

WHO'S WRITING WHAT WE READ: AUTHORSHIP
IN CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH

By

Bethany Claire Bray

Courtney A. Crittenden
Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
(Chair)

Karen M. McGuffee
Professor of Criminal Justice
(Committee Member)

Christina N. Policastro
Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
(Committee Member)

WHO'S WRITING WHAT WE READ: AUTHORSHIP
IN CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH

By

Bethany Claire Bray

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree
of Master of Science in Criminal Justice

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

May 2020

Copyright © 2020

By Bethany Claire Bray

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to identify authorship trends based on presumed gender and current institutional affiliation from four major criminal justice and criminological (CCJ) journals from 2014 through 2019. A content analysis was conducted on articles from these journals to determine the author gender and affiliation. Findings indicated that a majority of authors were housed in universities. Moreover, the gender of first authors significantly varied by journal type, with a majority of first authors in *Criminology* and *Critical Criminology* being male. In contrast, gender of first authors in *Race & Justice* was equally distributed, while an overwhelming portion of first authors in *Feminist Criminology* were female. Additionally, gender of author teams varied significantly, with the largest percentage of all male teams being published in *Critical Criminology*, and the largest percentage of all female teams published in *Feminist Criminology*. Other significant findings regarding gender authorship in CCJ journals are discussed.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my unrelentingly encouraging parents, who have provided inspiration and support throughout the entirety of my years as a student. Without the two of them, I would not know the strength and resilience that is so frequently required throughout this life. I am wholly undeserving of their devotion, but I am undoubtedly better because of it.

I like to believe that I am typically fairly skilled in sharing my sentiment through writing, but words cannot begin to express all that I feel for my parents. That being said, I will consolidate my love into this simple statement: It is my proudest honor to be their daughter.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest and sincerest thanks and appreciation to my committee chair, Dr. Courtney Crittenden, who has been a constant source of guidance throughout this process. Her confidence in my ability to conduct research within a topic of study that held such gravity was the driving force behind each discovery and revelation. I am eternally grateful for her assurance and trust, and I hope she soon understands the impact she has had.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Christina Policastro and Karen McGuffee, who were so gracious in providing their expertise for this study. Dr. Policastro and Professor McGuffee have been the origins of personal inspiration since my time as an undergraduate student, and the opportunity to work alongside them as a graduate student has been one of my most heartening experiences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Male Privilege.....	4
Privilege in the Academy.....	7
Privilege and Networking	12
Gender and Authorship.....	14
Gender and Editorial Roles.....	19
Calls for Inclusivity.....	21
III. RESEARCH METHODS	24
Purpose and Questions.....	24
Data and Sample	24
Coding Technique	26
Measures	27
Dependent Variable	27
Authorship.....	27
Independent Variable(s).....	27
Gender.....	27
Institutional Affiliation	27
Census Region of the United States.....	28
Analytic Plan.....	28
IV. RESULTS	30
V. DISCUSSION.....	37

VI. CONCLUSION.....	42
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX	
A. JOURNAL CODE SHEET	54
VITA.....	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Descriptives 31

Table 2 Gender of Authors by Journal..... 32

Table 3 Author Teams by Journal..... 34

Table 4 Female-Led Author Teams by Journal 35

Table 5 Male-Led Author Teams by Journal 35

Table 6 Gender of First Authors by Census Region 36

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCJ, Criminology and criminal justice

ASC, American Society of Criminology

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The authorship of scholarly knowledge inside the realm of academia has evolved to both symbolize one's exertion for fresh philosophies and to serve as a stamp of approval from colleagues. Not only do publications within journals provide a channel for scholars to distribute their research throughout the academic world, but they additionally assist in molding the path of direction and focus for various fields of study (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015).

The probability of contributing research and obtaining authorship of scholarly knowledge in academic journals has been found to be heavily reliant upon academic networking (De Welde, 2017). However, previous studies have revealed that networking in the academy - an activity in which an academic career relies heavily - routinely excludes women and minority faculty (Baldwin & Griffin, 2015; De Welde, 2017; De Welde & Laursen, 2011). Even more, the traditional culture of systematic suppression and gender discrimination that has continued throughout generations in academia has been found to be incredibly resilient, and thus, difficult to reform (Šandl, 2009). Such gender discrimination has persisted through a variety of methods, including, but not limited to: the majority of faculty at research-based and prestigious institutions being men, women faculty being less likely to secure tenure and promotions, and males comprising more editorial boards than women (De Welde, 2017; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; Kennelly, Misra, & Karides, 1999; Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Šandl, 2009).

In criminology and criminal justice specifically, female authorship in academic journals has been historically deficient (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). The lack of scholarly knowledge published by women in criminology and criminal justice journals has been linked to broader gender disparities in academia as a whole. For example, due to the theme of rejection of women in academic networks by male scholars, women are rarely offered support and/or opportunities for collaboration by male academics (Šandl, 2009). This exclusion from academic networks puts women at a huge disadvantage, because it ultimately affects their chance of authorship in academic journals (Doherty, Manfredi, Vázquez-Cupeiro, & Elston, 2006; Kaufman, 1978; O’Leary & Mitchell, 1990; Šandl, 2009; Toren, 1991). Moreover, extant studies have found that women continue to be underrepresented in all editorial roles for academic journals in other fields, such as environmental biology, natural resource management, medicine, and management (Amrein, Langmann, Fahrleitner-Pammer, Pieber, & Zollner-Schwetz, 2011; Cho et al., 2014; Jagsi, Tarbell, Henault, Chang, & Hylek, 2008; Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Metz & Harzing, 2009).

Such gender disparity has made way for an overrepresentation of white males on journal editorial boards and has percolated into the recruitment of other male academics to take positions in complementary roles (Özbilgin, 2009). The disproportionate representation on editorial boards causes huge rifts in the type of research that is conducted and published, and, ultimately, may expand the underrepresentation of women and scholars of color. When overrepresentation of a singular niche develops, scholars in the academy, as well as the general public, hear and learn from one racial and biological faction of academics whose members obtain similar focuses and ideas. Thus, we, the readers and observers, lose the ability to acquire and evaluate issues that other genders and races find important. Moreover, it has been found that the publication of scholarly knowledge is directly linked to one’s career trajectory. This is especially problematic

because if women and minorities are not being published in academic journals, it has the ability to significantly stifle their careers in the “publish or perish” atmosphere that is generated throughout academia.

Based on the existing literature, this study seeks to evaluate and identify trends in the authorship within criminological journals based on presumed gender and current institutional affiliation. The principal ambition for this study is to augment the extant research regarding the benefits and advantages which presumed gender may present in the context of publishing scholarly knowledge, specifically within criminological journals. Additionally, as there are a limited number of former studies analyzing the effects of institutional affiliation on the authorship of scholarly knowledge (De Welde, 2017; Forret & Dougherty, 2004; Winslow, 2010), this study strives to contribute vital material detailing the mutualistic relationship between the two. Specifically, the current research is guided by the following questions: Does gender affect authorship in criminological journals and does it vary by journal type? How does institutional affiliation affect authorship in criminological journals and does it vary by journal type, and is there one scholarly journal within the field of criminology and criminal justice that is more diverse than others in authorship?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Male Privilege

Gender, as it has come to be defined, is reliant upon how one identifies him or herself within society, as either masculine or feminine (McDonald & Miller, 2013). Gender is not determined by biological differences, but instead, by the form presented to the outside world, and the behaviors and interactions based on this display of self-identity (McDonald & Miller, 2013; Nobelius, 2011). Gender roles, alternatively, are the socially scripted or attributed behaviors historically assigned to males and females (Barak, Leighton, & Flavin, 2010). Traditionally, gender roles within the United States have mirrored white, patriarchal values that have secured male dominance within positions of power (Barak et al., 2010). For example, historically, established gender roles prevented women from working outside of the home, participating in sports, voting, and numerous other privileges deemed to be reserved for men (Barak et al., 2010). Women were expected to behave under the widely held concept of conventional femininity, which included seeking protection and guidance from men, and conducting the creation of a pleasant refuge for men inside the home (Barak et al., 2010). Gender, thus, has been, and continues to be, socially constructed. The social construction of gender is a social process through which gender is “done” or “performed” through routine communication with other people (Barak et al., 2010). Simply put, gender itself is constituted through interaction (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Goffman (1976) argued that femininity and masculinity are regarded as “prototypes of essential expression - something that can be conveyed fleetingly in any social situation and yet something that strikes at the most basic characterization of the individual” (p. 75). Moreover, Goffman (1976) expressed that gender depictions are less a consequence of our “essential sexual natures” than interactional portrayals of what we would like to convey about sexual natures through habitual gestures (p. 75). In his view, gender is a socially orchestrated dramatization of the culture’s understanding of feminine and masculine characteristics. For example, society has customarily attributed women with being emotional and nurturing. This socially structured belief has followed women through generations and has had a critical impact on the advancement of women due to developed stigmas regarding the capabilities of females.

Within the United States, women comprise slightly more than half of the total resident population, making them a numeric majority in the nation (Barak et al., 2010). However, because of their unequal standing in the economic, social, and political spheres of American life, women are still deemed to be a “minority group” (Barak et al., 2010). In their explanation of this discrepancy, Headlee and Elfin (1996) illustrated that women:

Are excluded from many good jobs. We are discriminated against in pay. More and more of us are supporting ourselves and our children with or without a husband’s help. If we try to climb the corporate ladder, we bump our heads on a “glass ceiling” beyond which we cannot climb (p. 14).

