

# Doing Good and Doing Well: On the Multiple Contributions of Journal Editors

HERMAN AGUINIS  
RYAN K. GOTTFREDSON  
Indiana University

STEVEN A. CULPEPPER  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

DAN R. DALTON  
Indiana University

GIDEON P. DE BRUIN  
University of Johannesburg

---

*We investigate four facets of the post-editorship research performance of journal editors (i.e., number of articles in refereed journals, books, book chapters, and presentations at professional conferences) and their relationship with nonresearch performance at the university (i.e., department, school/college, university) and professional (i.e., professional organizations, journal editorial boards) levels. Our sample included 31 of the 32 journal editors from the mid-1950s to the mid-2000s of Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management, and Personnel Psychology who have not retired or passed away studied by Aguinis, de Bruin, Cunningham, Hall, Culpepper, and Gottfredson (2010). Results based on robust regression analysis indicate that post editorship productivity does not involve a simplistic dichotomy and mutually exclusive choice between research performance versus other types of contributions. Results show that past editors can do well—be productive researchers—and also do good—make meaningful nonresearch contributions to their universities as well as their professions in general.*

---

We are very pleased that our article on productivity fluctuations of journal editors (Aguinis, de Bruin, Cunningham, Hall, Culpepper, & Gottfredson, 2010) has motivated Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012) to write on this same topic. As we noted, “little is known about how the editorship

---

We thank Carolyn Egri and two *Academy of Management Learning & Education* anonymous reviewers for highly constructive feedback that allowed us to improve our manuscript substantially. We also thank the 31 former journal editors who shared their curriculum vitae with us. These individuals serve as exemplary role models for all of us in the Academy.

experience affects editors, particularly regarding their post-editorship research productivity” (Aguinis et al., 2010: 683). Accordingly, we are delighted that the *Academy of Management Learning & Education* (AMLE) is becoming a leader in the efforts to understand the journal editorship role—arguably the most influential position in terms of knowledge generation in management and all other scientific fields.

Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012) asserted that journal publications are not the only avenue for editors to make a contribution to the field after

their terms end. This is not a novel point and we agree. In fact, we wrote that “past editors choose to influence the field in ways other than publishing journal articles. Some editors may be ready to engage in other activities as part of their career progressions and, for example, choose to participate in more executive education, serve professional organizations as their officers, or become university administrators” (Aguinis et al., 2010: 693). In addition, Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012) argued that journal editors face a dilemma because they need to choose between allocating time and effort to furthering their careers, via publications, or allocating time and effort to having broader scholarly impact via nonpublication contributions. This is also not a novel point (e.g., Baruch, Konrad, Aguinis, & Starbuck, 2008). Moreover, Aguinis and Vaschetto (2011: 411) identified and discussed this same dilemma in great detail as follows:

. . . the demanding nature of the editorial role combined with the positive and strong relationship between publications and extrinsic rewards puts editors in a difficult ethical dilemma . . . Should editors allocate the necessary time, effort, and resources to excel in their role, or should they minimize their editorial role investment and, instead, allocate the bulk of their time, effort, and resources to their own research productivity?

While we agree with Northcraft and Tenbrunsel’s aforementioned points, we disagree with their opinion that editors must solve the dilemma by either “reinforcing a selfish choice of personal productivity” or having a “broader scholarly impact” (2012: 305). Also, while we admire Northcraft and Tenbrunsel’s (2012) work and their intentions with regard to the current discussion, we regret that their response to Aguinis and colleagues (2010) was rhetorical and not empirical.

The goal of our article is to further our understanding of the performance of editors after their editorship terms end by providing empirical evidence based on some of the same past journal editors included in the Aguinis et al. (2010) study. Our results show, contrary to the opinion by Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012), that post-editorship productivity does not involve a simplistic dichotomy and mutually exclusive choice between research performance versus other types of contributions. Results show that past editors can do well—be productive researchers—and also do

good—make meaningful nonresearch contributions to their universities as well as their professions in general.

Although our manuscript refers to the performance and contributions of journal editors, it addresses an issue of interest to the entire body of organizational scholars—irrespective of their rank. First, as members of the Academy mature in their roles, particularly if their research becomes available in the form of publications, they will be invited to serve as reviewers and also join editorial boards, serve as associate editors, and, in due course, even serve as editors. Our manuscript provides a candid, and empirical, overview of the “return of investment” for such activities, activities which are critical to the mission of the Academy. Second, our manuscript addresses the critical educational mission of the Academy, that specifically, book writing, including textbooks, is a crucial activity in terms of teaching, disseminating our knowledge, and having an impact on external stakeholders—not just other academics (Aguinis, Suarez-González, Lannelongue, & Joo, 2012). Our manuscript sheds light on the question of whether making a contribution to the Academy in the form of book writing may be negatively related to other indicators of research productivity (i.e., articles published in refereed journals). Overall, our manuscript addresses an issue of interest to business school professors in universities worldwide: the research versus service dilemma.

## CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOURNAL EDITORS

Aguinis and Vaschetto (2011) built upon the concept of organizational responsibility and coined the term “editorial responsibility.” *Organizational responsibility* has been defined as “context specific organizational actions and policies that take into account stakeholders’ expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance” (Aguinis, 2011: 855). Extrapolating from this definition, Aguinis and Vaschetto (2011: 412) defined *editorial responsibility* as “context specific editorial actions and policies that take into account stakeholders’ expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance.” *Editorial economic performance* refers to the activities that produce an economic benefit to the editor (e.g., promotions, job offers from other universities, job-related perquisites). *Editorial social performance* refers to activities that lead to noneconomic tangible and intangible

benefits to a journal editor's primary stakeholders, such as the universities with which the editor is affiliated. Last, *editorial environmental performance* refers to activities that lead to noneconomic tangible and intangible benefits to a journal editor's secondary stakeholders, such as the field, profession, and professional organizations.

