (Lei and Yan 2016), while that of this study was 17.35. In addition, according to Sawyer et al. (2008), the average readability score was 16.2 for marketing journals, which indicates that the articles are difficult to read for someone who received less education than an average college senior. The relatively low readability scores of communication journals are understandable considering the target audience of research-oriented journals: researchers and doctoral students. According to Zimmerman (1989), doctoral students are the primary readers of research papers because they are frequently used in their seminar classes.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

This study has some limitations that are closely related to future recommendations. First, this study is limited to journals that originated in the United States. The geographical concentration of the editors and editorial board members may be due to the journals' demand for scholars who are competent in reviewing submissions written in English. Journals published in other countries need to be investigated to examine the relationship between the preferred languages of the journals and the appointment of their editors and editorial board members.

Second, the geographical dispersion of the editors' and editorial board members' affiliated institutions was measured to examine the diversity of the editorial community. Future research can investigate alternative methods for establishing diversity. It is possible for journals to invite guest reviewers and ad-hoc reviewers with various national and cultural backgrounds. In addition, the origin of data and the nationality of authors can provide an additional perspective regarding the journal's pursuit of diversity.

Third, this study did not account for when the editors or editorial board members took their positions. During the examined decade, some scholars were an editorial board

member for a longer period than others. Hence, it is possible for some endogenous publications to have been published before the scholar became an editorial board member. Although the editorial board members are unlikely to change dramatically over the years (Campanario et al. 2006), future studies should consider each scholar's duration of editorial board membership.

Last, it is possible for the editors and editorial board members to publish in other top-tiered journals. For example, the editors of Croatian journals published in other journals that are indexed in the same database (Bošnjak et al. 2011). In this study, the editors' and editorial board members' publications in other journals affiliated to the same association was not examined. However, there may be a network-like structure between journals and their editorial communities. For example, a scholar may become the member of an editorial board member because they have demonstrated their academic competence by publishing in other journals affiliated to the same association. It is recommended for future studies to conduct a network analysis on the journals and their editorial board members to identify a specific cluster of scholars who mutually publish in each other's journal.

Recommendations for journals and scholars

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are made regarding the diversity in the appointment of editorial board members and the abstracts of endogenous publications. First, to promote diversity, journals, editors-in-chief, and scholars are recommended to work collectively. As for the journals and editors-in-chief, they may diversify their editorial community only if it is necessary considering their interests. Although international diversity in the editorial community can reduce potential parochialism (Daft and Lewin 2008; Harzing and Metz 2013), this decision must be consistent with the trajectory of the journal.

It is recommended for scholars to collaborate with other researchers from various backgrounds. The international collaboration can make scholars from the less-represented countries to be more visible than before; this makes them more likely to be invited to the editorial community of international journals (Zsindely et al. 1982b). Furthermore, as the citation counts of publications are higher for those written with multiple authors than a single author, there is an incentive for scholars living in the United States and abroad cooperate with other scholars. Although collaboration is advantageous for scholars, it should be noted that the burden of international cooperation varies depending on where the scholar is from. According to Demeter (2017, 2018b), intranational collaboration is more prevalent than international collaboration for scholars living in North America and Western Europe. It is relatively more desirable for scholars in the periphery countries to collaborate with authors with high scientific output than those from core countries (Toth 2018). Nonetheless, it can be concluded that to have diverse *gatekeepers*, the *gate* needs to be opened and be *knocked on*.

As for now, the effects of endogenous publications on the journals may not be clear. Nonetheless, certain precautions can be made. First, journals can have clear policies about submissions from their editors or editorial board members, whether it be prohibiting their submissions or having a special procedure to prevent biases in the review (Graf et al. 2007). Second, journals can disclose information regarding editorial conflict of interest (Bošnjak et al. 2011; Søreide et al. 2010). Third, corruptive camaraderie can also be prevented by having a large and diverse editorial board (Søreide et al. 2010).

