

# Criminology, Gender, and Race: A Case Study of Privilege in the Academy

Feminist Criminology  
2016, Vol. 11(4) 311–333  
© The Author(s) 2016  
Reprints and permissions:  
[sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav)  
DOI: 10.1177/1557085116633749  
[fcx.sagepub.com](http://fcx.sagepub.com)  


Meda Chesney-Lind<sup>1</sup> and Nicholas Chagnon<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Criminology has historically exhibited a significant gender bias. Yet, spurred by feminist efforts, criminology has become more gender-inclusive recently. Research has documented this bias, and gains made by women. However, much of this research examines only gender bias, ignoring other important factors such as race. In this article, we examine gender and racial bias in criminology, conceptualizing the discipline as a Bourdieusian field, characterized by hierarchically arranged positions. We find that though women are present in nearly equal numbers to men, non-White people have a more limited presence, and White men dominate in positions endowed with the highest amounts of prestige and power.

## Keywords

history of criminology, intersections of race/class/gender, race, women, women as criminologists

## Introduction

Feminist criminologists have long criticized the masculinist bias in criminology, arguing for the inclusion of women, women's insights, and the study of women in the field. This bias has generally been manifest in two interrelated phenomena—the ways in which criminologists have ignored women's experiences with crime and justice, and the limited presence of female criminologists in the field. Some studies have documented significant gains made by women in gaining access to the field and promoting feminist insights in research agendas (Baro & Eigenberg, 1993; Eigenberg & Baro, 1992; Love & Park, 2013; Sharp & Hefley, 2007). On the contrary, the same

---

<sup>1</sup>University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Nicholas Chagnon, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2424 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA.  
Email: [chagnon@hawaii.edu](mailto:chagnon@hawaii.edu)

research has found that these gains are often quite limited. For example, while women are now regularly included in samples of criminological studies, the analysis of gender in such studies is often superficial at best (Sharp & Hefley, 2007). As much research on the topic is nearing two decades old, this study makes a new attempt to investigate masculinist bias in criminology, as well as add the issue of racism to this discussion. Specifically, we employ an analysis inspired by Bourdieu's (1984) work on the field, to map the gendered and racialized landscape of the criminological academy today.

Of course, criminology is not alone in having legacies of sexism and racism. A plethora of prestigious professional and academic fields have historically exhibited sexism and racism. However, scholars have noted that, today, although there is often a high level of concern about increasing cultural and gender diversity in fields such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), there is often far less interest in seeking to increase this in the social sciences (Jenkins, 2014). Our article begins with a discussion of some key ways that women and non-White criminologists and their contributions have been historically marginalized. We then critically review the contemporary status of female and non-White scholars in the field while considering how the emerging logic of the neoliberal academy, with its emphasis on "performance, efficiency, mobility, competitiveness and evaluation" (Jenkins, 2014, p. 161), functions to suppress culturally diverse scholarship (Ishikawa, 2014). To do so, we conceptualize criminology as a Bourdieusian field, comprised of hierarchically arranged positions, endowed with differential amounts of capital. Our study will examine who occupies several key positions in the field, focusing on the gender and racial makeup of those populations, and we will consider our findings in light of the contemporary neoliberal context that arguably marginalizes diverse viewpoints within the academy.

## Classic Criminological Theory: A Problematic Legacy

A brief survey of American criminology illustrates the analytical bias that has been present in the discipline since its advent. Prior to the mid-1970s, theorizing about crime and delinquency was actually theorizing about *male* crime and delinquency, although the myopic theoretical and research focus on males was largely seen as unproblematic or even easily defensible. As well, considerations of race were bypassed, as class became the main theoretical focus. The study of urban gangs in cities like Chicago, their subcultures, and their structures is a core part of this legacy (Hagedorn & Chesney-Lind, 2014); these gangs were assumed to be male, and their public displays of male aggression and violence perfectly fit a field that focused on public crime and victimization, and the use of official statistics.