Similar to the glass ceiling that prevents the progression of women, a considerable amount of occupational segregation with “sticky floors” keep women in low-paying jobs (Barak et al., 2010). These sticky floors have been described as the pattern in which women are less likely to climb the career ladder in comparison to men (Baert, De Pauw, & Deschacht, 2016). A frequent

explanation for this disparity is that women obtain less education and work experience than men (Barak et al., 2010). Due to this occupational gap, women are overrepresented in clerical and service professions, making up over 80% of registered nurses and licensed practical nurses, secretaries and receptionists, elementary school teachers, and childcare workers (Barak et al., 2010). Conversely, men make up the majority of craft and laborer jobs, such as mechanics, construction workers, metal workers, truck drivers, and other motor-vehicle workers (Barak et al., 2010). Firefighters are 95% men, even though almost a third of the firefighters hired in the last decade have been women (Barak et al., 2010). Architects and engineers, clergy, airplane pilots, and police officers are primarily men as well (Barak et al., 2010). Gender discrimination is also a significant and an evident problem in higher education, as evidenced in Yale's (2012) study which displayed university science faculty demonstrating gender bias against female job candidates (Barak et al., 2010; Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2012).

Many of the same themes of gender discrimination apply to criminology and criminal justice (Barak et al., 2010). Constructed beliefs about women being too emotional and unable to handle the rigors of logic kept women out of law school, and, in turn, out of the practice of law entirely for years (Barak et al., 2010). Worries concerning the weakness and fragility of women continue to exert influence on women in positions like police and correctional officers (Barak et al., 2010). Gender injustice molds the opportunities available in legitimate police work and in the actual committing of crime, where women are typically placed on the lower end of criminal organizations and are fully immersed in classic female-dominated crimes, like property and drug crimes (Barak et al., 2010). Additionally, gender disparities exist within the studies of these

topics as well. As Belknap stated in her 2015 Presidential Address to the American Society of Criminology,

it is difficult to imagine a field in which it is more essential than criminology to have a diverse and inclusive representation of scholars and intersectional approaches. Offending, victimization, law enforcement, court practices, incarceration, and basic human rights are so tightly bound within the intersections of oppression. And yet, the academy has been dominated by white men who have likely disproportionately come from class-privileged backgrounds (p. 6).

After reviewing the economic, political, and social evidence, it is apparent that most power is concentrated and held within the hands of [white] men (Barak et al., 2010). Men continue to govern all of the key institutions of power, such as the military, government, business, academic, and financial institutions in the United States (Barak et al., 2010). Although, there is some evidence to suggest that the expansion of men in positions of power and the exclusion of women is done both consciously and subconsciously, women are maintaining increasing advances in representation within the top echelons of business, in Congress, the medical profession, and academia (Barak et al., 2010).

Privilege in the Academy

Within the antebellum era prior to the Civil War that began in 1861, two private colleges, Oberlin and Antioch, permitted coeducation (Parker, 2015). Oberlin College in Ohio was the first to admit women and men of all races in 1837 (Parker, 2015). In 1870, women accounted for only 21% of the college undergraduate population, and by 1890, that number had climbed to 47% (Parker, 2015). Early justifications for the exclusion of women in higher

education relied heavily on the false assumption that women were innately incapable of dealing with the rigors of college-level education (Barak et al., 2010). However, in 1992, women represented 53.1% of enrolled college students (Jacobs, 1996). In that same year, it was reported that 54.2% of bachelor's degree recipients were women, with 58.9% of two-year degrees, 51.5% of master's and professional degrees, and 37.3% of PhD degrees being awarded to females as well (*Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1994; Jacobs, 1996). Although colleges were first founded in the United States in the 17th and 18th centuries, the majority of minority women, European-American women, and minority men were not provided the opportunity to teach at colleges and universities until over one hundred years later with the founding of women's and historically black colleges and universities (Kennelly et al., 1999).

Despite the creation of more inclusionary academic institutions, the class backgrounds of faculty members continued to heavily dictate the institute at which they were employed. For example, those from a working-class upbringing were typically operating within the lower ranks of public institutions, like two-year colleges, community colleges, and less research-intensive institutions, as opposed to the more elite academies (Kennelly et al., 1999; Winslow, 2010). However, the patterns of prejudice based on gender, race, and class within academia began to shift in the latter part of the 20th century. Throughout the 1920s, the number of women employed by universities and colleges across the United States exhibited a steady upsurge, and by 1980, one quarter of higher education faculty was comprised of women (Kennelly et al., 1999).

Regardless of the significant advances in gender representation, women continued to be underrepresented at most levels of the academic career ladder through the late 1990s, with the number growing increasingly scant the further up one went in the academic hierarchy (Bronstein

& Farnsworth, 1998). In their study examining gender discrimination in academia, Bronstein and Farnsworth (1998) reported that, at the time of their analysis, 46% of assistant professors, 32% of associate professors, and only 17% of full professors in the United States were women, which actually represented a small increase from the previous five years, from 40%, 27%, and 15%, respectively (*Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1994). Moreover, Jacobs (1996) explained that women's representation at institutions declined with the prestige of the institution. Specifically, (Jacobs, 1996) found that women comprised 37.9% in public two-year schools, 28.9% in the public comprehensive schools, and 19.5% in private research universities. Moreover, this exclusion within the world of academia is exacerbated for women of color and women from working-class backgrounds (Grant & Ward, 1991; Kennelly et al., 1999; Tokarczyk & Fay, 1993).

Previous research has suggested that European-American women, minority men, and minority women are more likely to gain employment at lower-prestige and two-year teaching colleges, and are less likely to obtain hired positions at high-prestige research universities (Kennelly et al., 1999). One structural shift in academe has been the progressive leaning towards vertical segregation. As defined, vertical segregation has been exemplified by the women who are overrepresented in contingent (part-time and non-tenure-track) and lower paying positions in the academy, like two-year institutions, despite their 109.7% growth as a share of the professoriate between 1993 and 2013 (De Welde, 2017; Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016). In fact, De Welde (2017) reported that male faculty outnumber women at all institution types except for those with the least prestige, fewest resources, and lower status (Aud, 2013). For members of minority groups, less than a quarter were employed at four-year institutions in 2017, and, similar to women, representation of minority faculty decreased as one moved up the

academic hierarchy, representing 22.9% of assistant professors, 21.1% of associate professors, and 16.1% of full professors (Basken, 2007; De Welde, 2017). Further, De Welde (2017) found that only 9.1% of women faculty were at the full professor rank (Finkelstein et al., 2016). De Welde (2017) study highlighted a trend in what had previously been found regarding where women in academia are hired. For example, Tolbert and Oberfield (1991) discovered that universities with greater resources are significantly less likely to hire women (Kennelly et al., 1999).

Graham (1978) once suggested that the obvious exclusion of women from the faculty of Ivy League institutions has undermined the position of all females, because, with the establishment of research universities as the peak of the higher education system, these schools set the pattern for higher education as a whole (Jacobs, 1996). The overall result of the substantial amount of research that has focused on the status of women faculty in higher education has shown that, despite overall gains in representation and decreases in various forms of blatant sexism, women continue to be underrepresented at most levels of the academic career ladder, and such underrepresentation only grows the further up one goes (Blum, 1991; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Johnsrud, 1993).

The tradition of undermining female academics has not only affected the institutions that extend employment opportunities to women but has additionally impaired the likelihood of receiving promotions and tenure for female scholars. In their examination of the various ways that race, gender, and class have historically affected the rates of hiring, degree attainment, promotion, segregation, and pay in academia, Kennelly and colleagues (1999) identified that women, minorities, and professors from working-class backgrounds may have trouble with promotion and tenure due to the operation of the informal system of networks that has been

created and maintained by middle and upper class European-American men. Further, their analysis concluded that, “although women are being hired in higher numbers than in the past, they are much less likely than men to gain tenure” (Alperson, 1975; Kennelly et al., 1999, p. 138; Menges & Exum, 1983). While the number of women with doctoral degrees has practically become parallel to the number of men, female faculty members are still found to achieve tenure and secure promotion to full professor at a slower rate (Winslow, 2010). It has been argued that, since research time is linked to research productivity, and research productivity remains a key component in employment reviews, gender differences in research time allocations may contribute to the gender discrepancies of tenure and promotion (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004; Lewis, 2004; Winslow, 2010). While McRae (2003) held that women’s research times and preferences were shaped by childcare demands, others, like Reynolds (2003), found that neither family structures nor levels of work were associated with preferences for less research time allocations from women in academia (Winslow, 2010).

Additionally, women are underrepresented at top ranks and in administrative positions and earn less than men in corresponding status (Winslow, 2010). Even female academics who are bestowed the exclusive opportunity to work within the upper echelons of academia are constricted under the confines of systematic suppression when working up the academic ladder. Employment within prestigious departments can stifle female faculty opportunities for promotion. In such departments, women are expected to meet higher standards than men in the same standing in order to maintain such a privilege, and are therefore forced to move horizontally in academia, or more slowly in terms of academic advancement (Kennelly et al., 1999; Long, Allison, & McGinnis, 1993; Rosenfeld, 1981; Rosenfeld & Jones, 1986).

