9-1-2004

Membership on Editorial Boards and Rankings of Schools with International Business Orientation

Kam C. Chan
Western Kentucky University, johnny.chan@wku.edu

Hung-Gay Fung Dr.
University of Missouri-St. Louis, fungh@umsl.edu

Pikki Lai
Alcott-Routon Consulting, plai@alcottrouton.com

Membership on Editorial Boards and Rankings of Schools with International Business Orientation

Kam C. Chan

Leon Page Professor of Finance
Department of Finance
Gordon Ford College of Business
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101
Tel: (937) 229-4591; fax: (937) 229-2477
Email: Johnny.Chan@wku.edu

Hung-Gay Fung

Dr. Y.S .Tsiang Professor of Chinese Studies
College of Business Administration
University of Missouri-St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, MO 63121
Tel: (314) 516-6374; Fax: (314) 516-6420
Email: fungh@msx.umsl.edu

Pikki Lai

Senior Analyst
Alcott-Routon Consulting
Franklin, TN 37067
Tel: (615) 261-7100
Email: Plai@AlcottRouton.com
September, 2004 (this version)

We thank three anonymous referees, Raj Aggarwal (editor), Julius Johnson, and David Ricks for helpful comments, and Bob Baumann, Jennifer Dennis and Patricia Peat for editorial assistance.

Membership on Editorial Boards and Rankings of Schools With International Business Orientation

Abstract

Using four-year data (1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002), we have provided a ranking of schools with international business (IB) orientation based on the membership on editorial boards of 30 leading international business journals. Participation on editorial boards of quality journals is highly selective, and should provide a quality indication of the schools. Both quality unadjusted and adjusted board membership based ranking are calculated in this study. Several interesting findings are worth noting. First, U.S. schools play a significant leadership role among the leading IB programs. Second, the findings of this study also show the major contribution of non-U.S. schools, which confirm the importance of the global nature of the IB discipline. Third, the top-ranked schools share a number of characteristics. Finally, the correlation among different ranking criteria can be low, particularly for the top-ranked schools, suggesting that care should be exercised in interpreting school ranking.

Membership on Editorial Boards and Rankings of Schools With International Business Orientation

Introduction

The objective of this study is to rank schools with international business (IB) orientation based on faculty representation on journal editorial boards. IB orientation refers to schools either with IB programs or with faculty conducting research in IB areas. To this end, we use an academic program's representation on editorial boards to proxy for the reputation of an international business orientation of a school. Membership on the editorial board of a quality journal is highly selective. A greater number of faculty in an institution's IB program serving on editorial boards of quality IB journals would indicate higher quality of the IB program. This approach has been used in marketing [Kurtz and Boone (1988)], in statistics [Gibbons (1990)], in economics [Gibbons and Fish (1991)], in accounting [Mittermaier (1991)], and in finance [Kaufman (1984) and Chan and Fok (2003)].

Using the editorial board representation, we provide a ranking of IB programs. We analyze the list of editorial board members for the top thirty IB journals in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002. The list of the selected IB journals has been well documented in Dubois and Reeb (2000) as the prime research outlets for IB researchers. We further extend earlier studies by including journal quality and IB programs, and identify a number of common characteristics among leading IB programs.

Our study on school ranking related to international business is interesting for several reasons. The AACSB-International (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), a business program accrediting organization, uses the editorial board representation information as part of its evaluation of professional services. Media such as *Business Week* and the *Financial*

Times rank business schools, while the *U.S. News and World Report* regularly provide rankings of U.S. business schools in a number of disciplines (including international business). However, with the exception of the *Financial Times*, the annual rankings of *Business Week* and *U.S. News and World Report* include only U.S. colleges. As international business is a truly global discipline, one would also expect colleges in the rest of the world to have a large influence on the development of the IB discipline. Thus, it is important to include non-U.S. colleges in the IB ranking. In addition, the media use subjective criteria in ranking schools.[1]

This study, using an editorial board representation approach, provides an alternative and objective approach to the ranking of schools with IB orientation.[2] Our study includes ranking of schools outside the U.S. and uses information from 1990-2002 to provide a more recent ranking of schools with IB programs and covers a larger set of IB journals with explicit consideration of journal quality. Several interesting findings are worth noting. First, U.S. schools play a significant leadership role among the leading IB programs. Second, we find a major contribution of non-U.S. schools to school ranking, confirming the importance of the global nature of the IB discipline. Third, the top-ranked schools share a number of characteristics, such as a stand-alone IB program, faculty publishing in the top-tier IB journals or ranked MBA programs. Finally, the correlation among different ranking criteria can be low, particularly for the top-ranked schools, suggesting that care should be exercised in interpreting school ranking.

[1] For example, *U.S. News and World Report* asks business school deans and program heads to nominate up to 10 programs for excellence in each of the areas listed. The 10 schools receiving the most votes are ranked as leaders of these programs in a particular business discipline. For details, see http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings.

[2] Some business schools may not necessarily have a designated international business program, but they do have international business courses or faculty conducting research in international business.

The organization of the paper is as follows. We first provide a brief literature review and a discussion on the research issue. Then we discuss editorial board membership data and the research methodology. Results of the empirical analysis along with their implications are presented. Finally, we conclude with some discussions on the limitations of our study and future research.

Literature Review and Research Issue

Rankings of schools provide important information for internal and external uses. Kaufman (1984), Gibbons (1990), and Chan and Fok (2003) provide detailed explanations for the use of rankings. As an internal yardstick, university administrators may use rankings for program evaluation, curriculum decisions, and even resource allocation. Promotion and tenure decision criteria may be related to rankings of programs involved. In addition, hiring departments may use rankings in employment decisions. For external purposes, schools typically publicize their good ranking to attract more qualified students, better faculty, and more financial donors.

Several approaches have been used to examine academic program ranking in the literature. The first approach is an opinion survey. Essentially, the survey approach uses questionnaires to ask opinions of a selected group of individuals regarding the ranking of schools in a business discipline. Ball and McCulloch (1984, 1988) and Nehrt (1987) have used the survey approach to rank IB programs. Opinion surveys are based on perceptions of the quality of academic programs among a selective group of individuals such as faculty, deans, or business executives. While perceptions of these selected groups are certainly useful, opinion surveys incur biases that are very difficult to correct in the survey design. Coe and Weinstocks (1983) and

Mabry and Sharplin (1985) discuss various shortcomings of the survey approach in general and Douglas (1989) presents her criticisms on the findings of Nehrt (1987) in the context of ranking IB master's degree programs. In general, shortcomings and criticisms of opinion survey include the subjective nature of survey design imparted by researchers, the large number of non-responses, the inability of respondents to gauge the changing quality of a program over time, and the question of whether the respondents are truly good representatives of the institutions.

Another approach to rankings in a specific functional discipline is to measure research output of each area. To provide a ranking of one functional area, many studies examine the research productivity of an institution's faculty or its doctoral graduates. Unlike the opinion survey, this approach is more objective. However, limitations of this approach include the assumption that quantity of research is the primary indicator [see Chan and Fok (2003)] and the approach usually ignores inter-disciplinary research outlets [see Chan, Chen, and Steiner (2002)]. There has been a plethora of ranking studies among various business functional areas -- for instance, in accounting [Cottingham and Hussey (2000)], in finance [Borokhovich, Bricker, Brunarski, and Simkins (1995) and Chan, Chen, and Steiner (2002)], in marketing [Powers, Swan, Bos, and Patton (1998)], and in economics [Conboy, Dusansky, Drukker, and Kildegaard (1995)].