The rapid urbanization and industrialization happening in U.S. cities like Chicago at the turn of the century came along with extreme, highly visible inequality. The outrageously affluent lived in opulence alongside the enormously unfortunate trapped in squalor. Early American criminologists saw in such a milieu an opportunity for using positivist criminology to illuminate and explore the dimensions of social problems. In opposition to the nativism of many contemporary political leaders, these criminologists

rejected the idea that race or ethnicity was a prime criminogenic factor. Instead, they documented how patterns of delinquency clustered and persisted in poor neighborhoods, for longer than any individual ethnic group occupied the area (Park, Burgess, McKenzie, & Wirth, 1925). However, such research entailed an exclusive analysis of public male behavior.

*Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas* (Shaw & McKay, 1972) serves as a classic example of this selective analytical vision. The study referred to delinquency rates based only on the measurement of male misbehavior simply as “delinquency rates,” though female rates were parenthetically acknowledged at times. *The Jack-Roller* (Shaw, 1931) and *Brothers in Crime* (Shaw, McKay, McDonald, Hanson, & Shaw, 1938) are other examples of classic studies examining only male deviance. Moreover, in his seminal work on group delinquency, *The Gang*, Thrasher (1927) nearly left out female gangs entirely, save for approximately a handful of pages out of about 300.

The Chicago school did produce some important contributions that remain relevant today, including a focus on subcultures, social disorganization, and the criminogenic consequences of class and inequality. Furthermore, subsequent researchers built upon the idea that juveniles’ sense of masculinity was a key element in delinquent behavior (Cloward & Ohlin, 1966; Cohen, 1955). However, these delinquency theories entailed significant blind spots in relation to the consequences of male violence, including the fact that their victims were often the women around them, not just other men. Moreover, the Chicago School’s lack of interest in gender is noteworthy given it, rather than class, has a dramatic effect on levels of criminality (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Leonard, 1981). Finally, by conflating ethnicity and race, and ignoring the legacy of slavery in American culture, the Chicago school set up criminology to miss what emerged as the major feature of the functioning of the criminal justice system (CJS)—a system that over-policed and over-punished African Americans for minor deportment and drug offenses (Chesney-Lind & Chagnon, 2015)

These same blind spots continually appear in more contemporary delinquency and crime theories, for example, strain theory, differential association, lower class focal concerns, labeling, and Marxist theories of crime. The majority of these theories were formulated departing from men’s experiences, specifically the obstacles and exclusions that ensued in the highly stratified society that is the United States, essentially reducing crime to a class-induced phenomenon. Even a recent review of the contributions of feminist criminology largely dismissed the importance of gender arguing that a focus on opportunities for offending and delinquent peers—all earmarks of traditional criminology—would be more fruitful theoretically (Kruttschnitt, 2013).

This determined focus by traditional criminological theories on class and the complimentary avoidance of gender considerations are actually quite ironic, in multiple ways. First, as Travis Hirschi pointed out, and other studies have reaffirmed, the relationship between class and delinquency does not always hold, though the gender–crime relationship is stronger and more consistent (Hagan, 1988; Hagan, Gillis, & Simpson, 1985). Second, race and racial privilege are integral factors in the definition of the contemporary crime “problem” and certainly the functioning of the criminal justice, with a number arguing that that system resembles “the new Jim Crow” (Alexander, 2010).

To summarize, the legacy of Chicago school delinquency theories, and those that have followed in their tradition is limited in two important ways. First, such theorizing fails to reflectively address the ways in which race and racism have profoundly affected crime and crime control in the United States. Second, such theories often implicitly embraced stereotypical notions of manhood, and, at the same time, eschewed a concern for the experiences of girls and women, especially in regard to formal social controls and gender violence. In addition to these two shortcomings, one might also point out that any consideration of sexual orientation and/or homophobia is absent from this research program. More concisely, the major shortcomings of classic delinquency theorizing can be characterized as normalizing male violence, overlooking the deviance and victimhood of girls, and prioritizing considerations of class over those of racist and/or heteronormative oppression.