Aguinis and Vaschetto's (2011) taxonomy refers specifically to the performance of editors; however, it provides a general framework that can be used to understand the performance of past editors along the following three dimensions: (a) research performance, (b) local (i.e., university) nonresearch performance, and (c) profession nonresearch performance. Of these three dimensions, Aguinis et al. (2010) focused exclusively on the research performance dimension. Moreover, Aguinis et al. investigated only one indicator of research performance: number of articles published in refereed journals. Clearly, number of articles in refereed journals is an important indicator of research performance and also a very meaningful one because it is a good predictor of faculty salary (Gomez-Mejía & Balkin, 1992). However, it is obviously not the only indicator of research performance. For example, many past editors may choose to write book chapters or entire books, which have the potential to become very influential in the field (Aguinis et al., 2012). Also, past editors choose to disseminate their research in the form of conference presentations, which is yet another indicator of research performance. Thus, expanding upon the work by Aguinis et al. (2010), in our work here we examined four indicators of post-editorship research performance: (1) number of refereed journal articles, (2) number of books, (3) number of book chapters, and (4) number of conference presentations.

As noted by Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012), past editors may also choose to engage in a variety of activities that are not directly related to research but nevertheless make important contributions to their local work context, which we label local nonresearch performance. Similar to research performance, there are multiple indicators of local nonresearch performance. One such indicator includes service in administrative positions, for example, service as a department chair, associate dean, or director of a program (e.g., doctoral program). Those administrative roles can be very time consuming but also quite impactful. In such a role, past editors can use the expertise they have gained in their editorship roles by, for example,

helping their departments select and mentor faculty members with great potential as future scholars. As a second type of indicator of local nonresearch performance, Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012) mentioned that mentoring others, for example in the form of serving as a dissertation committee chairperson, is another important dimension of post-editorship performance.

The third performance dimension, which we label profession nonresearch performance, involves contributions that past editors make to professional organizations. Aguinis and colleagues (2010) specifically noted that many past editors "serve professional organizations as their officers" (Aguinis et al., 2010: 693). In fact, Aguinis et al. wrote that "at the time of the writing of this article, three recent past presidents (DeNisi, Lee, and Smith), the president (Jackson), and the president elect (Tsui) of the Academy of Management are all former journal editors" (Aguinis et al., 2010: 693). Thus, an understanding of post-editorship performance also requires an assessment of the extent to which past editors choose to serve professional organizations at either a committee level or in leadership roles. These are obviously important contributions that past editors can make to their fields. In addition, past editors also choose to assist their fields by serving on editorial boards. Serving on editorial boards involves reviewing many manuscripts, which is a time-consuming activity that has the potential to be of great benefit to the field given these reviewers' expertise.

In sum, as noted by Aguinis et al. (2010), Baruch and colleagues (2008); Aguinis and Vaschetto (2011), and, more recently, Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012), a more thorough investigation of the performance of past editors should go beyond an exclusive emphasis on the number of refereed journal articles. In other words, such an investigation should assess additional indicators of research performance (e.g., publication of books) as well as local nonresearch, and profession nonresearch performance. Next, we describe an empirical study we conducted based precisely on these considerations. As noted earlier, our study addresses issues relevant to the entire body of organizational scholars regardless of their rank, the educational mission of the Academy, as well as the research versus service dilemma—one experienced by business school professors worldwide.

## METHODS

### Sample and Data Collection Procedures

Although Aguinis et al. (2010) relied on electronic databases to collect data regarding past editors' research performance (i.e., number of articles in refereed journals), adopting that same data collection strategy would be insufficient for our purposes here. Although information regarding published journal articles can be obtained from electronic databases, information regarding other indicators of research performance such as authoring books and book chapters and giving conference presentations is usually not included. Moreover, information regarding nonresearch performance is not available in such databases or other on-line sources. For example, past editors may choose to make important contributions by taking on administrative responsibilities at their universities (e.g., becoming department chair, director of the doctoral program, associate dean). Although this faculty information is likely to be available on a university website at the time of the appointment, it is unlikely to be available after the appointment is over. Moreover, many past editors have changed affiliations and may have served in an administrative capacity for past employers, making information regarding local nonresearch performance even more difficult to obtain. Similarly, past editors may choose to serve professional organizations in a variety of capacities (e.g., as board members, elected officers). Information regarding these types of professional nonresearch performance is usually not publicly available. Moreover, it is not easy to know all the professional organizations to which past editors may have provided some service, given the many specialty fields of past editors included in the Aguinis et al. (2010) study (e.g., strategic management, human resource management, industrial and organizational psychology, organizational behavior, organizational psychology, international business).

Given the aforementioned considerations, we decided that a valuable source of information is the past editors' curriculum vitae (CV). We made this choice based on the performance management literature. In specific, self-reports of performance are most valid when they refer to activities that are verifiable by third parties and are not based on subjective criteria (Aguinis, 2013). Indicators of self-reported performance, as shown in past editors' CVs, meet these characteristics.

Our data collection effort involved three steps. The first included obtaining e-mail addresses for the 58 editors included in Aguinis et al.'s (2010) study. To do so, we conducted Internet searches using Google including the editors' full names, last known university affiliations based upon last known publication reported by the Thompson ISI Web of Knowledge database, and other known university affiliations based upon publications throughout the editors' careers. As a result of this initial search effort, we obtained e-mail addresses for 35 of the 58 editors.

The second step involved confirming that each of the 23 editors for whom we were unable to obtain e-mail addresses either passed away or retired and, hence, were ineligible for inclusion in our study. It was important for us to confirm that these individuals were no longer active because their inclusion in the sample would bias our results due to truncation (Aguinis & Stone-Romero, 1997). In other words, an observed decline in performance due to passing away or retiring could be misattributed to other reasons. To obtain this information, we conducted additional Google searches using the editors' full names and key terms associated with passing away or retirement (e.g., "obituary," "passed away," "memoriam," "retire," "retirement"). As a result of our second step in the data collection effort, we were able to confirm that 14 passed away as described in obituaries, memoriams, and announcements posted on a university or professional association websites (e.g., Academy of Management, Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology). We were also able to confirm that the additional 9 of the 23 individuals for whom we did not have e-mail addresses retired based on announcements posted on a university or professional association webpage or that their last known publication according to ISI Web of Knowledge was prior to 2000. In addition, we found that 3 of the 35 editors for whom we had e-mail addresses also retired. In short, as a result of this second step, we were able to identify the 32 past journal editors of the 58 included in Aguinis et al.'s (2010) sample who were eligible for inclusion in our study.