In contrast, there are few research productivity-based studies in school ranking related to international business. Using publication data of nine leading journals[3] from 1980-1989 and carefully selecting only IB articles to be included in their sample[4], Morrison and Inkpen (1991) provide an IB school ranking based on research productivity. In their ranking, articles in two

[3] The nine journals are *Journal of International Business Studies, Columbia Journal of World Business* (now called *Journal of World Business*), *Harvard Business Review, Journal of Marketing, Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Finance, and American Economic Review.*

[4] For instance, there were only three articles selected from *Journal of Finance* and *American Economic Review*.

journals (*Journal of International Business Studies* (*JIBS*) and *Journal of World Business*) constitute 86% of all "IB articles" in their sample.[5] In a retrospective study of *JIBS*, Inkpen and Beamish (1994) also provide a ranking of schools with research productivity solely based on articles appearing in that journal from 1970-1994. While both Morrison and Inkpen (1991) and Inkpen and Beamish (1994) are informative, the studies are focused on one to two major IB journals only. Pierce and Garven (1995) survey a wide array of journal editors and provide information on 79 business journals that publish international research. Phene and Guisinger (1998) provide citation-based analysis on the development of *JIBS*, and confirm that it does well. Pierce and Garven (1995) is a publishing guide for authors, and Phene and Guisinger (1998) provide a recent evaluation of *JIBS* to suggest its status as the leading IB journal.

The research published in IB journals displays multi-functional interests, and thus raises the question of uniqueness of the discipline. Wright and Ricks (1994) provide an update to an earlier study of Nehrt, Truitt, and Wright (1970) regarding the scope of IB research, and conclude that IB research has extended into a broader range of functional areas and geographical areas. In addition to the studies of Morrison and Inkpen (1991) and Inkpen and Beamish (1994) on IB productivity, Chandy and Williams (1994) examine the influence of individuals and other business disciplines on IB research in *JIBS*, and conclude that management, economics, marketing, and finance disciplines have significant impacts on IB research, endorsing the multi-functional aspect of the IB discipline. In a survey study, Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) find that five out of the top 40 marketing journals were international in nature, while a citation analysis of the leading management journals revealed that *JIBS*, an international journal, was the most cited journal in the management literature.

[5] Among 664 IB articles in the nine journals (in footnote 2), *Journal of International Business Studies* and *Journal of World Business* account for 571 articles.

In some universities, the IB area is a stand-alone program, while in other universities, the IB area blends into other disciplines or is a sub-set of other disciplines. It is not surprising that in a recent comment and reply exchange, Dubois and Reeb (2000, 2001), in studying the pecking order of IB research outlets, maintain that IB research should maintain an inward focus, while Inkpen (2001) believes that IB research should extend into specific disciplines in order to gain greater legitimacy. Apparently, it is not easy and remains an issue for researchers to identify an objective measure to capture the nature of ranking IB programs.

In light of the issues above, the use of editorial board membership appears to be an objective and potentially useful measure that can benchmark research productivity (as board members are typically productive members who are research oriented) and the extent of international business programs (as board membership provides visibility to their schools). Because of the multi-functional nature of IB as a discipline, IB scholars have published in leading IB journals and other major journals focusing in different functional areas. This pattern of research may make the traditional approach of output analysis difficult because there are many journals that publish IB-related articles. Our editorial membership approach can potentially circumvent the difficulty. If an IB scholar publishes well (in IB and/or functional journals), he or she will likely be invited to join an editorial board of an IB journal. Hence, editorial board representation is useful in gauging the schools' research productivity. Using a regression analysis, we also examine whether board memberships can indeed reflect school reputation, research output, and nature of the IB programs.

Editorial Board Data and Ranking Method

We examine the editorial board members of 30 leading international business journals. The list of these journals is reported in Appendix 1. A recent study by Dubois and Reeb (2000) include these 30 journals as the basis in ranking IB journals. The list contains journals with an explicit focus on IB topics (e.g., the *Journal of International Business Studies* and *Journal of World Business*) as well as journals in other disciplines with substantial international focus (e.g., *Journal of International Marketing* and *Management International Review*). The examination of journal editorial boards in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002 allows us to examine the quality of IB programs among academic institutions over a reasonably long time period.

To accommodate the argument that it may be more prestigious in serving at the *Journal of International Business Studies* than other journals, we use the journal impact factors to adjust for differential journal quality served by editorial board membership. Similar to Chan and Fok (2003), we calculate an editorial board index (EBI) by multiplying the impact factors of the 30 journals by the frequency counts of editorial board representation to generate a ranking. The EBI of an institution or individual is defined as:

$$EBI = \sum_{i=1}^{30} \sum_{t=1}^{4} f_{it} * IF_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where f_{it} = frequency of editorial memberships in the i^{th} journal at time t; and

IF_{it} = impact factor of the i^{th} journal at time t.

The EBI index enables us to mitigate the effect of differential journal quality on IB program rankings using impact factors as weights. We have two methods to compute the impact factors. First, we follow the conventional methodology used by the *Social Science Citation Index* but focused only on five source journals (i.e., the *Journal of International Business Studies*, the

Journal of World Business, *International Business Review*, *Multinational Business Review*, and *Management International Review*) as in Dubois and Reeb (2000). We constructed the new impact factors for 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002 in order to match the year of editorial board memberships. The *Social Science Citation Index* impact factor for a journal at time t is calculated by dividing the number of citations from articles of the source journal at time t for articles published in the prior two years by the total number of articles published in that journal for the same period. For example, the 2002 impact factor for *JIBS* is the total citations that *JIBS* received from the five source journals in 2002 for *JIBS* articles in 2000 and 2001 divided by the total number of *JIBS* articles in 2000 and 2001. The impact factors using information for the prior two years for 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002 are reported in Appendix 1. Apparently, *JIBS* has the largest impact factor.[6] A weakness in this analysis is that we use only five source journals and look into the citation patterns for two years before the citing articles for our impact factor calculations. Nevertheless, our reported impact factors of *JIBS* are consistent with the impact factors in Table 3 of Phene and Guisinger (1998), which has a median impact factor of 0.324 during 1981-1991. For robustness of the study, we also use information for the prior five years in counting article citations. This approach is different from the *Social Science Citation Index* but it allows a longer time horizon for articles to show their impact.[7] The results are in Appendix 2.

When editorial board members associate with more than one affiliation, we divide the credit to each institution equally. For instance, if individual A is an editorial board member affiliated with two institutions X and Y, we assign institutions X and Y half of the credit for the editorial board membership.

[6] The largest impact factor of *JIBS* is 0.8649, which has been checked to ensure accuracy.
[7] We thank a reviewer for suggesting this to us.

There are 103 editorial boards from 30 IB journals over the four years: 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002.[8] Specifically, there are 23, 27, 26, 27 editorial boards in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002 respectively.[9] Among the 103 editorial boards for the four years, there are 3,542 editorial memberships consisting of 1,457 different individuals from 686 different institutions.[10] These editorial board memberships include different titles such as managing editor, editor-in-chief, consulting editor, editor, associate editor, and members of editorial boards. We exclude staff members who have titles such as editorial assistants or assistant editors. There are 24 editorial board members with more than one affiliation.

Empirical Analysis

Table 1 displays the geographical location of editorial board membership for the international business discipline. Two points are noteworthy. First, as a region, North America dominates the IB field with 2,162.5 (63%) editorial board memberships. Europe follows second with 838 (24%) board memberships. Asia and Pacific countries rank third with 320.5 (9%) members. It is interesting to note that other regions (South America, Africa and Middle East) also have a noticeable contribution to the profession (104.5 memberships).