### **Feminist Pushback: Making Inroads in the Academy**

Feminist criminologists have pushed back against this problematic legacy, and, subsequently, two theoretical traditions have emerged to reshape criminological thought regarding gender and crime (though they are not always successful). One, often called feminist pathways research, accounts for how victimization (e.g., sexual or parental abuse) often causes women to resort to behaviors construed by officials as criminal (e.g., running away, joining gangs, drug-taking) (Belknap, 2014; Covington & Bloom, 2007). One key insight gained from this perspective is that girls and women's survival strategies lead them into crime—essentially that the state tends to criminalize female responses to abuse (Chesney-Lind, 2015).

At times, called Black feminist criminology, the second theoretical tradition is a criminology springing from critical race feminism (Belknap, 2014; Potter, 2006). Beginning with an acknowledgment of the social construction of race, this perspective focuses on how gender, race, and other vectors of oppression intersect to illuminate and explain the experiences that women who suffer “double and multiple marginality” have with crime and the CJS (Belknap, 2014; Chesney-Lind & Morash, 2011). Furthermore, this perspective has shed light on the fact that the domination of White men in the social sciences has resulted in the exclusion of the epistemic perspectives of non-Whites (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). Race is often seen through a White male lens in the field of criminology.

Having exposed the inappropriateness of simply transposing theories of male crime onto women, these challenges to mainstream masculinist criminology have met with some success. Surely feminist insights have gained some inclusion within criminology since the 1970s (Renzetti, 1993). However, assessing the degree of that success is an empirical question in need of study. One way researchers have sought to answer this question is to examine how women are portrayed in criminology textbooks. The basic rationale behind such studies is that textbooks provide students of crime their earliest, and often formative, education on crime and criminology (Love & Park, 2013). Thus, they are fundamental in the construction of criminological knowledge. Perhaps the first instance of such research, Baro and Eigenberg's (1993) study of introductory texts

found that women were included in only 19% of images in textbooks. And, as criminal justice practitioners, women were underrepresented. Conversely, the majority of images portrayed them in stereotypical roles, for example, as prostitutes. In fact, they found that patterns of misrepresentation were more severe in criminology texts than related fields like sociology. Such findings led Baro and Eigenberg to conclude that introductory texts served as mechanisms for the marginalization of women within the field. In a more recent study, Love and Park (2013) replicated Baro and Eigenberg's now classic study, yielding strikingly similar results. These authors found that women were still largely being portrayed in stereotypical roles—They were underrepresented as criminal justice professionals, and were overrepresented as victims of violence. In fact, Love and Park found a 9% increase in exclusively male textbook images, though they did find that women were 3 times more likely to be portrayed as judges compared with the previous study. Overall, they concluded that little had changed in reference to the way that criminological textbooks work to marginalize women and their experiences. In another recent study, Ptacek (2013) found that among 15 popular criminology textbooks, an average of 13.2 pages were dedicated to feminist insights, and only 20% of these texts paid any attention to multiracial varieties of feminism. Such results firmly indicate that feminist insights are granted only a tertiary position in mainstream criminology textbooks.

Other studies have taken a different approach to investigating how women are conceptualized in criminology by looking at the inclusion of female samples and the analysis of gender in mainstream crime studies (Hannon & Dufour, 1998; Hughes, 2005; Sharp & Hefley, 2007). These studies have generally found that studies including women in samples have increased since the 1970s. But, they have also found that the inclusion of female samples has been somewhat limited, and that the analysis of gender has remained superficial. For example, one study found that as of the late 1990s, criminology had retained a substantial tendency to masculinist “overgeneralization”—holding that male criminality was the norm and assuming that male-focused findings easily translated to women (Hannon & Dufour, 1998). Most recently, Sharp and Hefley (2007) examined several high-profile criminology journals, seeking to illuminate how contemporary criminological studies analyzed gender. More specifically, they looked at how analytically sensitive operationalizations of gender were in each study. The results were no more encouraging than those of the previously mentioned studies. They found that 85% of studies featured no female sample at all, or merely used gender as a control, rather than including gender as a theoretically informed independent variable. Furthermore, the authors found little change over time, concluding that the field had made little progress in integrating feminist criminological insights on gender into mainstream criminological inquiry.