The third step in our data collection procedures involved sending individualized e-mail messages to the 32 individuals included in our targeted population. We followed e-mail messages with phone calls when needed. Our e-mail message informed them that we were conducting a study on "the performance of past editors in multiple dimensions." Our message also informed them that we

**TABLE 1**  
Past Editors Included in Aguinis et al. (2010) and  
the Present Study

Editor's name	Journal	Editorship period
Dauten Jr., P. M.	AMJ	1958–1960
McFarland, D. E.	AMJ	1961–1963
Gordon, P. J.	AMJ	1064–1966
Vance, S. C.	AMJ	1967–1969
Scott, W. G.	AMJ	1970–1972
*Miner, J. B.	AMJ	1973–1975
Cummings, L. L.	AMJ	1976–1978
*Slocum Jr., J. W.	AMJ	1979–1981
Mahoney, T.	AMJ	1982–1984
Beyer, J. M.	AMJ	1985–1987
*Mowday, R. T.	AMJ	1988–1990
*Hitt, M. A.	AMJ	1991–1993
*DeNisi, A. S.	AMJ	1994–1996
*Tsui, A. S.	AMJ	1997–1999
*Northcraft, G. B.	AMJ	2000–2001
*Lee, T. W.	AMJ	2002–2004
Wortman Jr., M.	AMR	1976–1978
Rosenzweig, J.	AMR	1979–1981
Hellriegel, D.	AMR	1982–1984
Behling, O. C.	AMR	1985–1987
*Whetten, D. A.	AMR	1988–1990
*Klimoski, R.	AMR	1991–1993
*Jackson, S. E.	AMR	1994–1996
*Smith, K. G.	AMR	1997–1999
*Conlon, E. J.	AMR	2000–2002
*Brief, A. P.	AMR	2003–2005
Thompson, J. D.	ASQ	1956–1957
Prethus, R. V.	ASQ	1957–1964
Lodahl, T. M. <sup>a</sup>	ASQ	1964–1968
		1972–1976
*Starbuck, W. H.	ASQ	1969–1971
*Weick, K. E.	ASQ	1977–1985
Freeman, J. H.	ASQ	1986–1993
*Barley, S. R.	ASQ	1994–1997
*Oliver, C.	ASQ	1998–2002
Darley, J. G.	JAP	1955–1960
Clark, K. E.	JAP	1961–1970
Fleishman, E. A.	JAP	1971–1976
Campbell, J. P.	JAP	1977–1982
Guion, R. M.	JAP	1983–1988
*Schmitt, N.	JAP	1989–1994
*Bobko, P.	JAP	1995–1996
*Murphy, K. R.	JAP	1997–2002
Ray, D. F.	JOM	1975–1977
*Bedeian, A. G.	JOM	1978–1979
Downey, H. K.	JOM	1980–1982
Hunt, J. G.	JOM	1983–1986
*Van Fleet, D.	JOM	1987–1989
*Griffin, R. W.	JOM	1990–1992
*Dalton, D. R.	JOM	1992–1995
Vecchio, R. P.	JOM	1996–1999
*Kacmar, K. M.	JOM	2000–2002
*Feldman, D. C.	JOM	2003–2007

(table continues)

**TABLE 1**  
(Continued)

Editor's name	Journal	Editorship period
Kuder, G.F. <sup>b</sup>	PPsych	1948–1950
		1959–1963
		1970–1974
Mosier, C. I.	PPsych	1949–1950
Taylor, E. K.	PPsych	1949–1958
Hornaday, J. A.	PPsych	1964–1971
*Hakel, M. D.	PPsych	1974–1984
*Sackett, P. R.	PPsych	1985–1990
*Campion, M. A.	PPsych	1991–1996
*Hollenbeck, J. R.	PPsych	1997–2002

Note. Present study's previous editors are indicated by an asterisk.

Abbreviations: AMJ = *Academy of Management Journal*; AMR = *Academy of Management Review*; ASQ = *Administrative Science Quarterly*; JAP = *Journal of Applied Psychology*; JOM = *Journal of Management*; PPsych = *Personnel Psychology*.

<sup>a</sup>Aguinis et al.'s (2010) analysis excluded T. M. Lodahl because he served multiple editorship terms at different points in his career.

<sup>b</sup>Aguinis et al.'s (2010) analysis excluded G. F. Kuder because of the high degree of overlap between his editorship term and his entire career span.

were "using CVs as the source of information because information about activities other than journal articles (e.g., serving as department chair) is likely to be available on the university's website at the time of the appointment, but unlikely to be available after the appointment is over. Moreover, many past editors have changed affiliations and may have served in an administrative capacity for past employers, making information regarding such activities even more difficult to obtain." Finally, our letter also clarified that "we will not use your CV for any other purpose than this particular research study. Moreover, I will delete your CV from my computer's hard disk after our project is completed." This third and final step involved sending out three waves of e-mail messages.

Our data collection effort took place during April and May 2012 and led to obtaining CVs for 31 of the 32 individuals in our targeted population. The list of the 58 editors included in the Aguinis et al. (2010) study as well as the 31 editors included in our sample are included in Table 1.

### Measures

We obtained information from the past editors' CVs regarding research performance, local (i.e., university) nonresearch performance, and profes-

sion nonresearch performance. The one exception for the source of our data is number of doctoral dissertation committees chaired, for which we used a third-party database. Next, we describe each measure included in our study.

### **Research Performance**

This dimension of performance addresses the research productivity during the post-editorship period. In contrast to the Aguinis et al. (2010) study, which focused on only one measure of research output (i.e., journal articles), our work here includes the following four indicators: journal articles, books, book chapters, and conference presentations. For each type of research output metric, we collected data from the CVs beginning at the year following the end of each editorship term.

**Refereed journal articles.** All past editors had a separate section in their CVs dedicated to journal articles. Occasionally, book chapters and other types of publications (i.e., nonrefereed magazine articles) were also included in this section, in which case the particular item was not included in this category.

**Books.** Books were commonly listed in a separate section of the CVs. A count of books published was made when the editors' names appeared in a reference as the author of the book. Special attention was provided to ensure that book chapters were not included in this count.

**Book chapters.** As mentioned earlier, book chapters were occasionally listed along with journal articles. However, in most cases they were included in a section devoted to chapters and books.

**Conference presentations.** Conference presentations were commonly listed in their own section of the CVs. As long as the entry included a reference suggesting that the presentation was delivered at the meetings of a professional organization, the item was counted.