Privilege and Networking

The phrase “It’s not only what you know, but who you know” is a tried-and-true cliché that has implied that success does not solely depend on individual merit for generations. This expression alludes to the acute importance that individual participation in social networks has on a career outcome, and academia is no exception. It is no secret to those functioning within the realm of the academic world that career success is often predicated on strong mentoring, collaborating, and networking (De Welde, 2017). Although, historically, academic institutions were idealized to be erected under the Mertonian norm of universalism, where personal and social attributes would not be taken into account when judging scientific claims (Šandl, 2009), there has been a continuous trend of neglect within the culture of academia. As Zdenka Sadl (2009) stated in her investigation of academic networking in Slovenia, “the academic culture is not a culture of inclusion, but a culture of selection” (p. 1240). Networking in the academy has gradually developed into being identified as an additional privilege largely offered on the basis of gender and institutional affiliation.

Networking, specifically, has been defined as a proactive behavior that helps to develop one’s relationship constellation - or the range of relationships that support one’s career development (Forret & Dougherty, 2004; Kram & Isabella, 1985). Networking, within the context of academia, entails the building and/or forming of relationships with others who have the “potential” to assist an individual in his/her work or career (Forret & Dougherty, 2004). However, previous studies have revealed that networking in the academy - an activity in which an academic career relies heavily - routinely excludes women and minority faculty (Baldwin & Griffin, 2015; De Welde, 2017; De Welde & Laursen, 2011; Zambrana et al., 2015). This systematic rejection of women and minorities in the academy has been largely influenced by

members of male network groups, particularly comprised of senior white, middle-class, male academics, who act as gatekeepers and consequently obstruct women and minority faculty's academic career progression (Šandl, 2009).

Research has long held that men dominate the academic institutions of higher education (Fogelberg, Hearn, Husu, & Mankinnen, 1999; Husu, 2001; Šandl, 2009). This male-dominated atmosphere has effectively acted as a barrier to prevent women from fully participating in and integrating into formal and informal networks within the realm of academia (Šandl, 2009). Husu (2001) reported that it was predominantly men who formed social networks in academia. As such, these networks incorporate a percolation of male academics promoting, favoring, and collaborating other male colleagues (Šandl, 2009). Husu (2001) additionally noted that many of the senior women interviewed for her analysis had observed that their male colleagues supported each other through “old boys’ networks.” Networks such as those (which are also frequently referred to as the “invisible college” (O’Leary & Mitchell, 1990)) involve the construction and operation of informal social groups whose members are in positions to authorize and/or make pivotal decisions about the academic rank, status, and position of a scholar (Šandl, 2009). Women in academia are most usually excluded from such academic networks, primarily because those networks are managed by white male intellectuals who act as gatekeepers and often bar the admittance of women, and thus, place women at a major disadvantage (Doherty et al., 2006; Kaufman, 1978; O’Leary & Mitchell, 1990; Šandl, 2009; Toren, 1991). Specifically, such a disadvantage comes in the form of professional isolation.

Professional isolation in academia can produce adverse outcomes on a career: death of collaborators for publications or externally funded grants, lack of information about tenure and expectations in place for advancement, leadership promotions and opportunities, and

circumscribed professional socialization, such as being rejected or ignored by additional colleagues in academia (De Welde, 2017). Women may also be excluded or passed over for opportunities to participate in the commercial marketplace, consult, serve on advisory and editorial boards, or to interact with the industry as a whole when they lack access to academic networks (Monroe et al., 2014; Murray & Graham, 2007).

Gender and Authorship

The most comprehensive study conducted surveying the relationship among gender and scholarly authorship involved the examination of the JSTOR digital archive by researchers at the University of Washington in 2010 (Crow & Smykla, 2015). The digital archive encompassed two million academic papers - written by 2.7 million scholars - that were published across nearly 1,800 disciplines between the years of 1665 and 2010 (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; West, Jacquet, King, Correll, & Bergstrom, 2013). The outcome of the study disclosed that, over the period of 345 years, about 22% of all authors across disciplines were female. From 1991 to 2010, the most recent year for which data are available, numbers indicated that the figure had risen to about 30% (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; West et al., 2013). Moreover, the authors of the study suggested that there was considerable variation by field. They explained that although women were more likely to be represented as authors in a field like sociology rather than biology or mathematics, females overall were consistently underrepresented as first authors across all disciplines (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; West et al., 2013).

Within the field of criminology and criminal justice in particular, women have historically endured inadequate representation (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). A number of productivity

studies have found that women specifically are underrepresented as authors of highly cited articles and/or those published within criminology and criminal justice (CCJ) journals (Cohn & Farrington, 2014; Copes, Khey, & Tewksbury, 2012; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; Kim & Hawkins, 2013; Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Zettler, Cardwell, & Craig, 2017). Moreover, various studies have suggested that publications in top-ranked criminology and criminal justice journals continue to be dominated by a relatively small number of highly-productive scholars who either graduated from or are faculty within a relatively small number of doctoral programs (Crow & Smykla, 2015).

Eigenberg and Baro (1992) were among the first to examine the issue of female underrepresentation as authors of highly cited articles and/or those published in CCJ journals. The two discovered that women comprised only 16% of the authors of articles published in five CCJ journals from 1976 through 1988 (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). An updated form of Eigenberg and Baro's (1992) research analyzed eight CCJ journals: *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Crime and Delinquency*, *Federal Probation*, *Criminal Justice Review*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Women & Criminal Justice*, and *Feminist Criminology*. They identified that women served as authors in 38% of the articles published from 2007 to 2013 (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Further, the study continued to find that, consistent with Eigenberg and colleagues' (1992) previous study, women were less likely to be represented as sole authors (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). The data showed that 60% of all sole authors in all of the eight journals analyzed were men. This figure rose to 66% when only the mainstream journals (*Justice Quarterly*, *Criminal Justice Review*, *Crime & Delinquency*, and *Journal of Criminal Justice*) were analyzed (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Eigenberg and Whalley (2015) specifically pointed out the number of sole-authored articles by women in *Criminology*. In *Criminology*, only five women, representing 4% of the

articles published in the journal, had single-author publications in the three years that were included in their analysis (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Further, gender stratification within the field of criminology has affected the research conducted by female scholars, and the journals that publish such studies (Eigenberg & Baro, 1992). Women may be instructed to pursue research topics that are considered marginal in a “malestream” or androcentric discipline (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Eigenberg & Baro, 1992). Thus, male editors of mainstream journals may be less likely to publish work by women, leaving the more particularized journals, which typically focus on one specific division of criminology, to publish female-written articles for their smaller audiences (Eigenberg & Baro, 1992)

In their research, Crow and Smykla (2015) analyzed 314 articles from 2008 to 2010 using two national journals (*Criminology* and *Justice Quarterly*) and four regional journals (*American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Western Criminological Review*, and *Journal of Crime and Justice*). Through their examinations, they discovered that women were lead authors on coauthored articles only 33% of the time. They determined that women were significantly more likely to be represented as authors (of any type) in regional versus national journals, and additionally, they were more likely to be represented as lead authors in regional journals compared to national ones (Crow & Smykla, 2015). Further, about 42% of the articles had only male authors, while only 14% of them had only female authors. 25% of the articles comprised of both male and female authors had a male lead author, and only 19% had a female lead author (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Thus, their finding showed that males tended to work more frequently with other males, and when both genders published together, males were more likely to be the lead author (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015).

Fisher and colleagues (1998) shed light on this subject of gender inequality in co-authorship:

Among women in the social sciences, but particularly in criminology and criminal justice, the dominant form of scholarship is cross-sex collaboration ... In contrast, men seem more likely to write articles alone or to publish with other men. The pervasiveness of female scholars' collaboration with males again raises the issue of how multiple-authored articles will be evaluated. If these works are devalued, or if women's contributions are implicitly attributed to male co-authors, then females' high level of multiple authorship may increase social inequality in academia. (p. 36).

In order to demonstrate the persistence of the patterns noted by Fisher and colleagues (1998) almost twenty years later, Fahmy and Young (2015) examined the structure of gender and co-authorship among scholarly articles. In their publication, Fahmy and Young (2015) disclosed that the most common explanation for gender inequality in knowledge production is due to the phenomenon of "gender sorting" (McDowell & Smith, 1992). Gender sorting has been construed as the tendency for males to form research partnerships with males more than females. If, in fact, this technique were responsible for generating the gender stratification within the production of scholarly publishing in co-authorship networks, it would mean that gender inequality, essentially, reproduces itself in a way that works against women based on biological sex (Fahmy & Young, 2015).

In addition to the concept of gender sorting, Fahmy and Young (2015) speculated that another cause of the gender gap in knowledge production could be due to scholars' preference to work with productive people (Fahmy & Young, 2015). It has been held that the preference of scholars to work with males over females is rooted in the argument that men have higher levels

of productivity – a characteristic favored in academia (Fahmy & Young, 2015). Primarily, it has been determined that those in higher ranking positions (i.e. associate professors over assistant professors) tend to obtain a higher rate of productivity within the context of publishing scholarly knowledge (Boschini & Sjögren, 2007; Cole & Cole, 1974; Copes et al., 2012; Fahmy & Young, 2015; Fox, 1991; Frost, Phillips, & Clear, 2007; Gabbidon, Higgins, & Potter, 2011; Tower, Plummer, & Ridgewell, 2007). Previous studies have found that productivity has been highly male dominated, with the gender gap being the most pronounced among higher academic ranks (Cohn & Farrington, 2014; Fahmy & Young, 2015; Robinson, 2006). As a result of the long-held notion that men in academia are more productive, it has been additionally contended that men are published more frequently in mainstream journals, which reach larger audiences and are more widely accessible to readers.