## **Navigating Gender and Race Bias in the Academy and Academic Publishing**

Criminology's historical analytical focus on men may be somewhat distinctive to the discipline. However, the exclusion or marginalization of women within the field is something common among many, if not nearly all, academic disciplines (Jenkins,

2014). Criminology's relationship with race is a bit more complicated, as has been noted. That said, it is clear that African Americans and other minorities are dramatically underrepresented in the faculty ranks. Indeed, their absence as well as the challenges they face have become major social issues on campuses across the nation (see Bonner, et. al, 2014). It is well documented that women and scholars of color face daunting challenges when they seek to get their work published or funded, regardless of field. Yet, for most academics, success in this domain is central to their ability to survive in the academy.

In criminology, specifically, demographic statistics for recently granted PhDs suggest that barriers to entry are less severe for women than non-Whites. A recent survey of newly granted PhDs in 2014 showed that 58.4% of degrees were awarded to women, whereas 21.7% were granted to non-White students (Milan, 2015). These statistics for criminology are similar to those for other related disciplines, though it seems criminology lags behind others in the proportion of degrees granted to women. In psychology, 71.1% of PhDs went to women in 2014, while 19.5% went to non-Whites, whereas in sociology, the figures were 63.4% and 23.1%, respectively. None of these figures, it should be noted though, provide the proportion of degrees going to students who face the double obstacle of being a woman and non-White.

Once they do enter the academy, just how serious are the problems women scholars face? The National Science Foundation (2003) conducted a literature review on the careers of academic scientists and concluded,

Taken as a whole, the body of literature we reviewed provides evidence that women in academic careers are disadvantaged compared with men in similar careers. Women faculty earn less, are promoted less frequently to senior academic ranks, and publish less frequently than their male counterparts.

Important confirmation of bias against women scholars was also reported by Christine Wenneras and Agnes Wold in their article "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer Review" published in *Science*. They reviewed the role played by the highly vaulted "peer review process" in the awarding of postdoctoral fellowships in Sweden where because of a lawsuit, they were able to review actual applications as well as the score sheets. After a careful regression assessment of nine possible variables (including a number of "productivity" variables such as numbers of publications, citations, and journal prestige), they found that only two variables "being male" and "knowing a reviewer" affected getting one of these awards. Looking further at the data, the authors concluded that a woman would need to be "on average 2.5 times as good" on their measures to be rated as highly as a male by reviewers (Wold & Wenneras, 1997, p. 342).

What about race and the academy? Institutions of higher education, particularly some of the nation's oldest and most elite universities, were frequently implicated in and benefited from slavery. As an example, Dartmouth's first president brought eight slaves to campus when he assumed the presidency in 1769 (Wilder, 2013). Although Oberlin College admitted the first African American in 1835 (Waite, 1996), many universities continued to systematically discriminate against ethnic and religious

minorities well into the 20th century until the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made such conduct illegal.

Despite that victory, research continues to suggest that the academy does not afford all the same opportunities. Milkman, Akinola, and Chugh (2014) explored discrimination in early pathways into the academy by using gender and race coded names in fictitious emails seeking mentorship and advice from faculty. They sent 6,548 emails from fictional prospective doctoral students to the same number of faculty. They found that faculty were “significantly more responsive” to emails from fictitious White male students seeking mentoring, than to either female or minority students sending similar inquiries (Milkman et al., 2014). In business, which was the most discriminatory discipline they studied, women and minorities seeking career advice were collectively ignored at 2.2 times the rate of Caucasian males. The pattern was particularly pronounced in higher paying disciplines and in private institutions.

More generally, there is powerful research on the extent of racial bias in hiring by Bertrand and Mullainathan (2003). They sent out fictitious resumes with racially coded first and last names (Emily Walsh, Brendan Baker; Lakisha Washington, Jamal Jones) in response to a wide range of help-wanted ads listed in the *Boston Globe* and the *Chicago Tribune*. The authors sent out roughly 5,000 resumes for positions ranging from sales, customer service, to manager of sales for a large firm. Using the callback rate for interviews as a measure of success, the authors found that resumes with White sounding names were 50% more likely to be called for an interview. Although this study did not specifically focus on positions in higher education, but the implications for higher education are clearly there.