Second, the top five countries with the largest board memberships are U.S. (1,991), U.K. (237.5), Canada (171.5), France (106.5), and Australia (96). Clearly, the U.S. plays the leading role in the IB profession with the largest number of board memberships and the highest number of different faculty. Non-U.S. schools as a whole make up 1,434.5 board memberships, which

[8] It is uncommon for editorial boards to change membership every year. Examinations of the board membership representation every four years should be able to capture possible changes among the journal editorial boards.
[9] Some journals ceased publishing in the late 1990s and some had not started publishing until late 1990s,
[10] There are 95 individuals with affiliations missing. We deleted them from the analysis.

are competitive with the 1,991 memberships in the U.S. Thus, the significant contribution of schools in other countries to the IB profession cannot be ignored and underestimated.[11]

Table 2 provides a ranking of institutions by the number of editorial member representations in the 30 IB journals. We only show the top-50 rankings in Table 2.[12] Column (3) provides the frequency counts of editorial board memberships. Other additional information (number of faculty and different journals) is also included to determine if a school has only a few or a large number of faculty serving on editorial boards.[13] While we include non-academic institutions in the analysis, academic institutions dominate the top rankings. Several interesting points are worth noting.

First, the top five institutions are U.S. schools, suggesting the leading roles of U.S. schools in the international business program. There are 67 editorial memberships at Michigan State University, 65 memberships at New York University, 57 memberships at Columbia University, 55 memberships at American Graduate School of International Management (Thunderbird), and 52 memberships at the University of South Carolina.

Second, the number of different journals and individual faculty members are fairly evenly distributed over most of the ranked IB programs. Columns (4) and (5) present the number of different journals and the number of different individuals from each institution, which make up the editorial boards of the 30 journals. For instance, Michigan State University has editorial

[11] While the majority of the journals (23 out of 30 or 77%) have editors from the U.S., there are only 58% (exclude Canada) of the editorial board members are from the U.S. It appears that US-based journal bias, if any, is not large. When we examine the affiliations of all the *JIBS* articles from 1990-2002, the affiliations of the non-US institutions share approximately 40% of all articles published. The *JIBS* publication patterns suggest that IB discipline depicts a genuine international scope in terms of author affiliations.

[12] A complete ranking is provided at the author's website.

[13] We do not normalize the frequency of editorial board memberships by the total number of faculty for two reasons. First, it is not practical or possible to know the number of IB faculty in early years in all the schools. Any count of IB faculty within each school may incur subjective bias because IB faculty are wide-spread in other functional areas and we need to subjectively determine if the faculty is indeed an IB faculty. Second, a school's IB reputation does not derive from a per capita basis. The name recognition is derived from all IB faculty as a group.

representation on 17 of the 30 journals, and it has 28 different faculty members on the editorial boards of the 17 journals over the period of 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002.

The results in Table 2 also suggest that a few programs are carried by a handful of individuals. Such examples would be John Carroll University (ranked 39th) and Brigham Young University (ranked 49th) with the editorial board representation of one and two individuals respectively.

<Insert Table 2 here>

Third, foreign institutions have a good representation on IB journal editorial boards, demonstrating the global nature of the discipline, a result consistent with Table 1. Table 2 indicates that there are 15 foreign institutions on the top-50 list. That is, foreign schools, as a group, represent 29% of top rankings.[14] However, there are only six non-U.S. schools ranked in the top-25, representing 24% of this group. This pattern confirms the dominant role of the U.S. schools in top rankings. The notable highest-ranked non-U.S. institutions are INSEAD (7th) in France, London Business School (13th) in U.K., the University of New South Wales (14th) in Australia, the University of Reading (19th) in U.K., Simon Fraser University (19th) in Canada, and Stockholm School of Economics (25th) in Sweden.

Finally, the 2002 international business program ranking by the *U.S. News and World Report* as of January 2003 (Column 6 of Table 2) differs sharply from those of our rankings.[15] For example, the University of Chicago, which was ranked 17th by the *U.S. News and World Report*, does not show up in our ranking. Many of the highly ranked U.S. and non-U.S. schools

[14] Because of ties in schools, there are fifty-one schools in our ranking.

[15] *U.S. News and World Report* offers IB schools ranking for undergraduate and graduate programs. This study uses their graduate school ranking here because they are supposedly more related to research and editorial boards.

(e.g., INSEAD, Pennsylvania State University, Georgetown University, and Rutgers University) according to our board membership ranking are not in the rankings of the *U.S. News and World Report*.

The last column of Table 2 presents the most recent IB program ranking study by Morrison and Inkpen (1991). While Morrison and Inkpen's ranking included non-U.S. schools, their relative ranking also differs from those of our results. The results in Table 2 do not consider the impact of differential journal quality. Most would agree that membership on the editorial board of a top journal, such as the *Journal of International Business Studies*, is more prestigious than membership on a less prestigious journal board.

Table 3 reports the new ranking for institutions adjusted by editorial board index (EBI (t-2) and EBI (t-5)). EBI (t-2) is the editorial board index that reflects the impact factors incorporating prior two-year information (see Appendix 1), while EBI (t-5) reflects the impact factors with prior five-year information (Appendix 2). The top five institutions are the University of South Carolina, New York University, Georgetown University, the University of Reading, and the University of Pennsylvania using EBI (t-2). New insight is generated. First, one non-U.S. school, the University of Reading, is now ranked fourth. There are 19 non-U.S. institutions ranked in the top-50, which is more than those in Table 2. The more non-U.S. institutions being ranked in the top schools suggests that IB faculty in foreign institutions serve on better (or higher impact factor) IB journals, and the faculty in these foreign institutions have a good representation in quality journals.

<Insert Table 3 here>

Second, a drastic shift of rankings for some schools can be observed. For example, Michigan State University, ranked 1st in Table 2, is now ranked 7th in Table 3. The University of Reading, a U.K. university, ranked 19th in Table 2, is now ranked 4th in Table 3 (using EBI (t-2)). These results illustrate the significant impact of different criteria used in ranking schools.

While there is a slight change in relative school ranking using EBI (t-5) as compared to EBI (t-2), there are no significant changes. However, several observations are worth mentioning with EBI (t-2) and EBI (t-5) using different years to compute the impact factors. First, there are more journals having non-zero impact factors with five-year prior information (see Appendix 2) as compared with those using two-year prior information (see Appendix 1). Second, the leading IB journals, such as *JIBS*, have more stable impact factors. Finally, the school rankings using EBI (t-2) and EBI (t-5) have a correlation coefficient of 0.9771, while the top 13 IB programs using EBI (t-2) and EBI (t-5) impact factors are essentially the same. Thus, it is not surprising that the literature uses the prior two-year information for rankings. Our results using prior five-year information further confirm the usefulness of using prior 2-year information suggested in the literature. The advantage of having more stable impact factors for some journals using the prior five-year information needs to be evaluated in light of the substantial cost of information collection.

An important issue pertaining to the rankings in Tables 2 and 3 is whether there are possible common characteristics shared by these leading IB programs. To this end, we conduct a regression analysis to examine the extent of editorial board participation for the top international business programs with some underlying important characteristics of schools. Our dependent variables are editorial board memberships, and two editorial board indices (using prior 2-year or 5-year information). We use the following characteristics as explanatory variables: (1) AACSB

accreditation or not, (2) whether a public or private institution, (3) MBA program ranking, (4) whether the schools have stand alone IB programs, highest degree offered (to proxy IB program size), (5) location, and (6) research output from *JIBS* during 1990-2002[16] (to proxy productivity if the schools are highly published). We collect data on these variables from the websites of the relevant schools, AASCB website, and published articles of *JIBS* for the period 1990-2002.