### **Local (i.e., University) Nonresearch Performance**

This dimension of post-editorship performance addresses contributions that are not directly related to research but benefit the local work environment: past editors' departments, programs, schools/colleges, and universities. For one of the variables in this dimension, we collected two different types of information: (1) number of activities (i.e., number of administrative positions), and (2) cumulative duration of such activities (i.e., total number of years

served in these positions). In this way, we were able to obtain a composite measure of involvement that included both the number of activities (i.e., quantitative indicator) as well as total time commitment (i.e., qualitative indicator). As was the case for the research performance indicators, data about local nonresearch performance only included the time frame from the year date following participants' editorship term.

**Number of administrative positions.** Many past editors choose to make contributions to their local context by serving in administrative roles. Such positions include department chair, program chair (e.g., doctoral program, MBA program), center or institute director, and even associate dean or dean. Such information was typically reported in two places on the editors' CVs. First, it was commonly included toward the beginning of the CV where the editors listed their various professional positions. Second, it was also commonly included in a section dedicated to university service.

**Cumulative years in administrative positions.** We also assessed the number of years that the editors served in each position and added those years to produce a measure of cumulative years served in administrative roles.

**Dissertation committees.** As another indicator of local nonresearch performance, we assessed the number of doctoral dissertation committees on which each past editor served as chair. Although this is a research-related activity, serving as a doctoral dissertation committee chair does not automatically translate into more publications. This measure is also an indicator of a past editors' willingness to share their experience and mentor future scholars. To collect data regarding this variable, we used the ProQuest Digital Dissertation and Theses Database, the world's most comprehensive collection of dissertations and theses (<http://www.proquest.com/en-US/catalogs/databases/detail/pqdt.shtml>). ProQuest allows users to search for faculty who serve as chairs on doctoral dissertations. Thus, we entered the full name of each editor to obtain the precise number of dissertation committees for which each served as chair. In some instances, results for more than one faculty member with the same name were returned, and we filtered the results by matching editors' university affiliations. The variable we used in our analyses is the number of doctoral advisees for editors post editorship.

### **Profession Nonresearch Performance**

This dimension of post-editorship performance refers to editors' service geared toward professional associations. The most common organizations to which editors devoted their time and effort included the Academy of Management, American Psychological Association, Southern Management Association, Strategic Management Society, and Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. But there were also others (e.g., International Association for Chinese Management Research). Also, many editors served on editorial boards during the post-editorship period.

### **Number of Academic Conference Committees**

Former journal editors' service within professional associations typically revolved around yearly academic conferences. Such service was usually listed in the CVs in one of two ways. Either the editors listed any professional service all together, or they grouped such service based upon the professional association they served in. Service on committees for academic conferences included positions such as service on program committees, paper review committees, and various selection and award committees. We counted the committees on which each individual served.

**Cumulative years on academic conference committees.** Because service on committees for academic conferences differs in terms of tenure, we also felt it important to assess the number of years the editors served in each committee. Subsequently, we added those years to produce a measure of cumulative years on service committees for academic conferences.

**Number of professional organization leadership positions.** Many past editors devoted time and effort to serve professional organizations in several leadership positions, many of them elective in nature. Such positions include professional association president, president-elect, and past-president; vice president, vice president-elect, and past-vice president; chair of the board of governors; and chair of a specific division or program chair. Such information was typically reported in the CVs in a section dedicated to professional service.

**Cumulative years in professional organization leadership positions.** As in the case of other non-research performance indicators, we also assessed the number of years devoted to professional posi-

tions. In other words, we assessed the total cumulative number of years in these positions.

**Number of editorial boards.** It is not uncommon for past editors to be involved in editorial boards of a variety of journals. Most CVs typically had a section devoted to editorship duties, and this section was often located near their service toward professional associations. Once such a section was identified, a count was made for each listing involving service on editorial boards post editorship.

**Cumulative years on editorial boards.** In addition to counting the number of editorial boards served on, we also counted the number of years that the editors served in each position and added those years to produce a measure of cumulative years on editorial boards.

### **Control Variable**

The longer the amount of time since the end of the editorship term, the greater the number of opportunities for past editors to increase their research output (Aguinis et al., 2010). Thus, as a control variable, we also measured the number of years that elapsed since the end of the editorship period, which we labeled *years since editorship*.

## **RESULTS**

### **Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Data Preparation**

Table 2 includes means and standard deviations for all variables included in our study as well as all bivariate correlations. Not all CVs included information on all variables. However, we did not have missing data for more than 30% of the cases for any of the variables. Nevertheless, we checked that missing data were not systematic, but random (Fichman & Cummings, 2003). Once we confirmed this randomness, we used median imputation for values that did not have complete data. As described next, the choice for median rather than mean imputation was guided by the non-normal nature of our data.

Table 2 shows that the mean and median values for most variables are not the same, suggesting non-normal distributions. This result is consistent with conclusions by O'Boyle and Aguinis (2012, Study 1), who investigated the performance of 490,185 researchers who have produced 943,224 publications across 54 academic disciplines between January 2000 and June 2009. Results reported

TABLE 2  
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Years since editorship	.52**													
2. Journal articles	.35	.31												
3. Books	.60***	.60***	.39*											
4. Book chapters	.42*	.51**	.33	.34										
5. Conference presentations	.65***	.83***	.69***	.46***	.82***									
6. Aggregate research performance	.23	-.05	-.10	.10	-.15	-.17								
7. Number of administrative positions	.20	-.06	-.19	.15	-.06	-.07	.76***							
8. Cumulative years in administrative positions	.32	.24	.40*	.43*	.17	.33	.17	.18						
9. Dissertation committees	.57***	.21	.14	.15	.19	.26	.23	.26	.39*					
10. Number of academic conference committees	.74***	.35*	.14	.37*	.32	.43*	.26	.28	.43*	.86***				
11. Cumulative years on academic conference committees	.07	-.09	.14	-.14	-.14	-.11	-.06	-.04	-.23	.02	.07			
12. Number of professional organization leadership positions	.05	-.09	.12	.03	-.23	-.09	-.08	.04	-.12	.10	.10	.86***		
13. Cumulative years in professional organization leadership positions	.35*	.44*	.30	.58***	.04	.39*	.29	.37*	.23	.24	.28	.28	.48**	
14. Number of editorial boards	.49**	.52**	.25	.70***	.13	.52**	.14	.21	.32	.34	.45*	.17	.38*	.89***
15. Cumulative years on editorial boards	17.71	40.81	3.94	16.90	60.65	122.29	2.05	8.45	6.08	14.79	34.13	3.58	4.85	8.60
<i>M</i>	16.00	26.00	3.00	12.00	55.00	89.00	1.50	7.00	2.50	11.50	27.00	3.00	4.50	8.50
Median	8.99	39.24	3.86	15.32	36.09	75.23	1.25	6.10	7.45	13.44	31.26	2.90	3.08	5.63
<i>SD</i>														