A significant amount of exploration has been dedicated to identifying the elements responsible for gender disparities in productivity (Fahmy & Young, 2015). First, previous studies have reported that female academics are generally less productive than their male counterparts due to their duties concerning children, family, and the home, thus affording women less time to devote to scholarly research (Cole & Singer, 1991; Del Carmen & Bing, 2000; Fahmy & Young, 2015; Robinson, 2006; Stack, 1994; Sutor, Mecom, & Feld, 2001). Coser and her colleagues (1971) argued that there is a dilemma rooted in the cultural mandate which requires women to place their family roles first, regardless of their commitment to their profession (Fahmy & Young, 2015; Sutor et al., 2001). Moreover, preceding investigations have contended that women are more likely to be involved in additional activities related to their academic careers, such as service (Fahmy & Young, 2015; Maske, Durden, & Gaynor, 2003; Rama, Raghunandan, Logan, & Barkman, 1997), have a greater desire to teach than males (Clemente, 1973; Fahmy &

Young, 2015; Fox, 1991), and they have a lack of the resources needed to publish knowledge, as well as a lack of institutional support to pursue their research interests (Fahmy & Young, 2015; Mathews & Andersen, 2001; Robinson, 2006; Tower et al., 2007). Lastly, Rice and colleagues (2007) have suggested that the gender differences in authorship patterns could be attributed to a lack of involvement and admittance of females into scholarship networks (Fahmy & Young, 2015). As discussed previously, women being barred from joining formal and informal academic networks has the potential to put them at a major disadvantage, due to the fact that such networks create opportunities for publishing research, provide positive reinforcement and the development of ideas, and contribute feedback on grant proposals (Fahmy & Young, 2015; Fox, 1991; Stack, 2004). In general, research has demonstrated that the differences in productivity and publishing habits between males and females appear to be a result of the gender disparities presented across various external and internal factors (Fahmy & Young, 2015).

Gender and Editorial Roles

Editorial boards are another component of academia that have historically displayed a lack of representation for female members. Eigenberg and Baro (1992) evidenced that between 1975 and 1988, females comprised only 15% of editors, 26% of associate editors, and 6% of editorial board members across five criminology and criminal justice journals (e.g., *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Criminology*, *Crime and Delinquency*, *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, and *Federal Probation*). Studies concerning the representation of women on the editorial boards of journals in other fields, such as environmental biology, natural resource management, medicine, and management, found that women have been routinely neglected (Amrein et al., 2011; Cho et al., 2014; Jagsi et al., 2008; Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Metz & Harzing,

2009). Thus, the inadequate representation of women is not only a problem within the discipline of criminal justice.

Even though there has been some evidence that the scope of female editors and editorial board members has increased in recent years in a few specific journals (i.e. medicine and environmental biology journals), there has been very limited research concerning the scope of female editors and editorial board members within the criminology and criminal justice discipline (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). Due to the little recent information available regarding this topic, Lowe and Fagan (2019) set out to find if the lack of representation of female editors and editorial board members in criminology and criminal justice journals in the 1970s and 1980s uncovered by Eigenberg and Baro (1992) held true in 2019 (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). In their study, Lowe and Fagan (2019) examined the gender composition of editors and editorial board members of seven top criminology and criminal justice journals (*Justice Quarterly*, *Criminology*, the *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *Crime and Delinquency*, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, and the *Journal of Criminal Justice*) from 1985 to 2017 with the goal of filling the gap in extant research analyzing gender disparities in editorial positions of criminology and criminal justice journals, and found that women continue to be underrepresented in all the editorial roles assessed (e.g., Editors-in-Chief, Associate Editors, and Editorial Board Members). Across the years evaluated in the study, women represented only 14% of the position of Editor-in-Chief (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). The representation of women increased in number among Associate Editors with 27% and Editorial Board members with 22% (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). The journal with the largest percentage of women in any editorial role in 2017 was *Criminology* (37.5%), and the journal with the smallest percentage was *Journal of Criminal Justice* (15.87%) (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). Moreover, it was

noted that none of the seven journals displayed an average that surpassed 36% of female representation during the years sampled (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). This finding, in particular, held great significance due to the fact that the American Society of Criminology was comprised of 49% of female members in 2012 (Rasche, 2014) and 45% in 2016 (Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Sutor et al., 2001).

These gender disparities in editorial roles have illustrated that the continuous reproduction of white male hegemony in academia, which has allowed exclusive access to impressive academic posts, has paved the way for white male overrepresentation on journal editorial boards. Journal editors typically seek well-known people in respected positions to sit on their editorial boards and to publish articles in their journals (Özbilgin, 2009). Due to the historic exclusion of women in academic networks and on previous editorial boards, men are typically the most well-known candidates for journal editors to place on editorial boards. Additionally, the discrepancy of women in editorial positions for academic journals could easily negatively affect prospective career trajectories (Lowe & Fagan, 2019). For example, because editorial experience is a prerequisite for becoming an Editor-in-Chief and Associate Editor, findings like Lowe and Fagan's (2019), which note a disparity in female editorial board members, are especially concerning because they indicate areas where women are being barred from advancement. This, in turn, could impact women's career trajectories and lessen the chances for achieving tenure and higher ranks within academia.

Calls for Inclusivity

The lack of diversity in academia affects not only the type of research conducted and the subject matter of the knowledge published, but, arguably more importantly, it affects the mold

from which students form their understanding. As noted by Kennelly, Misra, and Karides (1999), academic faculty serve as role models and mentors for students. Because of this, the underrepresentation of professors and additional faculty based on external factors like gender, race, and class, then also affects and shapes the ideology of the next generation of scholars. Additionally, the omittance of scholars based on race, class, and/or gender may also cause disadvantaged scholars to doubt themselves, their abilities, their perceptions, and their hopes for a successful academic future (Kennelly et al., 1999). When disadvantaged individuals in academia, like women and minorities, become discouraged, they succumb to contorting themselves to fit the characteristics of their department or university - leaving behind unique research interests that could ultimately expand knowledge within the field (Kennelly et al., 1999).

The outcome of students' experiences in academia are heavily reliant upon how they perceive their instruction and teaching based on the instructors' particular mix of race, class and gender. This is problematic because, rather than recognizing the absence of women, minorities, and members of the less affluent classes as a product of the racial, gender, and class barriers that exist within the realm of academia, students are inclined to assume that the keepers of knowledge are naturally white men, which would then explain the wide representation of such a group holding positions of power in higher education (Kennelly et al., 1999).

The absence of women, minorities, and individuals not included in the upper-class in journals will result in a steady plateau in the scholarly knowledge published within criminological research. Until recently, gender had not been integral to the study of criminology because men had been the vast majority of male offenders and accounted for the bulk of those employed in the criminal justice system (Barak et al., 2010). Due to women only being

responsible for a small percentage of the crimes committed, the field of criminology did not analyze or explore women's experiences to construct and develop new theories (Barak et al., 2010). All criminological theories and conducted research were based on males and patterns of male criminology, including those related to females in crime (Barak et al., 2010). As a result, there was a large gap and extended silence about women from theories of crime and discussions, which ultimately led to the creation of a void within the subject of criminology as a whole (Barak et al., 2010). However, in the mid-1970s, women in academia insisted that they be included in criminological research and analysis about crime and the criminal justice system (Barak et al., 2010). The integration of feminist theories of crime and justice guided criminology in its migration to describing gendered oppression in its various forms, identifying and explaining its causes and consequences, and forming strategies for the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes (Barak et al., 2010; Rice et al., 2007; Tong, 1989). The same pattern of inclusion can be plotted for scholars of color and for emerging queer criminology. When certain voices are silenced or not heard, gaps occur in the literature - gaps which easily could be filled with the voices of scholars already in the field. It is important, therefore, that we continually examine the inclusion of various scholars in the field of criminal justice and criminology, in order to ensure that our knowledge is being gathered by a diverse group of people with varied views and interests in order to advance the field more fully.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

Purpose and Questions

Based on the existing literature, this study seeks to identify trends of authorship and patterns of representation within criminological journals based on presumed gender and current institutional affiliation. The principal ambition for this study is to augment the extant research regarding the benefits and advantages which presumed gender may present in the context of publishing scholarly knowledge, specifically within criminological journals. Additionally, as there are a limited number of former studies analyzing the effects of institutional affiliation on the authorship of scholarly knowledge, this study strives to contribute vital material detailing the mutualism of the two. Specifically, our research was guided by the following questions:

1. Does gender affect authorship in criminological journals and does it vary by journal type?
2. How does institutional affiliation affect authorship in criminological journals, does it vary by journal type, and is there one CCJ journal that is more diverse than others in authorship?

Data and Sample

In order to explore possible patterns of privilege in the authorship of scholarly knowledge, a content analysis of criminological journals was conducted. The content analysis

approach, as suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967), is a constant comparison method which involves the examination of the patterns evident in the data and classifying the data into categories (Gray & Densten, 1998). Specifically, the current study focused on the presumed gender and current institutional affiliation of authors. Therefore, a content analysis using manifest coding analyzing author gender and institutional affiliation for each author of the examined publications was administered. Manifest coding was chosen for the current study as it allows for the analysis of data elements that are physically present, countable, and visible (Gray & Densten, 1998; Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). Explicitly, the researcher for this study inspected articles for words indicative of presumed gender (i.e. “he,” “she,” “they”), as well as information provided within the text regarding author order, author institutional affiliation, and census region of author location. The manner of manifest coding was decided upon instead of the alternative coding technique of latent coding, which examines the deep structural meaning conveyed by messages rather than the elements provided on the surface. Due to the current study’s collection of outwardly presented author information, latent coding would not have been a viable style of analysis (Berg, 2004; Gray & Densten, 1998).