Table 4 Panel A presents the correlation coefficients among the variables used in the regression models. All the explanatory variables do not have high correlation coefficients among themselves while the three dependent variables all have high correlation coefficients. Table 4 Panel B reports the regression model results. We identify several variables that the leading IB programs share in terms of editorial board memberships and editorial board index. First, a stand-alone IB program and an IB doctoral program have a positive and significant coefficient in the editorial board members regression equation, implying that they improve scores of school ranking in terms of editorial board memberships. Second, a higher research productivity output (a large number of *JIBS* articles published) has a positive impact on scores of schools based on the number of editorial board memberships. The higher the research productivity of a school, the better rank the school could have based on either the editorial board membership or the editorial board index. Third, the MBA ranking variable is negative, implying that a school with a higher MBA ranking (i.e., a lower number) variable will have a higher ranked IB program (higher scores). These findings suggest that the top IB programs (in terms of more editorial board representation) share a number of characteristics such as having stand-alone IB programs, offering the doctoral degree, having a high MBA ranking, and having a highly published faculty. The regression results using EBI (t-2) and EBI (t-5) are similar in sign with the results using

[16] We hand-collected all article information from *JIBS* during 1990-2002 and calculated the research productivity of the schools in our sample. The top-50 IB programs according to *the JIBS* research output are reported in Appendix 3.

editorial board memberships, but not significant in stand-alone IB program and IB doctoral program variables. We use variance inflation factors to detect multicollinearity problems among the explanatory variables for all the regressions in Panel B, Table 4. The factors are all below four, suggesting no multicollinearity problems among the explanatory variables.[17]

< Insert Table 4 here>

Table 5 presents the rank correlation analyses among various rankings. Panel A reports the correlation for different criteria using all the institutions that have EBI (both academic and non-academic). The correlation between EBI (t-2) ranking (in Table 3) and editorial board ranking (Table 2) is 0.5203 for 332 institutions, EBI (t-5) ranking and editorial board ranking is 0.5883 for 526 institutions and 0.6808 for the top-25 IB programs.

Panel B of Table 5 reports the correlation between the ranking of *U.S. News and World Report*, Morrison and Inkpen (1991) and Inkpen and Beamish (1994) and the rankings in this study. The rank correlation of *U.S. News and World Report* with editorial board membership is 0.1565 and with EBI (t-2) is 0.2151. The top-25 schools in Morrison and Inkpen (1991) and the rankings in this study also have low correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficient is 0.1645 with editorial board memberships and 0.1430 with EBI (t-2) ranking. Lastly, the rank correlation coefficients between Inkpen and Beamish's (1994) top-25 schools and the ranking editorial board membership and EBI (t-2) ranking are 0.2928 and0.3724, respectively. The results for EBI (t-5) are similar to those of EBI (t-2). Overall, the correlation coefficients in Panel B are low across different criteria, suggesting that rankings based on an opinion survey methodology, on only U.S. schools, or restrictive to one or two IB journals may be misleading.

[17] Please refer to http://raven.cc.ukans.edu/~kups/maillist/classes/ps707/2004/msg00057.html for details.

Table 6 provides a list of leading IB professionals in terms of the number of editorial board memberships (Panel A) and EBI (t-2) (Panel B).[18] In Panel A, the top five individuals are Raj Aggarwal, Erdener Kaynak, Tamer Cavusgil, David Ricks, and Jean Boddewyn. Panel B presents the impact factor-based EBI ranking. The top five individuals are Raj Aggarwal, Susan Douglas, Nancy Adler, Jean Francois Hennart, and Mark Cassion. The results in both panels indicate that Raj Aggarwal ranks at the top consistently, but the ranking of other individuals changes depending on the criteria used.

<Insert Table 6 here>

Summary and Implications

We have ranked institutions according to the representation of their faculty on editorial boards of 30 leading international business journals. We consider that the editorial board membership on high-quality journals represents prestigious positions of the institutions and signals the academic reputation of the individuals. The number of membership representations on the editorial board is a good proxy for the quality of the program. Without adjusting for journal quality, the top five institutions are Michigan State University, New York University, Columbia University, American Graduate School of International Management (Thunderbird), and the University of South Carolina. Using the impact factor to adjust for journal quality in editorial board representation (EBI (t-2)), the top five institutions are the University of South Carolina, New York University, Georgetown University, the University of Reading, and the University of Pennsylvania.

[18] The individual rankings based on EBI (t-5) are similar to those of EBI (t-2). The detailed results are available upon request.

In addition, school ranking, such as the one provided in *U.S. News and World Report*, entirely based on only U.S. schools can be misleading for the international business school discipline because international business is truly a global discipline. One striking result in our study is the leading role of the U.S. schools in the international business profession. However, the contribution of the non-U.S. schools as a group is shown to be equally important as their faculty representation on editorial board membership is very significant. Our study also suggests that the top IB programs share a number of characteristics such as having stand-alone IB programs, an IB doctoral program, high MBA ranking, and highly published faculty.

When school administrators use ranking as a managerial decision for fund raising and faculty promotion, care must be exercised in interpreting the ranking and the issues involved. Blindly following the ranking provided by media can be misleading, which is demonstrated in our study. The rank correlation between the survey ranking by *U.S. News and World Report* and board membership participation in this study is found to be very low.

Limitations and Future Research

Editorial board membership is not a perfect ranking criterion. There are limitations in our study. First, our study only covers a 12-year time span for the analysis. Clearly, a longer time span is preferred, if resources are available. Second, we used only five source journals in computing the impact factors. Although this approach has been used previously, a larger number of source journals (e.g., all 30 IB journals in our study) would be more desirable[19]. Third, when we calculate impact factors, we do not adjust for self-citations. An evaluation of this nature would illustrate whether or not self-citations would change the impact factors and the

[19] We use five journals in this study for two reasons. First, we try to follow the literature [see Dubois and Reeb (2000)]. Second, some journals in earlier years are not readily available in all university libraries and the cost of collecting all the information is prohibitive.

outcomes.[20] Fourth, good researchers may not choose to be on editorial boards due to time constraints or other reasons. As a result, limited participation on an editorial board does not necessarily imply that the non-ranked schools are of lesser quality. Last, it is evident that IB has gained substantially in the last few years and there are a number of IB articles appearing in top functional area journals like *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Strategic Management Journal*, and *Journal of Marketing*, among others. Hence, editorial board representations in these functional area journals may also potentially carry important implications in gauging the progress of IB programs.[21]

Future research efforts in ranking schools with international business programs may be directed to examining the productivity of faculty in different schools across the globe in a more recent time period. Thus, future research may extend the study of Morrison and Inkpen (1991) to include more IB related journals. The challenge in conducting productivity-based research ranking is the increasing number of IB journals in recent years and the inter-disciplinary nature of the IB area.

Our ranking study using editorial board memberships is evidently an alternative approach in ranking schools with an international business program. This study provides a useful complement to the survey results of Ball and McCulloch (1984, 1988) and productivity-based Morrison and Inkpen (1991), and offers with a different approach to discover new insights into rankings of schools for the international business discipline.

[20] We believe that excluding self-citations would distort the true results of our analysis. The leading IB journal, *JIBS*, dominates the citations and has many self-citations. Thus, the impact factor of *JIBS* will be unfairly lowered if we do not count self-citations.

[21] There are apparently a number of non-IB scholars serving on editorial boards of these top functional area journals. To include these top-functional journals editorial board members without identifying who should be considered an IB scholar would definitely introduce different kinds of biases.