Note. Variable no. 6 labeled "Aggregate research performance" is the sum of the four research performance indicators (i.e., variable nos. 2-5).  
\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

in O'Boyle and Aguinis' Table 1 show that the Paretian distribution yielded a superior fit to the normal distribution in every one of the 54 scientific fields. Similarly, our data regarding research performance in terms of journal articles, books, book chapters, and conference presentations are consistent with O'Boyle and Aguinis' conclusions regarding journal articles. Moreover, extending O'Boyle and Aguinis' findings, Table 2 also shows that the same conclusion regarding non-normal distributions applies to the local nonresearch and profession nonresearch performance dimensions (Aguinis & O'Boyle, in press).

Descriptive results included in Table 2 indicate that on a yearly basis since the end of their editorship past editors published a mean number of 2.30 journal articles (median: 1.47), .22 books (median: .17), .95 book chapters (median: .68), and delivered 3.42 (median: 3.11) conference presentations. This is a very impressive record of scholarship given that, as noted by an anonymous reviewer, "there are a lot of business schools out there where the Dean would be delighted if their senior faculty members averaged 1–2 articles per year, regardless of publication quality or institutional and professional service roles."

As noted in the Method section, we used measures of quantity (i.e., number of activities/committees/roles) as well as time investment (i.e., number of years served in these capacities) for several local nonresearch and profession nonresearch contributions. As shown in Table 2, the quantitative (i.e., number of activities) and qualitative (i.e., time investment) indicators for each type of activity are highly correlated. Specifically, the correlation between number of local administrative positions and number of years on such positions is  $r = .76$  ( $p < .001$ ); the correlation between number of academic conference committees and number of years serving on these committees is  $r = .86$  ( $p < .001$ ); the correlation between number of leadership roles in professional organizations and number of years served on these positions is  $r = .86$  ( $p < .001$ ); and the correlation between number of editorial board memberships and number of years served on these boards is  $r = .89$  ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, we computed standardized scores within each of these eight variables to use a common metric because, as shown based on the means and medians in Table 2, these variables have different ranges. We then added the two standard scores for each pair of variables, leading to the following four composite scores: (1) involvement with university administra-

tive positions (i.e., sum of standard scores regarding number of local administrative positions and number of years on those positions); (2) involvement with academic conference committees (i.e., sum of standard scores regarding number of committees and number of years served on those committees); (3) involvement with professional organization leadership positions (i.e., sum of standard scores regarding number of leadership positions in professional organizations and number of years on those positions); and (4) involvement with editorial boards (i.e., sum of standard scores regarding number of editorial boards and number of years on those boards).

### Data-Analytic Approach

Because summary information in Table 2 shows that the mean values are larger than the median values, the use of traditional ordinary least-squares (OLS)-based data-analytic techniques (e.g., multiple regression, structural equation modeling) would not be appropriate for the analysis, given their reliance on the normality assumption (Rousseeuw & Leroy, 2003; Starbuck, 2004). Accordingly, we used a type of robust regression data-analytic approach called quantile regression (Koenker, 2005). Quantile regression has an important advantage over the more traditional OLS regression because it produces estimates of relationships among variables that are robust to the effects of outliers and non-normality (Aguinis, Gottfredson, & Joo, 2013). More specifically, OLS regression considers the effect of predictors on the conditional mean of an outcome variable, which is susceptible to the influence of outliers. In contrast, quantile regression is used to understand how differences in a predictor relate to differences in the conditional quantile for a specified percentile. In our case, we chose the 50th percentile (i.e., median) and examined how differences in past editors' research performance are associated with the local and profession nonresearch performance dimensions. In other words, our robust regression models predict the conditional median of research productivity as a function of nonresearch performance—both at the local and profession levels. We conducted our robust regression analyses using the "quantreg" package (Koenker, 2012) of the R statistical program (for an overview of R, see Culpepper & Aguinis, 2011).

### Robust Regression Results

Table 3 includes results based on the robust regression analysis. As shown in this table, we created four models, one using each of the four indicators of research performance as the criterion variable. As described in the Methods section, number of years lapsed since the editorship term is related to research performance (Aguinis et al., 2010). Confirming results reported by Aguinis and colleagues (2010), Table 2 shows that number of years since the editorship term is correlated with number of articles (i.e.,  $r = .52, p < .01$ ); number of book chapters (i.e.,  $r = .60, p < .001$ ); and number of conference presentations (i.e.,  $r = .42, p < .05$ ). Accordingly, we used years since editorship period as a control variable in each of the robust regression models. Also, for each of the four models, we computed the percentage of variance that the median regression models accounted for in the research performance variables as indexed by the squared multiple correlation coefficient (i.e.,  $R^2$ ) between predicted and observed scores. We also computed omnibus  $F$  statistics to evaluate each model in comparison with a null model with no predictors. Last, we used R to compute bootstrapped standard errors for calculating  $t$  statistics and  $p$  values associated with the robust regression coefficients, which we also report in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, all four  $F$  values were statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ), meaning that non-research performance indicators predict research performance at levels higher than chance. An interesting result reported in this table is that the proportion of variance explained has a wide range across the four models. Specifically, only 6% of variance in research performance as measured by conference presentations is explained by nonresearch performance. Further, 26% of variance in research performance as measured by journal articles is explained by nonresearch performance. Last, 70% of variance in research performance based on books authored and 79% of variance in research performance based on book chapters authored is explained by nonresearch performance.