The data for the current study were drawn from four CCJ journals published from 2014 through 2019, the most recent five years of publication. The journals analyzed included *Criminology*, *Critical Criminology*, *Feminist Criminology*, and *Race & Justice*. While presently there is no consensus on what constitutes “top-tier” journals in CCJ (Lowe & Fagan, 2019) and prior research has failed to identify a common and specified list of the most influential journals in the field (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015), *Criminology* was included in this study because it is the peer-reviewed journal published on behalf of the American Society of Criminology (ASC) (ASC, 2019). ASC is largely considered to be the most prestigious association of criminal justice

scholars in the U.S. Additionally, *Critical Criminology*, *Feminist Criminology*, and *Race & Justice* were examined because they represent specialized divisions of ASC, the Divisions of Critical Criminology and Social Justice, Women and Crime, and People of Color and Crime, respectively. Specifically, they were included to determine whether publication patterns vary in these journals compared to a more mainstream outlet, like *Criminology*, especially when considering that previous literature has suggested that mainstream criminological journals tend to favor and publish methods that are less frequently used by female criminologists (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). It has been formerly held that this tendency may cause female scholars to be limited to publishing within more specified CCJ journals (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015).

Coding Technique

The sample contained every piece that was published in the four selected journals from 2014 through 2019. This resulted in the examination of 152 articles from *Criminology*, 162 articles from *Critical Criminology*, 114 articles from *Feminist Criminology*, and 97 articles from *Race & Justice*. The data were then manually entered into a code sheet that included journal title, volume and issue number, year of publication, title of article, names of contributing authors, census region of authors, and article keywords.

Additionally, the authors' presumed gender and institutional affiliations were coded and recorded in the code sheet for each author on the publication. The presumed gender of authors was coded according to the pronouns used in professional biographies, as well as through various internet searches to determine preferred pronouns of the authors (i.e., school/personal websites, biography pages, and curriculum vitae). Similarly, the institutional affiliation of authors was coded according to the affiliations listed in professional biographies. 58.6% of the first authors in

Critical Criminology were male, compared to 56.6% in *Criminology*, 47.4% in *Race & Justice*, and 7.9% in *Feminist Criminology*. Lastly, article keywords were coded by including the keywords provided within the text of each article.

Measures

Dependent Variable

Authorship

Authorship of individual authors was established through an examination of those listed as contributors on each article analyzed. Additionally, the names of authors were specifically coded according to the order that they were presented within each article. For the current study, authors were coded as: first author, second author, third author, fourth author, fifth author, sixth author, seventh author, and eighth author.

Independent Variable(s)

Gender

The presumed gender of authors was determined by referencing the pronouns used in professional biographies and Internet research. The presumed gender of authors was coded as follows: female (0), and male (1).

Institutional Affiliation

The institutional affiliation of authors was concluded through evidence provided within professional biographies and author curriculum vitae. Authors' institutional affiliation was categorized as: university (0), government agency (1), and other (2). If an author were coded as

other, it because they were affiliated with a private business or organization, or another entity that did not fall under the definition of a university or government agency.

Census Region of the United States

The census region of each author was established by relating the location of an individual's institutional affiliation to its appropriate census region. Census regions were consistent with the designation of regions used by United States Census Bureau (Bureau, 2015). The census regions of authors were coded as: Northeast (1), Midwest (2), South (3), West (4), US Territory (5), and Outside U.S. (6).

Analytic Plan

Exploratory analyses for the current study were performed through distinctive phases. First, univariate analyses were applied in order to intently inspect the patterns displayed within the data collected. In particular, descriptive statistics and frequencies were assessed and evaluated by the researcher. The measurements provided through univariate analyses allowed for the observation of percentages regarding the variables of presumed gender of author, type of institutional affiliation, journal title, gender of author teams, and census region of authors. The calculations estimated permitted the researcher to observe the sample's overall number of authors included, the gender specifics of each author, the number of articles published within each CCJ journal included within the study, and the type of institutional affiliation associated with each author.

Once univariate analyses had been employed and examined, bivariate analyses were administered in order to study the relationships between variables more thoroughly. Chiefly, chi-

square analyses were conducted for all of the variables considered. For example, chi-square analyses were estimated for the four journals of *Criminology*, *Critical Criminology*, *Race and Justice*, and *Feminist Criminology*, and the presumed gender and type of institutional affiliation for each author. By choosing to utilize chi-square analyses to observe the data, the relationships between the variables considered for the current study were presented to the researcher. The chi-square analysis permitted evaluation of both dichotomous variables and nominal variables (McHugh, 2013). Moreover, chi-square provided substantial information regarding the bivariate association between categorical variables, which allowed the researcher to better comprehend the outcome of the results, and thus, derive more detailed information to use when exploring the results (McHugh, 2013). Additionally, the bivariate analyses presented a straight-forward method for determining the significance, strength, and relationships between variables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The sample was composed of 525 articles from *Criminology*, *Critical Criminology*, *Feminist Criminology*, and *Race and Justice*, written by a total of 1,117 authors. As shown in Table 1, women represented 55% (n = 289) of first authors, while men comprised 45% of first authors (n = 236). Additionally, in regard to author teams across the sample, 36.8% (n = 193) were all female, 31.9% (n = 167) were all male, and 31.3% (n = 164) were mixed gender teams.

Moreover, our findings indicated that a considerable percentage of authors were housed in universities. For example, 99.4% of first authors in *Critical Criminology* were institutionally affiliated with a university or college (n = 161), as were 99.0% of first authors in *Race and Justice* (n = 96), 98.2% of first authors in *Feminist Criminology* (n = 112), and 96.1% of the first authors published in *Criminology* (n = 146). Collectively, 98.1% of all first authors from each publication reviewed were associated with a university or college (n = 515), while .2% belonged to a government agency (n = 1), and 1.7% were associated with other institutional affiliations, like a private organization or business (n = 9). Additionally, *Feminist Criminology* proved to be the most diverse CCJ journal in terms of institutional affiliation of authors, as that publication obtained authors from each of the categories sampled of University/College, Government Agency, and Other. However, these findings did not indicate a significant relationship between institutional affiliation and authorship within the journals.

Table 1 Descriptives

Author	Male (n)	Female (n)	University Affiliation (n)
First Author	45.0% (236)	55.0% (289)	98.1% (515)
Second Author	50.9% (169)	49.1% (163)	95.8% (318)
Third Author	60.9% (92)	39.1% (59)	93.4% (141)
Fourth Author	53.0% (35)	47.0% (31)	89.4% (59)
Fifth Author	48.0% (12)	52.0% (13)	84.0% (21)
Sixth Author	50.0% (7)	50.0% (7)	85.7% (12)
Seventh Author	100.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (3)
Eighth Author	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)

Notes: Percentages based on valid percentage.

In *Criminology* (n = 152 articles), 56.6% of first authors were men (n = 86), whereas 43.4% of first authors were women (n = 66), as shown in Table 2. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of authors in subsequent author roles were male in *Criminology* publications, with 68.5% (n = 85) being second authors, 71.6% (n = 53) being third authors, 57.1% (n = 20) being fourth authors, 60.0% (n = 9) being fifth authors, 75.0% (n = 6) being sixth authors, and 100% (n = 2) being seventh authors.

Similarly, in *Critical Criminology* (n = 162 articles), 58.6% of first authors were men (n = 95), and 41.4% were women (n = 67). In further resemblance to the trends in *Criminology*, the majority of second, third, fourth, and seventh authors in *Critical Criminology* were men, as shown in Table 2, and the number of sixth authors were equally distributed between men and women. Conversely, *Feminist Criminology* (n = 105 articles) had a considerable number of women publishing as first authors, with 92.1% being women (n = 105), and only 7.9% (n = 9)

being men. Additionally, women accounted for the majority of consecutive authorship roles with women authors functioning as the predominance of second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth authors, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Gender of Authors by Journal

	Criminology	Critical Criminology	Race & Justice	Feminist Criminology	X ²
	% Male (n)	% Male (n)	% Male (n)	% Male (n)	
First Author	56.6% (86)	58.6% (95)	47.4% (46)	7.9% (9)	84.077***
Second Author	68.5% (85)	55.2% (37)	52.2% (35)	16.2% (12)	51.622***
Third Author	71.6% (53)	70.6% (12)	50.0% (16)	39.3 (11)	11.335**
Fourth Author	57.1% (20)	100.0% (5)	50.0% (7)	25.0% (3)	8.503*
Fifth Author	60.0% (9)	48.0% (12)	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	2.564
Sixth Author	75.0% (6)	50.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (1)	5.000
Seventh Author	100.0% (2)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	
Eighth Author	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	

First author gender varied significantly between the journals, as shown in Table 2, with a majority of first authors in *Criminology* (56.6%) and *Critical Criminology* (58.6%) being male, while, in contrast, author gender was equally distributed in *Race and Justice* (47.4%), and most first authors in *Feminist Criminology* were female (92.1%).

Following, *Race and Justice* (n = 97 articles) published 52.6% (n = 51) of women as first authors and published 47.4% (n = 46) of men in the same role. Moreover, the gender of coauthors in successive roles was more equally distributed in *Race and Justice* in comparison to the other journals examined. There was an equal number of women and men acting as third

authors (n = 32) and fourth authors (n = 14), while the majority of fifth, sixth, and eighth authors were women at 60% (n = 3), 100% (n = 2), and 100% (n = 1), and the majority of second and seventh authors were men at 52.2% (n = 35) and 100% (n = 3).