References

Ball, Donald A. and Wendell H. McCulloch, Jr., 1984. International business education programs in American schools: how they are ranked by members of the Academy of International Business, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 15, 175-180.

Ball, Donald A. and Wendell H. McCulloch, Jr., 1988. International business education programs in American and non-American schools: how they are ranked by the Academy of International Business, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19, 295-299.

Borokhovich, K.A., R.J. Bricker, K.R. Brunarski, and B.S. Simkins, 1995. Finance research productivity and influence, *Journal of Finance*, 50, 1691-1717.

Chan, Kam C., Carl R. Chen, and Thomas L. Steiner, 2002. Production in the finance literature, institutional reputation, and labor mobility in academia: a global perspective, *Financial Management*, 31, 131-156.

Chan, Kam C. and Robert Fok, 2003. Membership on editorial boards and finance department rankings, *Journal of Financial Research*, 26, 405-420.

Chandy, P.R. and Thomas G.E. Williams, 1994. The impact of journals and authors on international business research: a citational analysis of *JIBS* articles, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 715-728.

Coe, R.K. and I. Weinstocks, I., 1983. Evaluating the finance journals: the department chairperson perspective, *Journal of Financial Research*, 6, 345-349.

Conboy, M.E., R. Dusansky, D. Drukker, and K. Kildegaard, 1995. The productivity of economics departments in the U.S.: publications in the core journals, *Journal of Economic Literature* 33, 1966-1971.

Cottingham, J., and R. Hussey, 2000. Publishing in professional accounting journals: academic institutional performance 1987-1996, *The British Accounting Review*, 32, 101-114.

Douglas, Susan P., 1989. The ranking of masters programs in international business: comment, *Journal of International Business*, 20, 157-162.

Dubois, Frank L. and David Reeb, 2000, Ranking the international business journals, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31, 689-704.

Dubois, Frank L. and David Reeb, 2001, Ranking the international business journals: A reply, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32, 197-199.

Gibbons, Jean D., 1990. U.S. institutional representation on editorial boards of U.S. statistics journals, *American Statistician* 44, 210-213.

Gibbons, Jean D. and Mary Fish, 1991. Rankings of economics faculties and representation on editorial boards of top journals, *Journal of Economic Education*, 22, 361-366.

Hult, G., M. Tomas, W. T. Neese, and R. E. Bashaw, 1997. Faculty perceptions of marketing journals, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19, 37-52.

Inkpen, Andrew C. and Paul W. Beamish, 1994. An analysis of twenty-five years of research in the Journal of International Business Studies, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 703-713.

Inkpen, Andrew C., 2001. A note on ranking the international business journals, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32, 193-196.

Kaufman, George, 1984. Rankings of finance departments by faculty representation on editorial boards of professional journals: a note, *Journal of Finance*, 39, 1189-1197.

Kurtz, David L. and Louis E. Boone, 1988, Rating marketing faculties on the basis of editorial review board membership, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 10, 64-68.

Mabry, Rodney H., Arthur D. Sharplin, 1985. The relative importance of journals used in finance research, *Journal of Financial Research*, 8, 287-296.

Mittermaier, Linda J., 1991. Representation on editorial boards of academic accounting journals: an analysis of accounting faculties and doctorial programs, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 6, 221-238.

Morrison, Allen J. and Andrew C. Inkpen, 1991. An analysis of significant contributions to the international business literature, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22, 143-153.

Nehrt, Lee C., 1987, The ranking of masters programs in international business, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18, 91-99.

Nehrt, Lee C., J. Frederick Truitt, and Richard W. Wright, 1970. International business research: past, present, and future. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Bureau of Business Research.

Phene, Anupama and Stephen Guisinger, 1998. The stature of the Journal of International Business Studies, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29, 621-632.

Pierce, Barbara and Garnet Garven, 1995. Publishing international business research: a survey of leading journals, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26, 69-89.

Powers, Thomas L., John E. Swan, Theodore Bos, and John Frank Patton, 1998, Career research productivity patterns of marketing academicians, *Journal of Business Research*, 42, 75-86.

Wright, Richard W. and David A. Ricks, 1994. Trends in international business research: twenty-five years later, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 687-701.

Table 1. Geographical location of editorial board memberships

This table displays the geographical location of editorial board membership for the international business discipline among academic institutions. Two points are noteworthy. U.S. plays the leading role in the IB profession with the largest board memberships and the highest number of different faculty. Non-U.S. schools, as a whole, also significantly contribute to the IB profession.

	Country	No. of editorial board members	No. of different journals	No. of different faculty
North America	U.S.	1991	29	778
	Canada	171.5	25	61
	Subtotal	**2162.5 (63.13%)**		
Asia and Pacific	Australia	96	21	47
	Japan	74	19	39
	Hong Kong	40	15	24
	South Korea	21	9	11
	New Zealand	18	9	11
	Singapore	16	7	9
	India	13	5	8
	Saudi Arabia	12	5	6
	Taiwan	12	4	8
	China	8.5	5	6
	Thailand	6	2	3
	Kuwait	2	2	1
	Malaysia	1	1	1
	Philippines	1	1	1
	Subtotal	**320.5 (9.36%)**		
Europe	U.K.	237.5	27	116
	France	106.5	19	52
	Germany	84.5	15	37
	The Netherlands	73	17	33
	Sweden	62.5	14	23
	Belgium	46	9	17
	Switzerland	41	14	22
	Norway	25	9	8
	Spain	23	10	13
	Finland	21	8	9
	Denmark	20.5	11	15
	Turkey	16	5	7
	Poland	15	8	6
	Italy	12	7	5
	Ireland	11	5	4
	Hungary	8	4	5
	Portugal	8	3	3
	Greece	6.5	5	4

	Country	No. of editorial board members	No. of different journals	No. of different faculty
	Austria	6	4	4
	Russia	5	3	2
	Cyprus	4	2	3
	Malta	3	1	1
	Romania	3	1	1
	Subtotal	**838 (24.46%)**		
Others (South America, Africa, Middle East)	Israel	39.5	11	16
	Mexico	14	7	5
	Brazil	10	5	6
	Nigeria	7.5	3	3
	Argentina	5	2	2
	Egypt	4.5	3	3
	Kenya	4	1	1
	Jordan	3	1	1
	Monaco	3	1	1
	South Africa	3	1	1
	Venezuela	3	1	2
	Bolivia	2	1	1
	Colombia	2	2	2
	Trinidad and Tobago	2	1	2
	Ghana	1	1	1
	Peru	1	1	1
	Subtotal	**104.5 (3.05%)**		

Table 2. Ranking of institutions by representation on international business journals editorial boards in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002

This table presents the ranking of institutions by number of editorial board memberships in 30 IB journals in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002. Column (1) provides the frequency counts of the editorial board memberships. Columns (2) and (3) give the number of different journals and the number of different individuals from each institution that make up the editorial boards.