Although the number of citations was not related to the readability of abstracts, there still are benefits to improving their qualities. According to Lei and Yan (2016), having a more readable abstract indicates that the information is more clearly conveyed to the readers. This also helps the scholars to easily navigate a large amount of literature. In addition, Sawyer et al. (2008) stated that maximizing a manuscripts' readability reduces the chance of it being rejected by journals. One of the ways to improve the clarity of abstracts is by structuring them. Hartley (2003) advocates structuring the abstracts instead of writing them in paragraphs. Furthermore, Hartley (1997) recommended scholars to include a few concise sentences regarding the following six headings when writing structured abstracts: background, aim, method, results, conclusion, and comments (optional).

In conclusion, as partaking in the screening process of journals is honorable for scholars (Kaufman 1984), the journals should be wary of potential bias in the appointment of their editors and editorial board members which may damage their academic integrity. In fact, submitted manuscripts must be reviewed fairly. As there are plenty of rooms for the peer-review process to improve (Bedeian 2004), the diversity of editorial communities and surveillance of endogenous publications may be good places to start.

Funding This research was partially funded by the School of Media and Communication at Korea University.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- About ICA. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.icahdq.org/page/About>.
- Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social science. *Current Sociology*, 51, 599–613. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516003>.
- Bakker, P., & Rigter, H. (1985). Editors of medical journals: Who and from where. *Scientometrics*, 7, 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02020137>.
- Baue, A. E. (1979). Writing a good abstract is not abstract writing. *The Archives of Surgery*, 1124, 11–12. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archsurg.1979.01370250013001>.
- Beattie, V. A., & Ryan, R. J. (1989). Performance indices and related measures of journal reputation in accounting. *The British Accounting Review*, 21, 267–278. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-8389\(89\)90097-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-8389(89)90097-8).
- Bedeian, A. G. (2004). Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the management discipline. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3, 198–216. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2004.13500489>.
- Beyer, J. M. (1978). Editorial policies and practices among leading journals in four scientific fields. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 19, 68–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1978.tb02172.x>.
- Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (1997). World culture in the world polity: A century of international non-governmental organization. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 171–190.
- Bošnjak, L., Puljak, L., Vukojević, K., & Marušić, A. (2011). Analysis of a number and type of publications that editors publish in their own journals: Case study of scholarly journals in Croatia. *Scientometrics*, 86, 227–233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-010-0207-7>.
- Bunz, U. (2005). Publish or perish: A limited author analysis of ICA and NCA journals. *Journal of Communication*, 55, 703–720. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb03018.x>.
- Campanario, J. M. (1996). The competition for journal space among referees, editors, and other authors and its influence on journals' impact factors. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 47, 184–192. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199603\)47:3%3c184::AID-ASI2%3e3.0.CO;2-U](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199603)47:3%3c184::AID-ASI2%3e3.0.CO;2-U).
- Campanario, J. M. (1998). Peer review for journals as it stands today—Part 2. *Science Communication*, 19, 277–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547098019004002>.