Comparable to the findings regarding individual authorship, the gender of author teams varied significantly across the four CCJ journals examined as shown in Table 3. Overall, the largest percent of all male teams were published in *Critical Criminology* with 49.4% (n = 80) of author teams being all male, while 34.6% (n = 56) of teams were females, and only 16.0% (n = 26) of teams were made up of mixed genders. In *Criminology*, more than half of the author teams published were comprised of mixed genders at 52.0% (n = 79), 34.2% of author teams were all males (n = 52), and 13.8% of teams were all females (n = 21). Just as seen in previous findings when analyzing gender of separate authors within each journal, the distribution of genders in author teams published within *Race and Justice* were more equally dispersed, with 35.1% of authors being all female (n = 34), 32.0% being all male (n = 31), and 33.0% of author teams being made up of mixed genders (n = 32). Opposite of the author team trends in *Critical Criminology*, the largest percentage of female author teams was published in *Feminist Criminology*. Of author teams in *Feminist Criminology*, 72.6% were made up of all females (n = 82), and 23.9% were mixed gender teams (n = 27). In comparison, only 3.5% of teams published in *Feminist Criminology* were all males (n = 4).

Table 3 Author Teams by Journal

	All Female Team	All Male Team	Mixed Gender Team
Criminology	13.8% (21)	34.2% (52)	52.0% (79)
Critical Criminology	34.6% (56)	49.4% (80)	16.0% (26)
Feminist Criminology	72.6% (82)	3.5% (4)	23.9% (27)
Race & Justice	35.1% (34)	32.0% (31)	33.0% (32)

$\chi^2 = 140.520$, *** = $p < .000$

First author gender and gender composition of author teams displayed a significant relationship for women and men across the four journals. For example, when a woman was the first author of an article published in *Criminology*, there was a significantly higher percentage of the coauthor team being comprised of mixed genders (68.2%) in comparison to *Race and Justice* (33.3%), *Feminist Criminology* (21.2%), or *Critical Criminology* (16.4%), as shown in Table 4. However, as seen in Table 5, when men were first authors in *Criminology* publications, the author team was typically composed of all males (60.5%). This trend was similar for *Critical Criminology* and *Race and Justice* where, when a male was first author, 84.2% and 67.4% of articles published were those of all male author teams. *Feminist Criminology* presented more mixed gender author teams when the first author was male (55.6%) compared to female (21.2%), making it an outlier.

Table 4 Female-Led Author Teams by Journal

	All Female Team	All Male Team	Mixed Gender Team
Criminology	31.8% (21)	0% (0)	68.2% (45)
Critical Criminology	83.6% (56)	0% (0)	16.4% (11)
Feminist Criminology	78.8% (82)	0% (0)	21.2% (22)
Race & Justice	66.7% (34)	0% (0)	33.3% (95)

$X^2 = 51.895$, *** = $p < .000$

These findings concerning first author gender and gender of author teams could be argued to fall in line with Fahmy and Young’s (2015) explanation of “gender sorting.” Gender sorting has come to be most commonly defined as the habit of male researchers to form more partnerships with other males in comparison to females (Fahmy & Young, 2015). This concept is directly applicable to the findings of the current study. As seen in Table 5, men were often seen most collaborating in research and publishing articles with teams of other men.

Table 5 Male-Led Author Teams by Journal

	All Female Team	All Male Team	Mixed Gender Team
Criminology	0% (0)	60.5% (52)	39.5% (34)
Critical Criminology	0% (0)	84.2% (80)	15.8% (15)
Feminist Criminology	0% (0)	44.4% (4)	55.6% (5)
Race & Justice	0% (0)	67.4% (31)	32.6% (15)

$X^2 = 15.978$, *** = $p < .001$

Finally, our findings revealed that an almost equal number of men and women were published as first authors across the four journals analyzed when the articles were divided into census regions of author location, as illustrated in Table 6. For instance, in the Northeast census region, 17.0% (n = 49) of first authors were women, and 16.1% (n = 38) of first authors were men. The Midwest census region produced similar results, with 16.5% (n = 39) of first authors being men, and 14.5% (n = 42) of first authors being women. The widest variation in gender of first authors was demonstrated when the authors were housed outside of the United States. Specifically, when located outside of the United States, 28.7% (n = 83) of first authors were women, and 24.6% (n = 58) of first authors were men. Nevertheless, much like the relationship between institutional affiliation and authorship, the relationship between the gender of first authors and census region of first author location was not significant.

Table 6 Gender of First Authors by Census Region

	Female	Male
Northeast	17.0% (49)	16.1% (38)
Midwest	14.5% (42)	16.5% (39)
South	27.3% (79)	29.2% (69)
West	12.5% (36)	13.6% (32)
Outside U.S.	28.7% (83)	24.6% (58)

$X^2 = .825$

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In order to examine the trends of authorship in CCJ journals, the current study analyzed author gender and institutional affiliation across four CCJ journals from 2014 through 2019 to measure the influence such aspects could have on the publication of scholarly knowledge. Prior research has determined that academic publications are often largely related to specific author characteristics like gender and university affiliation (Crow & Smykla, 2015; Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; Kennelly et al., 1999; Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Šandl, 2009; West et al., 2013).

The current findings indicated that, though women's rates of representation as first authors had increased compared to earlier studies examining the gender of first authors, there continues to be a significant relationship between gender and journal type. The data show that in the four CCJ journals evaluated over a five-year period, 55.0% of first authors were female and 45.0% were male. However, this depiction of women is misleading and is due in large part to the inclusion seen within *Feminist Criminology*. Indeed, the analysis demonstrated that a higher percentage of men were first authors in *Criminology* and *Critical Criminology*, while the overwhelming majority of first authors in *Feminist Criminology* were women. In line with previous research, the current study illustrated that women were most extensively represented in gender-specific criminology journals (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Specifically, 92.1% of first authors in *Feminist Criminology* were women, and only 7.9% of first authors were men. This

finding remains consistent with Eigenberg and Whalley's (2015) preceding study which revealed that women were most represented in journals with a central focus on gender and/or women.

Our data also determined that the gender of author teams varied significantly by journal. *Critical Criminology* exhibited a majority of all male authors by a large margin of 49.4% with only 16.0% of mixed gender author teams, while 72.6% of *Feminist Criminology* articles were composed by all female author teams and 23.9% were composed by mixed gender author teams. The data configured regarding the staggering number of male authors and male author teams within *Critical Criminology* is particularly momentous. As indicated on the publisher's official website, "*Critical Criminology* explores social, political and economic justice from alternative perspectives, including anarchistic, cultural, feminist, integrative, Marxist, peace-making, postmodernist and left-realist criminology" (Springer, 2020). Additionally, *Critical Criminology* is publicly advertised as the official Journal of the ASC Division on Critical Criminology and the ACJS Section on Critical Criminology, and is publicized for focusing on "issues of social harm and social justice, including work exploring the intersecting lines of class, gender, race/ethnicity and heterosexism" (Springer, 2020). Considering the large percentage of men published within *Critical Criminology*, it is important to note that the journal claims to "offer works that focus on creative and cooperative solutions to justice problems, plus strategies for the construction of a more inclusive society" (Springer, 2020). However, this may not be the case, considering the lack of inclusivity regarding authorship.

This data reinforces previous findings that suggested that women were more likely to work exclusively with other women in gender-based journals (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). While a vast majority of authors in *Feminist Criminology* were female and female-only author teams, more than half of the articles included in *Criminology* were penned by mixed gender

author teams. Again, this outcome upholds Eigenberg and Whalley's (2015) precursory observation that men and women were most likely to publish collaboratively together in mainstream journals, as evidenced in the current study by the 52.0% of mixed gender author teams published in *Criminology*.

There were also significant gender differences in author teams when the genders of first authors were analyzed across the four journals. In *Criminology*, there was a significantly higher percentage of mixed gender author teams when a woman was first author than the publications from *Critical Criminology*, *Feminist Criminology*, or *Race & Justice*. For example, 68.2% of articles published in *Criminology* were from mixed gender author teams when a woman was first author, while only 16.4% from *Critical Criminology* and 21.2% from *Feminist Criminology* included mixed gender author teams when a woman was named first author. In contrast, when men were first authors in *Criminology* publications, the highest composition of gender of author teams was comprised exclusively of males. This conclusion from the current study suggests that men who were first authors might be less likely than women to have a coauthor of the opposite gender - a finding that had been formerly identified in prior research (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015; Fahmy & Young, 2015; Lowe & Fagan, 2019), or that male authors may just be less apt to work with female scholars in general. In regard to the current study, this specific finding on the influence of first authors on the configuration of author teams is especially concerning given that many promotion and tenure committees tend to apply more value to first authorship when assessing the contributions of a particular scholar (Eigenberg & Whalley, 2015). Moreover, this finding could be argued to uphold Daly and Chesney-Lind's (1988) argument that, as male editors and first authors of criminological journals are less likely to work with and publish women, female authors are left to publish in particularized journals for smaller audiences.

Regarding sole-authored articles, there was a considerable increase in the number of sole-authored articles published by women, specifically within *Criminology*. In their 2015 study reviewing authorship trends within the articles published in eight CCJ journals from 2007 to 2013, Eigenberg and Whalley (2015) found that only five women, representing 4% of the articles published within *Criminology*, had single-author publications in the years that were examined. In the current study, our findings determined that 11 of the 28 solo authors published in *Criminology* were women, representing of 39.0% of the entirety of articles published within the journal from 2014 to 2019. The steady increase of women published within *Criminology* illustrates the notion that, though still underrepresented in comparison to men, women are being published within mainstream journals at a higher rate than before.