Rank	Institutions	No. of editorial board members	No. of different journals	No. of different faculty	*U.S. News and World Report* graduate ranking as of Jan 2003	Morrison and Inkpen (1991) ranking (p. 148)
1	Michigan State U	67	17	28	20	
2	New York U	65	12	20	5	6
3	Columbia U	57	10	36	3 (tied)	1
4	American Graduate School of International Business	55	13	19	1	
5	U of South Carolina	52	14	17	2	5
6	U of Michigan	51	16	18	6	11
7	INSEAD, France	43.5	12	20		19
8	Penn State U	43	11	10		22
9	Georgetown U	39	13	11	14	8
10	Rutgers U	38.5	15	17		4
11	U of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	39	11	20		23
12	U of Penn	38	10	21	3 (tied)	2
13	London Business School, UK	37	11	16		
14	U of New South Wales, Australia	35	12	18		
15	Indiana U	33.5	12	10	15	21
16 (tied)	City U of New York (Baruch College)	33	11	9		14
16 (tied)	Temple U	33	12	14	22 (tied)	
18	U of Texas, Austin	31.5	10	11	16	12

Rank	Institutions	No. of editorial board members	No. of different journals	No. of different faculty	*U.S. News and World Report* graduate ranking as of Jan 2003	Morrison and Inkpen (1991) ranking (p. 148)
19 (tied)	Northwestern U	29	6	13	11	
19 (tied)	Simon Fraser U, Canada	29	12	7		18
19 (tied)	U of Reading, UK	29	9	7		
22	Harvard U	26	10	16	7	3
23 (tied)	Texas A&M U	24	11	9		25
23 (tied)	U of Maryland	24	9	7		
25	Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden	23	8	8		
26	U of Washington	22	8	9	22 (tied)	
27 (tied)	Ohio State U	21	11	9		20
27 (tied)	U of California, Irvine	21	9	6		
29 (tied)	Chinese U. of Hong Kong	20	9	10		
29 (tied)	Florida International U	20	9	8		
29 (tied)	U of Wisconsin, Madison	20	9	7		
32	U of California, Los Angeles	19.5	6	8	10	
33 (tied)	Concordia U, Canada	19	8	7		
33 (tied)	McGill U, Canada	19	7	2		9
35 (tied)	Arizona State U	18	9	9		
35 (tied)	Drexel U	18	7	7		
35 (tied)	Emory U	18	10	7		
35 (tied)	Erasmus U, The Netherlands	18	8	12		
39 (tied)	John Carroll U	17	8	1		
39 (tied)	Kent State U	17	11	3		
39 (tied)	U of Groningen, The Netherlands	17	5	4		
39 (tied)	U of Missouri-Columbia	17	7	9		
39 (tied)	U of Western Ontario, Canada	17	6	6		10

Rank	Institutions	No. of editorial board members	No. of different journals	No. of different faculty	*U.S. News and World Report* graduate ranking as of Jan 2003	Morrison and Inkpen (1991) ranking (p. 148)
44 (tied)	California State U, Fresno	16	2	7		
44 (tied)	U of Miami	16	7	8		
44 (tied)	U of Toronto, Canada	16	8	5		
47	Tel Aviv U, Israel	15.5	7	8		16
48	U of Southern California	14.5	7	7	12	7
49 (tied)	Brigham Young U	14	5	2		
49 (tied)	Texas A&M International U	14	2	5		
49 (tied)	Uppsala U, Sweden	14	3	4		
	636 institutions have 13 or less editorial board membership					

Table 3. Impact factor-based editorial board index rankings 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002 for editorial boards of 30 IB journals

This table presents the ranking of institutions based on the impact factor-based editorial board index (EBI). The EBI of an institution is defined as:

$$EBI = \sum_{i=1}^{30} \sum_{t=1}^{4} f_{it} * IF_{it}$$

where f_{it} = the frequency of the editorial memberships in i^{th} journal at time t.
IF_{it} = impact factor of the i^{th} journal at time t.

The impact factors in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002 are reported in the Appendices 1 and 2.

Rank (based on EBI (t-2))	Institutions	EBI (t-2)	EBI (t-5)	Rank (based on EBI (t-5))
1	U of South Carolina	7.0321	8.7242	1
2	New York U	6.1642	7.5918	2
3	Georgetown U	5.5117	6.3585	4
4	U of Reading, UK	5.3879	7.0252	3
5	U of Pennsylvania	5.0928	5.6449	8
6	Michigan State U	4.5607	5.9482	6
7	London Business School, UK	4.4285	5.9734	5
8	Indiana U	4.4192	5.9258	7
9	Rutgers U	4.2451	5.2539	9
10	U of Michigan	3.7766	4.7480	11
11	Thunderbird U	3.6139	4.6635	12
12	U of Western Ontario, Canada	3.4720	4.8233	10
13	Harvard U	3.3480	4.4561	13
14	U of Washington	2.8782	3.0797	15
15	U of Texas, Austin	2.7236	2.8358	18
16	McGill U, Canada	2.5916	2.4701	23
17	U of Minnesota	2.3982	3.5291	14
18	U of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	2.2737	2.5169	21
19	U of Toronto, Canada	2.1746	2.8859	17
20	John Carroll U	2.1640	2.2143	32
21	Fordham U	2.0877	2.2169	31
22	Laval U, Canada	2.0221	2.0810	36
23	U of Leeds, UK	1.9834	2.4999	22
24	INSEAD, France	1.9235	2.7057	19
25	U of Oklahoma	1.8716	1.9829	38
26	California Polytechnic State U	1.8617	1.9918	37
27	U of California, Irvine	1.8356	1.3171	61
28	U of Miami	1.7811	2.2908	27
29	U of New South Wales, Australia	1.7517	1.6026	51
30	Temple U	1.7111	3.0098	16
31	Columbia U	1.6567	2.2583	29
32	U College Dublin, Ireland	1.6421	1.9457	40
33	Ohio State U	1.4533	2.6416	20

Rank (based on EBI (t-2))	Institutions	EBI (t-2)	EBI (t-5)	Rank (based on EBI (t-5))
34	Simon Fraser U, Canada	1.4458	2.1233	33
35	U of Wisconsin, Madison	1.4316	1.6086	49
36	U Hohenheim, Germany	1.4143	2.3660	25
37	Pennsylvania State U	1.3987	2.0843	35
38	Kent State U	1.3974	2.2243	30
39	U of Virginia	1.3342	1.2784	62
40	Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden	1.2950	2.3843	24
41	U of Antwerp, Belgium	1.2681	1.9804	39
42	Brigham Young U	1.2616	1.9291	42
43 (tied)	Korea U	1.2231	1.1859	65 (tied)
43 (tied)	Versailles Saint-Quentin U, France	1.2231	1.1859	65 (tied)
45	U of Richmond	1.2172	1.0001	83
46	Northwestern U	1.1768	2.2789	28
47	U of Strachclyde, UK	1.1688	2.3241	26
48	Vrije U of Brussels, Belgium	1.1296	2.1111	34
49	Concordia U, Canada	1.1197	1.5262	56
50	Texas A&M U	1.1175	1.8634	44
		282 institutions have EBI (t-2) below 1.1175	476 institutions have EBI (t-5) below 1.6026	

Table 4. Determinants of editorial board representation

This table presents a regression model of finding the common characteristics among the top-100 institutions based on representation in editorial memberships in IB programs. We use the top-100 schools in Tables 2 and 3 as the samples. Because of tied ranking, there are more than 100 schools in the sample. *10% significant, **5% significant, and ***1% significant; VIF is the variance inflation factor. The variable definitions are:

AACSB = AACSB accreditation (Yes = 1; otherwise 0);
IB = Stand alone IB program (Yes = 1; otherwise 0);
Doctoral = Doctoral program (highest IB degree offered is doctorate = 1; otherwise 0);
Master = Master program (highest IB degree is master =1; otherwise 0);
Bachelor = Bachelor program (highest IB degree is bachelor =1; otherwise 0);
Public = Public institution (public institution =1; otherwise 0);
MBA = MBA ranking from *Financial Times* (1 is highest);
Location = Location of the institution (US and Canada =1; otherwise 0);
JIBS = Number of JIBS articles published in 1990-2002;
Board = editorial board membership;
EBI (t-2) = editorial board index that uses (t-2) years impact factors;
EBI (t-5) = editorial board index that uses (t-5) years impact factors;