- Campanario, J. M., González, L., & Rodríguez, C. (2006). Structure of the impact factor of academic journals in the field of education and educational psychology: Citations from editorial board members. *Scientometrics*, 69, 37–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-006-0137-6>.
- Caruso, M. (2008). World systems, world society, world polity: Theoretical insights for a global history of education. *History of Education*, 37, 825–840. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00467600802158256>.
- Cheng, C., & Dunn, M. (2015). Health literacy and the internet: A study on the readability of Australian online health information. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 39, 309–314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-6405.12341>.
- Corley, K. G., & Schinoff, B. S. (2017). Who, me? An inductive study of novice experts in the context of how editors come to understand theoretical contribution. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31, 4–27. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0131>.
- Crosier, K. (2004). How effectively do marketing journals transfer useful learning from scholars to practitioners? *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 22, 540–556. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500410551923>.
- Daft, R. L., & Lewin, A. Y. (2008). Perspective—Rigor and relevance in organization studies: Idea migration and academic journal evolution. *Organization Science*, 19, 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0346>.
- Demeter, M. (2017). The core-periphery problem in communication research: A network analysis of leading publication. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 33, 402–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-017-9535-2>.
- Demeter, M. (2018a). 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, 2893–2921.
- Demeter, M. (2018b). Nobody notices it? Qualitative inequalities of leading publications in communication and media studies research. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 1001–1031.
- Demeter, M. (2018c). Theorizing international inequalities in communication and media studies. A field theory approach. *KOME—An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, 6(2), 92–110. <https://doi.org/10.17646/KOME.75692.94>.
- Demeter, M. (2018d). The winner takes it all: International inequality in communication and media studies today. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 96, 37–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699018792270>.
- Didegah, F., & Thelwall, M. (2013). Which factors help authors produce the highest impact research? Collaboration, journal and document properties. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7, 861–873. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.08.006>.
- Dusansky, R., & Vernon, C. J. (1998). Rankings of U.S. economics departments. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(1), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.12.1.157>.
- Dybå, T., & Dingsøyr, T. (2008). Empirical studies of agile software development: A systematic review. *Information and Software Technology*, 50, 833–859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2008.01.006>.
- Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 121–150. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587862>.
- Forrester, J. P., & Watson, S. S. (1994). An assessment of public administration journals: The perceptivity of editors and editorial board members. *Public Administration Review*, 54, 474–482. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976433>.
- Frey, B. S. (2003). Publishing as prostitution? Choosing between one's own ideas and academic success. *Public Choice*, 116, 205–223.
- Giménez-Toledo, E., Román-Román, A., Perdiguer, P., & Palencia, I. (2009). The editorial boards of Spanish scholarly journals: What are they like? What should they be like? *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 40, 287–306.
- Guiding principles. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.icaahdq.org/page/MissionStatement>.
- Goyanes, M. (2019). Editorial boards in communication sciences journals: Plurality or standardization? *The International Communication Gazette*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048518825322>.
- Graf, C., Wager, E., Bowman, A., Fiack, S., Scott-Lichter, D., & Robison, A. (2007). Best practice guidelines on publication ethics: A publisher's perspective. *International Journal of Clinical Practice*, 61(s152), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-1241.2006.01230.x>.
- Graves, P. E., Marchand, J. R., & Thompson, R. (1982). Economics departmental rankings: Research incentives, constraints, and efficiency. *The American Economic Review*, 72, 1131–1141.
- Hartley, J. (1997). Is it appropriate to use structured abstracts in social science journals? *Learned Publishing*, 10, 313–317. <https://doi.org/10.1087/09531519750146789>.
- Hartley, J. (2003). Improving the clarity of journal abstracts in psychology: The case of structure. *Science Communication*, 24, 366–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547002250301>.