Added to these challenges, for those academics who are committed to doing critical and/or feminist research, there is the further penalty for doing this sort of research. Prolific criminologist Lee Bowker made his name in a number of areas in traditional criminology, like penology and corrections. But when he began doing work on wife abuse, he suddenly noticed problems with the peer review process that had never dogged him previously (Bowker, Arbitell & McFerron 1988). He noted that when he submitted nonfeminist articles and book manuscripts, his acceptance rate was 85%. However, when he submitted what he labeled “feminist” publications, his acceptance rate fell to 54% (see Table 1).

In reviews of his feminist work, he further noted that he was assumed to be female, and his work was generally rejected for poor methodology. He quipped, “From my experience with gatekeeper journals, I think I have found the answer to the question, ‘What is the correct methodology for carrying out feminist research?’ It is ‘Whatever methodology you didn’t use’” (Bowker et al., 1988, p. 171). He even caught one editor shopping for a critical review through a slip-up in the editor’s communication with him.

Research focusing on criminology has also been conducted on gender bias in publishing specifically. Complimenting their study on images of women in textbooks, Eigenberg and Baro (1992) conducted one of the first content analyses to assess women’s inclusion in criminological publishing. Although they found gains made by women since the 1970s, the authors concluded that compared with their membership



**Table 1.** Publication Experience of Lee Bowker.

	Total publications	Feminist publications	Nonfeminist publications
Published articles	69	22	47
Rejections	27	19	8
Total submissions	96	41	55
Acceptance rate (%)	72	54	85

Source. Compiled from Bowker et al., (1988, p. 171).

in professional organizations, women were underrepresented in peer-reviewed journals. A more recent study found that over a 100-year period (1895-1995), male authors outnumbered female ones four-to-one (Hughes, 2005). Similarly, a more recent study, adding race to the conversation, found that men (more specifically White men) dominated the most visible publishing positions; in a review of 20 years' worth of data, White men made up 77.1% of those ranked as top-cited criminologists, compared with White women (12.4%), non-White men (1.3%), and non-White women (0.7%) (Kim & Hawkins, 2013). Relatedly, research indicates that men disproportionately occupy editorial positions within criminological publishing (Eigenberg & Baro, 1992). Indeed, the same authors found a correlation between the gender of journal editors and the gender most likely to be published in those journals (Eigenberg & Baro, 1992). Although there is no overabundance of it, the research examining bias in publishing firmly supports the idea that men (mostly White ones) dominate criminological publishing.

As we progress through the 21st century, any inquiry into the status of the academy must consider the influence of neoliberalism. Principally considered an economic philosophy, neoliberalism has expanded its reach to become a powerful influence on even those social sectors thought to be semiautonomous, or completely autonomous, from the economy, such as the higher education system (Brown, 2006; Harvey, 2007). Of paramount concern for those promoting diversity within academia is the dialectic between neoliberalism and White masculinist epistemic domination (Jenkins, 2014). Because neoliberalism is a logic springing from capitalistic economism, means-ends rationality and quantified calculability are at the heart of neoliberal "efficiency enhancement" and "excellence promotion" in the academy (Ishikawa, 2014; Jenkins, 2014). Essentially, this means that under neoliberalism, research that presents itself as scientific and appeals to the broadest and most powerful audience possible (e.g., policy makers and business leaders) tends to be most valued. Within criminology, this often translates to an overemphasis on the value of positivistic research and/or that which is of direct use to criminal justice practitioners. Such a restricted valuation of research contributions can have the effect of devaluing various feminist perspectives seen as occupying a qualitative niche, or those that are of little direct use to actors involved in state-based crime control. This is also true for the work of non-White scholars, which often is founded on alternative epistemologies, similar to or overlapping with those used by feminists (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). Furthermore, the marginalization of such research buffers mainstream modes of inquiry (most often White



masculinist ones) from critical epistemic challenges (often multicultural and/or feminist ones), not only limiting intellectual diversity but also reducing the likelihood of enhancing validity through falsification (Jenkins, 2014).