Regarding Model 1, which refers to journal articles, Table 3 shows that involvement with local administrative roles is the only statistically significant nonresearch predictor. The robust regression coefficient of  $-11.44$  means that a 1  $SD$  increase regarding involvement with local administrative positions is associated, on median, with roughly 11 fewer peer-reviewed journal articles, holding all other predictors in the equation constant. Given that the median number of years since the editorship term is 16.00 (see Table 2), a 1  $SD$  increase in involvement with local administrative roles represents a median decrease in productivity of 11.44/

**TABLE 3**  
**Robust Regression Results Predicting Research Performance Based on Local Nonresearch and Profession Nonresearch Performance**

Variable	Model 1: Journal articles			Model 2: Books			Model 3: Book chapters			Model 4: Conference presentations		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	17.78	17.86	.329	-3.59	1.81	.058	-6.19	4.98	.226	4.88	18.77	.797
Years since editorship	0.81	0.72	.268	0.36	0.10	.001	1.14	0.26	.000	2.25	0.89	.019
Involvement with university administrative positions	-11.44	2.85	.001	-0.33	0.36	.364	-2.11	1.42	.152	-7.65	10.76	.484
Number of dissertation committees	1.27	1.22	.309	0.12	0.08	.150	0.45	0.29	.135	0.30	0.91	.745
Involvement with academic conference committees	9.53	8.56	.277	-2.89	0.97	.007	-9.35	3.03	.005	-1.53	9.61	.875
Involvement with professional organization positions	-11.44	12.03	.351	2.17	0.60	.001	0.48	2.22	.831	7.48	7.59	.334
Involvement with editorial boards	11.91	9.71	.232	0.03	0.67	.960	7.36	2.01	.001	-10.70	8.87	.239
$R^2$	0.26			0.70			0.79			0.06		
$F$	4.01			0.006			9.59			.000		

Note. The  $F$  tests for the four models are based upon 6 and 24 model and residual degrees of freedom, respectively. As described in the Method section, university administrative positions and committees can be at the department, college/school, program, or university level.

16 = .72 articles per year. On average, editors have published 2.30 articles per year since the end of their terms (see Table 2). So, a 1 *SD* increase in their involvement with local administrative roles represents a decrease in the yearly number of articles from 2.30 to 1.58.

Regarding Model 2, which refers to number of books published, Table 3 shows that involvement with professional leadership positions is positively related to this type of research performance ( $b = 2.17$ ). On the other hand, involvement with academic conference committees is negatively related to this research performance dimension ( $b = -2.89$ ).

Results regarding Model 3 show that past editors who are more involved with editorial boards publish more book chapters ( $b = 7.36$ ). On the other hand, involvement with service on academic conference committees is related to fewer book chapters authored ( $b = -9.35$ ).

Table 3's Model 4 shows that the number of conference presentations is not related to any of the nonresearch performance dimensions we examined. As mentioned earlier, only 6% of variance in this performance dimension is explained by this model, due to the statistically significant effect of number of years since the end of the editorship term.

Last, as an additional set of analysis that we were requested to conduct during the manuscript-review process, we constructed an aggregate measure of research performance (i.e., sum of journal articles, books, book chapters, and conference pre-

sentations). We then used that aggregate measure as the criterion in an additional robust regression model. Note that, as seen in Table 2, the indicators of research performance are not homogeneously related to each other. Also, results summarized in Table 3 show that involvement with university administrative service is negatively related to number of journal articles, but involvement with professional organizations is positively related to number of books. Taken together, results in these tables suggest heterogeneity in how the indicators of research performance relate to each other as well as how they relate to indicators of nonresearch performance. Eysenck (1984) provided a colorful image regarding the calculation of an aggregate score based on heterogeneous components. In a famous statement, he noted that "adding apples and oranges may be a pastime for children learning to count, but unless we are willing to disregard the differences between these two kinds of fruit, the result will be meaningless" (Eysenck, 1984: 57). As expected, results based on an aggregate of four heterogeneous research performance indicators suggested that the indicators of nonresearch performance do not have a statistically significant relationship with the criterion. Results of these analyses are included in Table 4.

## DISCUSSION

As noted by several authors, journal editors are the gatekeepers of knowledge, and yet there is not much that is known about them, particularly their

**TABLE 4**  
**Robust Regression Results Predicting Aggregate Research Performance (i.e., Sum of Journal Articles, Books, Book Chapters, and Conference Presentations) Based on Local Nonresearch and Profession Nonresearch Performance**

Variable	Aggregate research performance		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	24.97	23.60	0.300
Years since editorship	4.26	0.98	0.000
Involvement with university administrative positions	-6.20	9.59	0.524
Number of dissertation committees	2.98	2.14	0.176
Involvement with academic conference committees	4.00	11.64	0.734
Involvement with professional organization positions	6.47	11.82	0.589
Involvement with editorial boards	5.87	14.85	0.696
$R^2$	0.33		
<i>F</i>	5.28		0.001

Note. The *F* test is based upon 6 and 24 model and residual degrees of freedom, respectively. As described in the Methods section, university administrative positions and committees can be at the department, college/school, program, or university level.

performance pre- and post editorship (Elkjaer, 2009; Schmidt-Wilk, 2009; Vince, 2009). Our work here includes new data and makes a value-added contribution in terms of furthering our knowledge regarding the journal editor role by understanding the multidimensional nature of past editors' performance as well as the relationships among the various performance dimensions. Also, our study has implications not only for journal editors, but also for the broader community of organizational scholars and the Academy in general.

Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012) argued without empirical evidence that the dilemma faced by past editors, which is also relevant to all scholars, to continue to advance their own careers by focusing on their research output or make additional contributions such as serving their universities in various administrative roles and their professions must be solved via a zero-sum choice. Northcraft and Tenbrunsel (2012) expressed the belief that past editors either engage in an active research program or choose to make other contributions. We value and respect Northcraft and Tenbrunsel's (2012) opinion; however, our study offers a more thorough and also data-based depiction of this issue. Our empirical examination of four different types of research performance indicators and their relationship with nonresearch performance indicators at the university and profession levels leads to the conclusions listed below.