Panel A: Correlation coefficients among variables in the regression model

Variables	AACSB	IB	Doctoral	Master	Bachelor	Public	MBA	Location	JIBS	Board	EBI (t-2)	EBI (t-5)
AACSB	--											
IB	0.0442	--										
Doctoral	0.1150	0.4089	--									
Master	0.0249	0.1799	-0.3923	--								
Bachelor	0.1670	-0.0355	-0.1714	-0.2421	--							
Public	-0.1997	-0.0364	0.0633	-0.1531	-0.1516	--						
MBA	-0.1731	0.0395	-0.2098	0.1323	0.1275	0.0546	--					
Location	0.5078	0.1565	0.1301	0.1249	0.0643	-0.2174	-0.1860	--				
JIBS	-0.0177	0.1546	0.3424	-0.1355	-0.0775	-0.0108	-0.3639	0.1294	--			
Board	0.0645	0.3053	0.4579	-0.1373	-0.1615	-0.0558	-0.4678	0.1453	0.5386	--		
EBI (t-2)	-0.0160	0.1460	0.3572	-0.1854	-0.1353	-0.0845	-0.4118	0.0963	0.7051	0.7387	--	
EBI (t-5)	-0.0724	0.1771	0.3733	-0.1899	-0.1342	-0.0274	-0.4075	0.0845	0.7239	0.7546	0.9769	--

Panel B: Regression analysis

		Dependent variables								
		Editorial board memberships			EBI (t-2)			EBI (t-5)		
Variables	Expected sign	Estimated coefficient	t-statistics	VIF	Estimated coefficient	t-statistics	VIF	Estimated coefficient	t-statistics	VIF
Intercept		19.2050	5.08***	0	1.5640	4.77***	0	1.8385	3.88***	0
AACSB	+	-0.1656	-0.06	1.47	-0.2604	-0.88	1.56	-0.4576	-1.35	1.46
IB	+	5.3066	2.31**	1.54	0.2631	1.01	1.63	0.4160	1.41	1.61
Doctoral	+	5.4256	1.68*	2.12	0.1043	0.29	2.27	0.1355	0.32	2.21
Master	?	-1.3531	-0.53	1.82	-0.4065	-1.41	1.81	-0.3933	-1.21	1.82
Bachelor	-	-3.5775	-0.98	1.37	-0.4455	-1.10	1.42	-0.4555	-0.96	1.37
Public	?	-1.8430	-0.83	1.12	-0.3632	-1.44	1.15	-0.2302	-0.82	1.21
MBA	-	-0.0126	-3.81***	1.28	-0.0008	-2.23**	1.31	-0.0011	-2.57**	1.29
Location	?	-0.1885	-0.08	1.47	-0.0593	-0.21	1.56	-0.0498	-0.16	1.48
JIBS	+	1.5897	4.05***	1.30	0.3213	7.71***	1.28	0.4101	8.35***	1.29
F-statistics		10.75***			13.23***			15.77***		
R-square		0.4795			0.5642			0.5843		
N		115			102			111		

Table 5. Rank correlation coefficients among various rankings

This table presents the rank correlation analyses among various rankings. Panel A reports the correlation for different criteria using all the 332 institutions (both academic and non-academic). Panel B reports the rank correlation between the ranking of *U.S. News and World Report* and the rankings in this study

Panel A: Editorial board memberships and EBI rankings

	All schools that have EBI (t-2) N=332	**All schools that have EBI (t-5) N=526**	**Top 25 schools in Table 3**
Editorial board membership ranking	0.5203	0.5883	0.6808

Panel B: *U.S. News and World Report* top 23 schools, Morrison and Inkpen top-25 schools (in Table 3 of Morrison and Inkpen (1991, p. 148), and Inkpen and Beamish top-25 schools during 1970-1994 (in Table 4 of Inkpen and Beamish (1994, p. 709) (Note: the 9th ranked University of California-Berkeley and 17th ranked University of Chicago were deleted because they had no faculty represented in the 30 IB journals)

Ranking criteria	**No. of editorial board members**	**EBI (t-2)**	**EBI (t-5)**
***US News and World Report* Top 23 schools as of Jan 2003**	0.1565	0.2151	0.2118
Morrison and Inkpen (1991)	0.1645	0.1430	0.1571
Inkpen and Beamish (1994)	0.2928	0.3724	0.5892

Table 6. Leading international business professionals by representation on editorial boards of 30 IB journals in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002

Panel A identifies leading IB professionals in terms of the number of editorial board memberships. Panel B ranks names by the impact factor-based editorial board index.

Panel A: By editorial board membership

Rank	Name	Institutional affiliation as of December, 2002	No. of editorial memberships	No. of different journals
1	Aggarwal, Raj	Kent State U	23	8
2	Kaynak, Erdener	Penn State U	20	6
3 (tied)	Cavusgil, S. Tamer	Michigan State U	18	8
3 (tied)	Ricks, David A.	U of Missouri, St. Louis	18	8
5	Boddewyn, Jean J.	City U of New York	17	6
6	Kotabe, Masaaki "Mike"	Temple U	14	7
7 (tied)	Czinkota, Michael R.	Georgetown U	13	6
7 (tied)	Radebaugh, Lee H.	Brigham Young U	13	5
7 (tied)	Samiee, Saeed	U of Tulsa	13	5
7 (tied)	Thorelli, Hans B.	Indian U	13	5
11	Tung, Rosalie L.	Simon Fraser U	12	6
12 (tied)	Daniels, John D.	U of Miami	11	4
12 (tied)	Rice, Gillian	American Graduate School of International Business	11	3
12 (tied)	Rugman, Alan M.	Indiana U / U of Oxford	11	7
12 (tied)	Terpstra, Vern	U of Michigan	11	5
16 (tied)	Adler, Nancy J.	McGill U, Canada	10	4
16 (tied)	Beamish, Paul M.	U of Western Ontario, Canada	10	5
16 (tied)	Booth, G. Geoffrey	Michigan State U	10	4
16 (tied)	Cassion, Mark C.	U of Reading, UK	10	3
16 (tied)	Douglas, Susan P.	New York U	10	3
16 (tied)	Dunning, John H.	Rutgers U / U of Reading, UK	10	4
16 (tied)	Ghauri, Pervez N.	U of Groningen, the Netherlands	10	3
16 (tied)	Kumar, Brij Nino	Friedrich-Alexander U, Germany	10	4
16 (tied)	Ortiz, Edgar	U Nacional Autonoma de Mexico	10	3
16 (tied)	Sheth, Jagdish N.	Emory U	10	4
16 (tied)	Stulz, Rene	Ohio State U	10	3

Panel B: By impact factor-based editorial board index (EBI (t-2))

Rank	Name	Institutional affiliation as of December, 2002	EBI (t-2)
1	Aggarwal, Raj	Kent State U	2.7857
2	Douglas, Susan P.	New York U	2.7040
3	Adler, Nancy J.	McGill U, Canada	2.5916
4	Hennart, Jean Francois	Tilburg U, the Netherlands	2.5239
5	Cassion, Mark C.	U of Reading, UK	2.4342
6	Daniels, John D.	U of Miami	2.1056
7	Egelhoff, William G.	Fordham U	2.0877
8	Cosset, Jean-Claude	Laval U, Canada	2.0221
9	Cavusgil, S. Tamer	Michigan State U	1.9102
10	Geringer, J. Michael	California Polytechnic State U	1.8617
11	Dunning, John H.	Rutgers U / U of Reading, UK	1.8459
12	Earley, P. Christopher	Indiana U	1.7925
13	Harvey, Michael G.	U of Mississippi	1.7775
14	Contractor, Farouk J.	Rutgers U	1.7230
15	Cantwell, John A.	U of Reading, UK	1.7113
16	Bradley, Frank	U College Dublin, Ireland	1.6421
17	Thorelli, Hans B.	Indiana U	1.5631
18	Grosse, Robert E.	American Graduate School of International Business	1.5575
19 (tied)	Brewer, Thomas L.	Georgetown U	1.5319
19 (tied)	Booth, Laurence D.	U of Toronto, Canada	1.5319

Appendix 1. International business journal impact factors (t-2)

The impact factors in Table 2 are calculated from citations from five core IB journals (*Journal of International Business Studies, Management International Review, Journal of World Business, Multinational Business Review,* and *International Business Review*) in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002.