Notably, the relationship between publications across the four journals and the institutional affiliation of authors was not significant, as seen in our chi-square analysis of the two variables. An explanation for this outcome may be found in the fact that the overwhelming majority of authors from each of the four journals examined were housed in a university or college. For instance, a total of 98.1% (n = 515) of all authors belonged to a university or college, while 0.2% (n = 1) of authors were from a government agency, and 1.7% (n = 9) of authors were classified as “Other,” which included private businesses, charity organizations, and the like. The large percentage of authors from university and colleges sampled for the current study supports previous literature that the number of women being hired at universities and colleges has been steadily increasing over the past decade (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998). Moreover, overall, 98.3% (n = 232) of authors belonging to a university or college were male, and 97.9% (n = 283) were female. This data is consistent with the substantial amount of extant literature that has revealed that, in lieu of moderate generational advances for women in

academia, more men continue to be hired and employed within institutions of higher education at a higher rate than women.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Previous research has demonstrated that gender and institutional affiliation significantly affect career trajectories within the academic world (De Welde, 2017; Šandl, 2009). More specifically, an extensive number of studies have shown that an academic's opportunities to achieve various levels of success are often guided by gender and institutional connections (Kennelly et al., 1999). In particular, those most heavily affected by the examination of such characteristics have been women and minority scholars (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Kennelly et al., 1999). In regard to authorship, the field of criminology has historically displayed an inadequate representation of women throughout publications within the majority of CCJ journals (Lowe & Fagan, 2019).

Much has improved within the realm of academia over time (Kennelly et al., 1999). Partly due to an increase in the number of women being hired to positions in higher education, the representation of women scholars in criminological publications has continued to rise. A recent study by Eigenberg and Whalley (2015) found that women's participation in criminological publications from 2007 through 2013 was at about 38%. This is in comparison to the 16% of women's participation in criminological publications that was displayed in a similar study conducted on articles published from 1976 through 1988. Yet, the synthesis of literature and data in the current study reveals that, despite the overall gains in representation, women

continue to be marginalized within the publications of scholarly knowledge in criminological fields.

The current study provided evidence that inequality by gender in criminological journals has continued to persist. The findings from this study have suggested that there are blatant gender differences in authorship when criminological journals are divided into categories of gender-based and not gender-based. Women authors were much more likely to be published in a gender-based criminological publication like *Feminist Criminology* rather than a mainstream journal like *Criminology*. Additionally, the current study found that men were most likely to publish collaboratively with other men in *Critical Criminology*, and women were most likely to publish collaboratively with other women in *Feminist Criminology*. Moreover, the current study upheld the conclusions of previous research which have suggested that men and women were most likely to publish collaboratively together in mainstream journals, as evidenced in the number of mixed gender author teams seen in *Criminology*.

Despite the contributions the current study devotes to existing research, it is not without limitations. Firstly, although it was the most feasible approach for the current study, the decision to use a content analysis left ample room for researcher error when identifying and analyzing data. Future studies may find it helpful to employ more than one trained researcher when collecting and coding data from the sample. With an increase in the number of researchers analyzing and evaluating the data, there would correspondingly be an increase in the consistency of data, as well as an added layer of assessment for accuracy and correctness.

An additional limitation of the current study existed within the choice of the CCJ journals that were examined. The selection of the four journals ultimately chosen to be sampled for this study were not necessarily representative of the entirety of criminological publications. Further,

the study was limited exclusively to CCJ journals. Many criminologists may choose to publish in journals of other fields, and the exclusion of those added publications may have affected the outcome of data. Moreover, this research was limited to articles published exclusively in journals. Future research may include supplementary publications like book chapters and government memos and reports.

Though the current study adds to the extant literature surrounding gender disparities within criminological journals, the race of authors was not a variable that was considered. By coding for the race of each author, future research may additionally analyze trends in the authorship of knowledge published by minority scholars. Moreover, as the current study did not account for the reputation and standing of the universities and colleges contained within the sample, future research may find it desirable to categorize schools into research universities, 4-year colleges, and 2-year colleges to adequately measure the relationship that institutional affiliation could have on authorship in criminological journals.

Although women's participation in publishing scholarly knowledge has become increasingly more feasible over the previous decades, the barriers and obstacles which women must clear before becoming published authors have remained systematically anchored. The recognition of such a disparity in authorship should motivate scholars to strive for a more inclusive system of research and publishing. Additionally, the field needs to establish direction and guidelines to ensure that gender is more frequently incorporated into publications, both as a topic of study and as a standard of variation in authorship. With an increase in the number of women included in publication processes, the topics researched and discussed within the field of criminology will gradually become more diverse and comprehensive over time. The expansion of subjects studied and discoveries made will be wholly beneficial to the field, but we must first

begin by acknowledging and resisting the standardized inequalities that have endured throughout generations.

REFERENCES

- Alperson, E. D. (1975). The minority woman in academe. *Professional Psychology, 6*(3), 252.
- Amrein, K., Langmann, A., Fahrleitner-Pammer, A., Pieber, T. R., & Zollner-Schwetz, I. (2011). Women underrepresented on editorial boards of 60 major medical journals. *Gender medicine, 8*(6), 378-387.
- American Society of Criminology (2020). The official Journal of the ASC Division on Critical Criminology and the ACJS Section on Critical Criminology. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/journal/10612/volumes-and-issues>.
- Aud, S. (2013). *The Condition of Education 2013*. Washington, DC
- Baert, S., De Pauw, A.-S., & Deschacht, N. (2016). Do employer preferences contribute to sticky floors? *ILR Review, 69*(3), 714-736.
- Baldwin, C. P., & Griffin, M. D. (2015). Challenges of race and gender for Black women in the academy. *Disrupting the culture of silence: Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education, 55-66*.
- Barak, G., Leighton, P., & Flavin, J. (2010). *Class, Race, Gender, and Crime: The Social Realities of Justice in America*: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Basken, P. (2007). A year later, Spellings report still makes ripples. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(5), A1.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). Methods for the social sciences. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Blum, D. E. (1991). Environment Still Hostile to Women in Academe, New Evidence Indicates. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 38*(7), 775-784.

- Boschini, A., & Sjögren, A. (2007). Is team formation gender neutral? Evidence from coauthorship patterns. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 25(2), 325-365.
- Bronstein, P., & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(5), 557-585.
- Bureau, U. C. (2015). Census Bureau regions and divisions with state FIPS codes.
- Cho, A. H., Johnson, S. A., Schuman, C. E., Adler, J. M., Gonzalez, O., Graves, S. J., . . . Skinner, I. (2014). Women are underrepresented on the editorial boards of journals in environmental biology and natural resource management. *PeerJ*, 2, e542.
- Clemente, F. (1973). Early career determinants of research productivity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(2), 409-419.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2014). Publication productivity of criminologists. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 25(3), 275-303.
- Cole, J. R., & Cole, S. (1974). Citation analysis. *Science*, 183(4120), 32-33.
- Cole, J. R., & Singer, B. (1991). A theory of limited differences: Explaining the productivity puzzle in science. *The outer circle: Women in the scientific community*, 277-310.
- Copes, H., Khey, D. N., & Tewksbury, R. (2012). Criminology and criminal justice hit parade: Measuring academic productivity in the discipline. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 23(4), 423-440.
- Coser, R. L., & Rokoff, G. (1971). Women in the occupational world: Social disruption and conflict. *Social Problems*, 18(4), 535-554.
- Crow, M. S., & Smykla, J. O. (2015). An examination of author characteristics in national and regional criminology and criminal justice journals, 2008–2010: Are female scholars changing the nature of publishing in criminology and criminal justice? *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(2), 441-455.
- Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice quarterly*, 5(4), 497-538.

- De Welde, K. (2017). Moving the needle on equity and inclusion. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 39, 192-211.
- De Welde, K., & Laursen, S. (2011). The glass obstacle course: Informal and formal barriers for women Ph. D. students in STEM fields. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 3(3), 571-595.
- Del Carmen, A., & Bing, R. L. (2000). Academic productivity of African Americans in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11(2), 237-249.
- Digest of Educational Statistics*. (1994). Washington, DC: U.S. Govt. Printing Off.
- Doherty, L., Manfredi, S., Vázquez-Cupeiro, S., & Elston, M. A. (2006). Gender and academic career trajectories in Spain. *Employee Relations*, 588-603.
- Eigenberg, H., & Baro, A. (1992). Women and the publication process: A content analysis of criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3(2), 293-314.
- Eigenberg, H. M., & Whalley, E. (2015). Gender and publication patterns: Female authorship is increasing, but is there gender parity? *Women & Criminal Justice*, 25(1-2), 130-144.
- Fahmy, C., & Young, J. T. (2015). Invisible colleagues: The informal organization of knowledge production in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 26(4), 423-445.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The faculty factor: Reassessing the American academy in a turbulent era*: JHU Press.
- Fisher, B. S., Vander Ven, T. M., Cobane, C. T., Cullen, F. T., & Williams, N. (1998). Trends in multiple-authored articles in criminology and criminal justice: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9(1), 19-38.
- Fogelberg, P., Hearn, J., Husu, L., & Mankinnen, T. (1999). *Hard Work in the Academy: Research and Interventions on Gender Inequalities in Higher Education*: ERIC.
- Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International*

- Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(3), 419-437.
- Fox, M. F. (1991). Gender, environmental milieu, and productivity in science. *The outer circle: Women in the scientific community*, 188-204.
- Frost, N. A., Phillips, N. D., & Clear, T. R. (2007). Productivity of criminal justice scholars across the career. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(3), 428-443.
- Gabbidon, S. L., Higgins, G. E., & Potter, H. (2011). Race, gender, and the perception of recently experiencing unfair treatment by the police: Exploratory results from an all-black sample. *Criminal justice review*, 36(1), 5-21.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. 1967. *Weidenfield & Nicolson, London*, 1-19.
- Goffman, E. (1976). Gender Display. In *Gender Advertisements* (pp. 1-9): Springer.
- Graham, P. A. (1978). Expansion and exclusion: A history of women in American higher education. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 3(4), 759-773.
- Grant, L., & Ward, K. B. (1991). Gender and publishing in sociology. *Gender & society*, 5(2), 207-223.
- Gray, J. H., & Densten, I. L. (1998). Integrating quantitative and qualitative analysis using latent and manifest variables. *Quality and Quantity*, 32(4), 419-431.
- Headlee, S. E., & Elfin, M. (1996). *The cost of being female*: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Husu, L. (2001). On metaphors on the position of women in academia and science. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 9(3), 172-181.
- Jacobs, J. A. (1996). Gender inequality and higher education. *Annual review of sociology*, 22(1), 153-185.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Winslow, S. E. (2004). The academic life course, time pressures and gender inequality. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(2), 143-161.

- Jagsi, R., Tarbell, N. J., Henault, L. E., Chang, Y., & Hylek, E. M. (2008). The representation of women on the editorial boards of major medical journals: a 35-year perspective. *Archives of internal medicine*, 168(5), 544-548.
- Johnsrud, L. K. (1993). Women and minority faculty experiences: Defining and responding to diverse realities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 53, 3-16.
- Kaufman, D. R. (1978). Associational ties in academe: Some male and female differences. *Sex roles*, 4(1), 9-21.
- Kennelly, I., Misra, J., & Karides, M. (1999). The historical context of gender, race, & class in the academic labor market. *Race, Gender & Class*, 125-155.
- Kim, B., & Hawkins, P. M. (2013). Who's getting cited: Representation of women and non-white scholars in major American criminology and criminal justice journals between 1986-2005. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 2, 306-321.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of management Journal*, 28(1), 110-132.
- Lewis, P. (2004). The publishing crisis and tenure criteria: An issue for research universities? *Profession*, 2004(1), 14-24.
- Long, J. S., Allison, P. D., & McGinnis, R. (1993). Rank advancement in academic careers: Sex differences and the effects of productivity. *American Sociological Review*, 703-722.
- Lowe, C., & Fagan, A. (2019). Gender Composition of Editors and Editorial Boards in Seven Top Criminal Justice and Criminology Journals from 1985 to 2017. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 30(3), 424-443.
- Maske, K. L., Durden, G. C., & Gaynor, P. E. (2003). Determinants of scholarly productivity among male and female economists. *Economic Inquiry*, 41(4), 555-564.
- Mathews, A. L., & Andersen, K. (2001). A gender gap in publishing? Women's representation in edited political science books. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 34(1), 143-147.
- Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (2011). *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology (The 6th Ed.)*, 26.

- McDonald, D., & Miller, A. (2013). *Race, Gender and Criminal Justice: Equality and Justice for All? : Cognella.*
- McDowell, J. M., & Smith, J. K. (1992). The effect of gender-sorting on propensity to coauthor: Implications for academic promotion. *Economic Inquiry*, 30(1), 68-82.
- McHugh, M. L. (2013). The chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica*, 23(2), 143-149.
- McRae, S. (2003). Constraints and choices in mothers' employment careers: a consideration of Hakim's preference theory. *The British journal of sociology*, 54(3), 317-338.
- Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 54(2), 123-144.
- Metz, I., & Harzing, A.-W. (2009). Gender diversity in editorial boards of management journals. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4), 540-557.
- Monroe, K. R., Choi, J., Howell, E., Lampros-Monroe, C., Trejo, C., & Perez, V. (2014). Gender equality in the ivory tower, and how best to achieve it. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(2), 418-426.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 109(41), 16474-16479.
- Murray, F., & Graham, L. (2007). Buying science and selling science: gender differences in the market for commercial science. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16(4), 657-689.
- Nobelius, A. M. (2011). Evidence not equity to win the gender war. *Medical education*, 45(11), 1163-1163.
- O'Leary, V. E., & Mitchell, J. M. (1990). Women connecting with women: networks and mentors in the United States. *Storming the tower: Women in the academic world*, 58-73.
- Özbilgin, M. F. (2009). From journal rankings to making sense of the world. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 113-121.

- Parker, P. (2015). The historical role of women in higher education. *Administrative Issues Journal*, 5(1), 3.
- Rama, D. V., Raghunandan, K., Logan, L. B., & Barkman, B. V. (1997). Gender differences in publications by promoted faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 12(2), 353.
- Rasche, C. E. (2014). The ASC division on women and crime from 30 years out. *Feminist Criminology*, 9(4), 253-269.
- Reynolds, J. (2003). You can't always get the hours you want: Mismatches between actual and preferred work hours in the US. *Social Forces*, 81(4), 1171-1199.
- Rice, S. K., Terry, K. J., Miller, H. V., & Ackerman, A. R. (2007). Research trajectories of female scholars in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(3), 360-384.
- Robinson, D. (2006). *The status of higher education teaching personnel in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States*: Canadian Association of University Teachers Ottawa.
- Rosenfeld, R. A. (1981). Academic men and women's career mobility. *Social Science Research*, 10(4), 337-363.
- Rosenfeld, R. A., & Jones, J. A. (1986). Institutional mobility among academics: The case of psychologists. *Sociology of Education*, 212-226.
- Šandl, Z. (2009). We women are no good at it': Networking in academia. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, 45(06), 1239-1263.
- Springer Publications. (2020). *Critical Criminology, An International Journal*. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/journal/10612/volumes-and-issues>.
- Stack, S. (1994). The effects of gender on publishing: The case of sociology. *Sociological Focus*, 27(1), 81-83.
- Stack, S. (2004). Gender, children and research productivity. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(8), 891-920.

- Suitor, J. J., Mecom, D., & Feld, I. S. (2001). Gender, household labor, and scholarly productivity among university professors. *Gender Issues, 19*(4), 50-67.
- Tokarczyk, M. M., & Fay, E. A. (1993). *Working-class women in the academy: Laborers in the knowledge factory*: Univ of Massachusetts Press.
- Tolbert, P. S., & Oberfield, A. A. (1991). Sources of organizational demography: Faculty sex ratios in colleges and universities. *Sociology of Education, 305-315*.
- Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist Theory: A Comprehensive Introduction*.
- Toren, N. (1991). Women at the top: female full professors in higher education in Israel. In *Women's Higher Education in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 165-184): Springer.
- Tower, G., Plummer, J., & Ridgewell, B. (2007). A multidisciplinary study of gender-based research productivity in the worlds best journals. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM), 2*(4), 23-32.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & society, 1*(2), 125-151.
- West, J. D., Jacquet, J., King, M. M., Correll, S. J., & Bergstrom, C. T. (2013). The role of gender in scholarly authorship. *PloS one, 8*(7): e66212.
- Winslow, S. (2010). Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty. *Gender & society, 24*(6), 769-793.
- Zambrana, R. E., Ray, R., Espino, M. M., Castro, C., Douthirt Cohen, B., & Eliason, J. (2015). "Don't Leave Us Behind" The Importance of Mentoring for Underrepresented Minority Faculty. *American Educational Research Journal, 52*(1), 40-72.
- Zettler, H. R., Cardwell, S. M., & Craig, J. M. (2017). The gendering effects of co-authorship in criminology & criminal justice research. *Criminal Justice Studies, 30*(1), 30-44.

APPENDIX A

JOURNAL CODE SHEET

Variable	Description
Journal name	
Volume/Issue Number	
Year of Publication	
Title	
Author 1	
Author 2	
Author 3	
Author 4	
Author 5	
Author 6	
Author 7	
Author 8	
Keywords	
Affiliation 1	
Affiliation 2	
Affiliation 3	
Affiliation 4	
Affiliation 5	
Affiliation 6	
Affiliation 7	
Affiliation 8	

VITA

Bethany Bray was born in Cookeville, Tennessee, to Amy and Kevin Bray. She is the youngest of two children, with an older brother named Drew. Following high school graduation in 2014, Bethany attended the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga and found a passion for learning the elements of civil liberties and legal studies. She earned her Bachelor of Science degree in May of 2018 in Legal Assistant Studies and began her career as a graduate student and graduate assistant within the Criminal Justice department of UTC in August of the same year. While in graduate school, Bethany has assisted in conducting a multitude of online and face-to-face courses, as well as instructing an in-class Introduction to Criminal Justice course to UTC undergraduate students. Bethany has been employed at the legal office of Leitner, Williams, Dooley & Napolitan, PLLC, in Chattanooga for three years, and the experience has provided her with first-hand knowledge in the inner workings of civil law. Bethany will graduate with a Master of Science degree in May of 2020 from UTC. Although she is unsure of the plans that will follow graduation, she looks forward to expanding her knowledge in whatever form that it may take.