- Harzing, A.-W., & Metz, I. (2013). Practicing what we preach. *Management International Review*, 53, 169–187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-011-0124-x>.
- Kaufman, G. G. (1984). Rankings of finance departments by faculty representation on editorial boards of professional journals: A note. *The Journal of Finance*, 39, 1189–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1984.tb03902.x>.
- Kitchenham, B. A., Pearl Breton, O., Owen, S., Butcher, J., & Jefferies, C. (2008). Length and readability of structured software engineering abstracts. *The Institution of Engineering and Technology Software*, 2, 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-sen:20070044>.
- Lauf, E. (2005). National diversity of major international journals in the field of communication. *Journal of Communication*, 55, 139–151. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/55.1.139>.
- Lei, L., & Yan, S. (2016). Readability and citations in information science: Evidence from abstracts and articles of four journals (2003–2012). *Scientometrics*, 108, 1155–1169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2036-9>.
- Luty, J., Arokia Dass, S. M. R., Easow, J. M., & Anapreddy, J. R. (2009). Preferential publication of editorial board members in medical specialty journals. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 35, 200–202. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2008.026740>.
- Mai, J., Makarević, J., Juengel, E., Ackermann, H., Nelson, K., Bartsch, G., et al. (2013). I publish in I edit? Do editorial board members of urologic journals preferentially publish their own scientific work? *PLoS ONE*, 8(12), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083709>.
- McDonald, D. G., & Dimmick, J. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of diversity. *Communication Research*, 30, 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650202239026>.
- McInnes, N., & Haglund, B. J. A. (2011). Readability of online health information: Implications for health literacy. *Informatics for Health & Social Care*, 36, 173–189. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17538157.2011.57.20>.
- Meyer, J. W. (1999). The changing cultural content of the nation-state: A world society perspective. In G. Steinmetz (Ed.), *State/culture: State-formation after the cultural turn* (pp. 123–143). London: Cornell University Press.
- Miller, C. C. (2006). Peer review in the organizational and management sciences: Prevalence and effects of reviewer hostility, bias, and dissensus. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 425–431. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.21794661>.
- Mort, G. S., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Kiel, G., & Soutar, G. N. (2004). Perceptions of marketing journals by senior academics in Australia and New Zealand. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 12(2), 51–61.
- Nisonger, T. E. (2002). The relationship between international editorial board composition and citation measures in political science, business, and genetics journals. *Scientometrics*, 54, 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016065929026>.
- Oliver, B., Dallas, M. J., & Eckman, M. (1998). Communication of empirical knowledge: An investigation of readability and quality of research in textiles and apparel. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 16, 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X9801600104>.
- Paasi, A. (2005). Globalisation, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning*, 37, 769–789. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3769>.
- Pagel, P. S., & Hudetz, J. A. (2011). Bibliometric analysis of anaesthesia journal editorial board members: Correlation between journal impact factor and the median *h*-index of its board members. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 107, 357–361. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aer191>.
- Raelin, J. A. (2008). Refereeing the game of peer review. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 7, 124–129. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2008.31413869>.
- Rosenstreich, D., & Wooliscroft, B. (2005). *What does it take to get published in a top marketing journal from Australasia*. Paper presented at the 30th Annual Macromarketing Conference, St. Petersburg, FL.
- San Martín-Rodríguez, L., Beaulieu, M. D., D'Amour, D., & Ferrada-Videla, M. (2005). The determinants of successful collaboration: A review of theoretical and empirical studies. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 19, 132–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820500082677>.
- Sauer, R. D. (1988). Estimates of the returns to quality and coauthorship in economic academia author. *Journal of Political Economy*, 96, 855–866.
- Sawyer, A. G., Laran, J., & Xu, J. (2008). The readability of marketing journals: Are award-winning articles better written? *Journal of Marketing*, 72(1), 108–117.
- Søreide, K., Ringdal, K. G., & Lossius, H. M. (2010). Submission policy, peer-review and editorial board members: Interesting conflicts and conflicts of interest. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation, & Emergency Medicine*, 18, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1757-7241-18-56>.
- Strang, D., & Siler, K. (2015). Revising as reframing: Original submissions versus published papers in Administrative Science Quarterly, 2005–2009. *Sociological Theory*, 33, 71–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275115572152>.

- Svensson, G. (2005). Ethnocentricity in top marketing journals. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 23, 422–434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500510612618>.
- Thomas, G. M. (2009). World polity, world culture, world society. *International Political Sociology*, 3, 115–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-5687.2008.00066_4.x.
- Toth, J. (2018). “U.S. journals can afford to remain regional, but we can not.” Author distribution-based internationality of Eastern European communication journals. *KOME—An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, 6(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.17646/KOME.2018.21>.
- Tuckman, H. P., & Leahey, J. (1975). What is an article worth? *Journal of Political Economy*, 83, 951–968. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260371>.
- Tung, R. L. (2006). North American research agenda and methodologies: Past imperfect, future—Limitless possibilities. *Asian Business & Management*, 5, 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.abm.9200148>.
- VandenBos, G. R. (Ed.). (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Wiedemann, T., & Meyen, M. (2016). Internationalization through Americanization: The expansion of the International Communication Association’s leadership to the world. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 1489–1509.
- What is NCA? (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.natcom.org/about-nca/what-nca>.
- Zimmerman, J. L. (1989). Improving a manuscript’s readability and likelihood of publication. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 4, 458–466.
- Zsindely, S., Schubert, A., & Braun, T. (1982a). Citation patterns of editorial gatekeepers in international chemistry journals. *Scientometrics*, 41, 69–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02098007>.
- Zsindely, S., Schubert, A., & Braun, T. (1982b). Editorial gatekeeping patterns in international science journals. A new science indicator. *Scientometrics*, 4, 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02098006>.