Journal	Short name	Impact factor 90	Impact factor 94	Impact factor 98	Impact factor 2002
Advances in International Accounting	AIA	0	0	0	0
Advances in International Banking and Finance	AIBF	0	0	0	0
Advances in International Comparative Management	AICM	0	0	0	0
Advances in International Marketing	AIM	0	0	0	0
Global Finance J	GFJ	0	0	0	0
International Business Review	IBR	0	0.1000	0.1194	0.0816
International J of Accounting	IJA	0	0	0	0
International J of Conflict Management	IJCM	0	0	0	0
International J of Finance	IJF	0	0	0	0
International J of Management	IJM	0	0	0	0
International J of Research in Marketing	IJRM	0	0	0	0
International Management	IM	0	0.0059	0	0
International Marketing Review	IMR	0.0943	0	0.0175	0.0294
International Review of Strategic Management	IRSM	0	0	0	0
International Studies of Management and Organization	ISMO	0	0	0	0
International Trade J	ITJ	0.0303	0.0909	0.0000	0.0000
J of Global Marketing	JGM	0	0	0.0250	0.0513
J of International Business Studies	JIBS	0.4902	0.3088	0.8649	0.3582
J of International Consumer marketing	JICM	0	0	0	0
J of International Finance	JIF	0	0	0	0
J of International Financial Management and Accounting	JIFMA	0	0	0	0
J of International Management	JOIM	0	0	0.0400	0.0256
J of International Marketing	JIM	0	0.0233	0.0377	0.0492
J of International Marketing and Marketing Research	JIMMR	0	0	0	0
J of Multinational Financial Management	JMFM	0	0	0	0
J of World Business	JWB	0.0423	0.0220	0.2653	0.2642
Management International Review	MIR	0.2200	0.0645	0.2162	0.1818
Multinational Business Review	MBR	0	0	0	0.1111
Multinational Finance J	MFJ	0	0	0	0
Thunderbird International Business Review	TIBR	0	0	0	0

Appendix 2. International business journal impact factors (t-5)

The impact factors in Table 2 are calculated from citations from five core IB journals (*Journal of International Business Studies, Management International Review, Journal of World Business, Multinational Business Review,* and *International Business Review*) in 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2002.

Journal	Short name	Impact factor 90	Impact factor 94	Impact factor 98	Impact factor 2002
Advances in International Accounting	AIA	0	0	0	0
Advances in International Banking and Finance	AIBF	0	0	0	0
Advances in International Comparative Management	AICM	0	0	0	0.0167
Advances in International Marketing	AIM	0.0500	0.0250	0.0250	0
Global Finance J	GFJ	0.2000	0	0	0.0125
International Business Review	IBR	0	0.1250	0.1250	0.1923
International J of Accounting	IJA	0	0.0066	0.0066	0
International J of Conflict Management	IJCM	0	0	0	0.0282
International J of Finance	IJF	0	0	0	0
International J of Management	IJM	0	0	0	0
International J of Research in Marketing	IJRM	0.0098	0.0090	0.0090	0.0085
International Management	IM	0	0.0040	0.0020	0
International Marketing Review	IMR	0.0224	0.0827	0.0827	0.0207
International Review of Strategic Management	IRSM	0	0	0	0
International Studies of Management and Organization	ISMO	0.0094	0	0	0.0579
International Trade J	ITJ	0.0159	0.0366	0	0
J of Global Marketing	JGM		0.0240	0.0240	0.0606
J of International Business Studies	JIBS	0.4545	0.4406	0.4406	0.6695
J of International Consumer marketing	JICM	0	0	0	0.0122
J of International Finance	JIF	0	0	0	0
J of International Financial Management and Accounting	JIFMA	0	0	0	0
J of International Management	JOIM	0	0	0.0159	0.1200
J of International Marketing	JIM	0	0.0500	0.0500	0.0948
J of International Marketing and Marketing Research	JIMMR	0	0	0	0
J of Multinational Financial Management	JMFM	0	0	0	0
J of World Business	JWB	0.0435	0.0690	0.0690	0.2295
Management International Review	MIR	0.1346	0.2464	0.2464	0.4118
Multinational Business Review	MBR	0	0	0	0.0926
Multinational Finance J	MFJ	0	0	0	0
Thunderbird International Business Review	TIBR	0	0	0	0.0072

Appendix 3. Top-25 IB programs based on publications in Journal of International Business Studies (1990-2002)

We hand-collected the information from *JIBS* during 1990-2002 and counted the number of *JIBS* articles published by respective institutions. If the numbers of articles are the same, we use the number of school appearance as the tie-breaker.

Rank	Institutions	Number of articles	Number of appearances
1	U South Carolina	15.25	32
2	U Western Ontario, Canada	12.92	27
3	U Texas-Austin	8.87	19
4	U Pennsylvania	8.50	12
5	Georgetown U	8.25	16
6	Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong	8.08	21
7	Harvard U	7.83	10
8	Rutgers U	7.17	15
9	U Hawaii	7.00	14
10	New York U	6.35	11
11	American Graduate School of International Management	6.08	11
12	INSEAD, France	6.08	9
13	U Oklahoma	5.37	8
14	U Minnesota	4.75	9
15	Indiana U	4.70	8
16	Michigan State U	4.67	12
17	American U	4.50	9
18	Northeastern U	4.33	8
19	University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong	4.20	12
20	Iowa State U	4.17	9
21	Ohio State U	4.08	8
22	Temple U	4.00	10
23	U Washington	4.00	8
24	U Bradford, UK	4.00	7
25	U Miami	3.67	6
26	Dartmouth College	3.50	8
28 (tied)	U Leeds, UK	3.50	7
28 (tied)	U Texas-Dallas	3.50	7
28 (tied)	UC-Irvine	3.50	7
30	Baruch College	3.50	6
30	U Toronto	3.50	6
32	U Reading	3.50	5

Rank	Institutions	Number of articles	Number of appearances
33	Tilburg U	3.25	6
34	Stockholm School Economics, Sweden	3.17	6
35	Boise State U	3.17	5
36	Simon Fraser U, Canada	3.12	7
37 (tied)	London Business School, UK	3.00	7
37 (tied)	Texas A&M U	3.00	7
39	Boston U	3.00	3
40	U Texas-San Antonio	2.83	7
41	Purdue U	2.83	4
42	U Houston	2.79	9
43	U Pittsburgh	2.67	6
44	U Utah	2.67	5
45	U Michigan	2.50	6
46	Hong Kong Polytechnic U, Hong Kong	2.50	5
47	Copenhagen Business School, Denmark	2.50	4
48 (tied)	Penn State U	2.50	3
48 (tied)	U Tulsa	2.50	3
50	Nanyang Technological U, Singapore	2.42	5