First, our data do not provide evidence that past editors who publish more journal articles chair fewer doctoral dissertations, are less involved with academic conference committees, are less involved with leadership roles in professional organizations, or are less involved with editorial boards of journals. On the other hand, our data indicate that greater involvement with local administrative activities (e.g., department chair, program director, associate dean) is negatively related to the number of journal articles published: A 1 *SD* increase regarding local administrative roles means that an editor is predicted to publish slightly fewer than two articles per year compared to slightly more than two articles per year. Using a customer-centric approach to reporting scientific results (Aguinis, Werner, Abbott, Angert, Park, & Kohlhausen, 2010), we categorize this effect as not practically significant. In other words, putting the size of this effect in context means that, over a 3-year period, which seems to be the typical tenure for department chair and other similar administrative roles, there would be a decrease in the pre-

dicted median number of publications from about seven to about five. It does not seem that over a 3-year period a total difference of two journal articles would lead to substantial differences in terms of promotions, prestige, or any other extrinsic rewards associated with research productivity—particularly if we also consider results regarding other types of research output as we discuss next. Moreover, a drop from seven to five journal articles over a 3-year period does not seem to be sufficiently large to be impactful for one's career. As noted by an anonymous reviewer, however, this "may be enough of a decline for many of us to notice if it pertained to our own scholarship." Our results suggest that such a decline does not seem to significantly affect past editors' willingness to continue to make contributions both to their universities and professional fields.

Second, our results do not suggest that past editors who are more prolific book writers are less involved in administrative roles at their universities, chair fewer dissertation committees, or are less involved with editorial boards. Moreover, past editors who are more involved with professional leadership positions publish more books compared to those who are less involved. On the other hand, involvement with academic conference committees is negatively related to the number of books authored, but a 1 *SD* increase regarding involvement with academic conference committees is associated with a median decrease of only  $2.89/16 = .18$  books per year. In other words, it would take 5.55 years longer for a past editor who is heavily involved with academic conference committees (i.e., 1 *SD* higher than another) to author a book compared to a past editor who is much less involved with such committees (i.e., 1 *SD* lower).

Third, our results do not indicate that editors who write more book chapters are less involved with administrative positions at their universities, chair fewer dissertation committees, or are less involved with leadership roles in professional organizations. Moreover, a higher degree of involvement with journal editorial boards is associated with more book chapters, but past editors who write more book chapters are less involved with academic conference committees (a 1 *SD* increase in committee involvement is associated with a median decrease of .58 chapters per year).

Last, our results do not indicate that past editors who present more papers at professional conferences engage in fewer nonresearch activities at the university or professional levels. In fact, only

number of years since the end of the editorship term was statistically significant.

Taken together, these results do not provide evidence that past editors solve the dilemma of focusing on their individual research careers versus making other contributions by doing one at the expense of the other. Moreover, in some cases, we found that making nonresearch contributions to the profession, such as serving in a leadership role for a professional organization or serving on editorial boards, is positively associated with research productivity—for example, as assessed by number of books and book chapters authored. But, our results do suggest that taking on heavy-workload university administrative roles, such as department chair, program chair, and associate dean, does relate negatively to number of articles published, although the effect does not seem to be practically significant. In a similar way, greater involvement with academic conference committees is negatively related to the number of books and book chapters authored—but, again, the estimated effects are not large.

We can understand this pattern of results through the conceptual lens of social network theory (Phelps, Heidl, & Wadhwa, 2012), meaning that, it is likely that past editors who reach out beyond their local institutions may benefit from invitations to write book chapters and join teams of researchers from several universities. Those individuals who take on leadership roles in professional organizations become highly visible, at an international level, which may serve as a catalyst for such opportunities. On the other hand, past editors who take on heavy-workload administrative positions at the local level are not able to benefit from these social and knowledge networks. This perspective is also consistent with the two-group typology of latent social roles of college faculty offered by Gouldner (1957, 1958) half a century ago. He distinguished between *locals*, who are more loyal to their particular universities, and *cosmopolitans*, who are more connected to national networks and sets of norms beyond their current university affiliation. Gouldner (1958) reported that cosmopolitans were less loyal to their universities, had reference groups outside the organization in professional groups, and were more oriented to research. Although serving on academic conference committees would qualify as a “cosmopolitan” activity, it does not lead to the same type of visibility and social capital afforded by serving in, for example, elective positions at the Academy of Management

Division. Although our interpretation is speculative, our informal telephone conversations with some of the past editors in our sample, as well as our own experiences as past editors, suggest that a social network theory perspective combined with a latent social role lens could serve as a likely explanation for our findings.

In terms of implications, the data we provide are reassuring. Consider the implications, for example, for those in the Academy who might aspire to one day be appointed as journal editor. Presumably, given the prestige associated with such an appointment, a candidate for such a position might be inclined to accept the call. We would add that there is complementary prestige afforded to the person’s department, school, and university. Even so, a candidate might be concerned about the impact of such a choice on his or her future productivity in terms of the number of post-editorship journal articles—as shown by Aguinis and colleagues (2010) and echoed by past editors themselves (e.g., Arbaugh, 2011). The concern that research productivity during the immediate post-editorship period is likely to decline is certainly warranted (Aguinis et al., 2010). However, our data provide some comfort in terms of post-editorship actions that may speed up the “recovery” period in terms of research productivity. First, service at the professional level in the forms of leadership positions and editorial board memberships is likely to open up opportunities for collaboration that result in higher levels of research performance. On the other hand, taking on heavy-workload administrative positions is likely to delay the recovery period—but, again, the effects are rather small and, adopting a customer-centric approach to interpreting significant results (Aguinis et al., 2010), do not seem to be practically significant.

We believe that an editorial position is a veritable bastion of opportunity. Day after day, submission after submission, journal editors are privy, in real time, to the current trends in research topics and the methodologies and analyses on which these submissions rely. This is a world-class education writ large. We would suggest that there is simply no better stage for such contemporary information. Beyond that, these editors are also privy to the comments and suggestions of the Academy’s finest in their roles as reviewers of such work. We know of no other venue wherein such high-quality information is available on a day-to-day basis. In that spirit, our data suggest that there are those who have distinguished themselves in the service

of the Academy's objectives in the period prior to their editorships, during their terms as editor, and in the period afterward. As earlier noted, for those developing scholars who might one day aspire to accept these responsibilities, they need not be concerned—should they elect otherwise, that such service will wane in the aftermath of their editorships.

We readily acknowledge limitations in our study, due mainly to research design and measurement considerations, which we hope will be addressed by future research. First, our study did not include measures of the quality of service provided. For example, we did not have information regarding the impact (positive or negative) that individuals had in their role as department chair. Second, our study did not include measures of the actual number of hours spent on each role. For example, a potential advantage of divisional/program roles for professional associations is that the administrative aspects of those roles can be delegated to doctoral students, and it can be more convenient to give less attention to stakeholders in these roles if need be because they tend to be geographically removed. Conversely, it may be more difficult to avoid constituents when operating in internal administrative roles. Third, given the nonexperimental nature of our research design, we are not able to draw inferences regarding causal processes.

In terms of future research on this subject, we acknowledge that the role of editorship, particularly of the more prestigious journals, is changing such that associate editors in many cases have autonomy regarding the selection of reviewers and also in terms of making decisions about manuscripts. As research moves forward in the investigation of editors and their performance post-editorship, we suggest the inclusion of associate editors in future studies to determine the effect that associate editorship can have on their career development and performance post-associate editorship.

In closing, our results provide evidence in support of Aguinis and Vaschetto's (2011) contention that past editors who do good also do well. Results of our study based on a stellar group of top-notch scholars provide evidence that research and non-research dimensions of performance are not mutually exclusive. As noted by Egri, "the reality of scholarly careers more often than not encompasses multiple and diverse contributions of research, teaching, and service that can be synergistic" (2012: 302).

## REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H. 2013. *Performance management*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Aguinis, H. 2011. Organizational responsibility: Doing good and doing well. In S. Zedeck, (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, vol. 3: 855–879. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Aguinis, H., de Bruin, G. P., Cunningham, D., Hall, N. L., Culpepper, S. A., & Gottfredson, R. K. 2010. What does not kill you (sometimes) makes you stronger: Productivity fluctuations of journal editors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9: 683–695.
- Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K., & Joo, H. 2013. Best-practice recommendations for defining, identifying, and handling outliers. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16: 270–301.
- Aguinis, H., & O'Boyle, E. In Press. Star performers in twenty-first-century organizations. *Personnel Psychology*.
- Aguinis, H., & Stone-Romero, E. F. 1997. Methodological artifacts in moderated multiple regression and their effects on statistical power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 192–206.
- Aguinis, H., Suarez-Gonzalez, I., Lannelongue, G., & Joo, H. 2012. Scholarly impact revisited. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26: 105–132.
- Aguinis, H., & Vaschetto, S. J. 2011. Editorial responsibility: Managing the publishing process to do good and do well. *Management and Organization Review*, 7: 407–422.
- Aguinis, H., Werner, S., Abbott, J. L., Angert, C., Park, J. H., & Kohlhausen, D. 2010. Customer-centric science: Reporting significant research results with rigor, relevance, and practical impact in mind. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13: 515–539.
- Arbaugh, J. B. 2011. From the editors: It takes a village to build a field. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10: 557–560.
- Baruch, Y., Konrad, A. M., Aguinis, H., & Starbuck, W. M., (Eds.). 2008. *Opening the black box of editorship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Culpepper, S. A., & Aguinis, H. 2011. R is for revolution: A cutting-edge, free, open source statistical package. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14: 735–740.
- Egri, C. P. 2012. Introduction: Toward a more balanced perspective on academic contributions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11: 302.
- Elkjaer, B. 2009. Review of opening the black box of editorship, by Yehuda Baruch, Alison M. Konrad, Herman Aguinis, and William Starbuck. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8: 133–134.
- Eysenck, H. J. 1984. Meta-analysis: An abuse of research integration. *Journal of Special Education*, 18: 41–59.
- Fichman, M., & Cummings, J. N. 2003. Multiple imputation for missing data: Making the most of what you know. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6: 282–308.
- Gomez-Mejía, L., & Balkin, D. 1992. The determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35: 921–955.

- Gouldner, A. W. 1957. Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2: 281–306.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1958. Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles—II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 444–481.
- Koenker, R. 2005. *Quantile regression*. Cambridge University Press.
- Koenker, R. 2012. Quantreg: Quantile regression. R package version 4.81. Available from: <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/quantreg/index.html> Accessed on October 2, 2013.
- Northcraft, G. B., & Tenbrunsel, A. E. 2012. Publications, contributions, and the social dilemma of scholarly productivity: A reaction to Aguinis, de Bruin, Cunningham, Hall, Culpepper, and Gottfredson (2010). *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11: 303–308.
- O'Boyle, E., & Aguinis, H. 2012. The best and the rest: Revisiting the norm of normality of individual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65: 79–119.
- Phelps, C., Heidl, R., & Wadhwa, A. 2012. Knowledge, networks, and knowledge networks: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38: 1115–1166.
- Rousseeuw, P. J., & Leroy, A. M. 2003. *Robust regression and outlier detection*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Schmidt-Wilk, J. 2009. Review of opening the black box of editorship, by Yehuda Baruch, Alison M. Konrad, Herman Aguinis, and William Starbuck. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8: 135–136.
- Starbuck, W. H. 2004. Methodological challenges posed by measures of performance. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 8: 337–343.
- Vince, R. 2009. Review of opening the black box of editorship, by Yehuda Baruch, Alison M. Konrad, Herman Aguinis, and William Starbuck. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8: 136–138.

**Herman Aguinis** is the John F. Mee Chair of Management, a professor of organizational behavior and human resources, and the founding director of the Institute for Global Organizational Effectiveness in the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University. His research and teaching interests span several organizational behavior, human resources, and research methods and analysis topics.

**Ryan K. Gottfredson** is a doctoral candidate in organizational behavior and human resources in the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University. His research and teaching interests focus on how leaders and managers can shape the perceptions and performance of their followers and subordinates. Specific topics include leadership behaviors (e.g., contingent rewards, transformational leadership), psychological contracts, justice, trust, and performance.

**Steven A. Culpepper** is an assistant professor in the Department of Statistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He received his PhD in educational psychology and quantitative methods from the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. His research focuses on the intersection of statistics and social science research.

**Dan R. Dalton** is the founding director of the Institute for Corporate Governance, dean emeritus, and the Harold A. Poling Chair Emeritus in the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University. With over 350 articles on corporate governance and strategic management, Professor Dalton is a Fellow of the Academy of Management.

**Gideon P. de Bruin** is a professor of industrial psychology at the University of Johannesburg. He earned his DLitt et Phil from Rand Afrikaans University in South Africa. He teaches research methods and psychometrics, and his research focuses on cross-cultural psychological assessment and work-related stress.