However, some recent research has indicated a significant increase in interest in feminist criminology, particularly at inclusive intellectual settings like national meetings. In an analysis of submissions to the 2009 annual American Society of Criminology (ASC) meeting, Chesney-Lind (2012) found that of the topics receiving the highest number of presentation submissions, two of the top four related to crime and gender. The category "Gender, Crime, and Justice: Gender and Offending:" received 52 submissions, the highest of any category. Furthermore, although two topics not dedicated to gender were tied for second most submissions, "Gender, Crime, and Justice: Physical Violence Against Women" was the third most popular topic, receiving 38 submissions. In comparisons, other topics such as "Theory and Research on Violence and Crime: Causes of Violence" and "Organized, Organizational, and White-Collar Crime: White-Collar Crime" received only 12 and 15 submissions, respectively. Simply put, research focusing on gender was among the most commonly submitted to the 2009 ASC conference.

The body of research examining masculinist bias within and the exclusion of women from criminology is substantial, though there is less research dealing directly with how bias affects non-Whites, and particularly non-White women. These studies have returned consistent results, producing important conclusions. There is ample evidence to suggest that women are conceptualized in simplistic and/or stereotypical ways by mainstream criminology. This is a product of the way criminological knowledge is produced and communicated through textbooks and empirical studies. In addition, women are underrepresented in the criminological publishing process, both as authors and editorial staff. Moreover, in today's neoliberal academy, feminist work seems to meet more resistance than mainstream research agendas, though its popularity and significance within the field continue to grow despite these obstacles. However, this body of research is imperfect and incomplete. Much of the research on this topic and/or the data used are somewhat dated, nearing two or three decades old. Also, most of these studies used only one type of data source (e.g., textbooks, journal articles). Finally, much of the research reviewed here focuses only on gender, while failing to acknowledge matters of class and race. More work is needed to update some of these findings and provide a more holistic analysis. Thus, this study furthers this agenda by using multiple forms of contemporary data to analyze a hierarchal range of spaces within criminology, accounting for not only gender but race and ethnicity as well, while considering the neoliberal context in which the criminological field is now embedded.

## Method

This study has two research objectives. First, we wanted to know what the gender and racial/ethnic makeup was for the field of American criminology in general. Second, we wanted to know how that general makeup compared to that of those occupying

several positions of prestige within the field, for example, authors published in prominent journals. To answer these questions, we used an analytical approach loosely inspired by Pierre Bourdieu's (1984, 1986) concepts of the field and capital. Bourdieu theorized various social spheres as hierarchically arranged "fields," comprised of diverse positions, which are endowed with multiple currencies of power, or what he called capital. Prestigious and privileged positions within the field are endowed with greater capital, and vice versa for marginalized positions. Thus, we conceptualize criminology as such a field. For example, being a first-year graduate student is to occupy a position of relatively low standing, and thus little capital, while being a tenured professor who has won major awards is to occupy a position with far more prestige and capital. To investigate the demographic composition of these positions, we used three data types—membership lists from the ASC, authorship data from three top-tier criminological journals, and lists of award winners and officeholders from the ASC.

We first did an analysis of members of the ASC, coding them for gender and/or race/ethnicity when possible. We took a random sample of 400 ASC members, generated by using a random number table. Once individuals were identified for the sample, we used Internet searches to research each person, looking for markers indicating his or her gender and/or race/ethnicity. To code for gender, we used three possible markers—first names, images, and pronouns used in biographical notes and/or news items about that person. This method was partially derived from Eigenberg and Baro's (1992) study, which relied on first names to code for gender. In the case that an individual's first name was unfamiliar to us, and no other markers were available, we used gender-checking software to ascertain that individual's gender. However, this method was still imperfect, resulting in four cases that were not coded for gender.

Coding for race/ethnicity was more difficult and, therefore, less certain. We generally relied on photos and first or last names. However, not every member of the ASC has a photo available publicly online, and even when photos are available, it is not always possible to ascertain an individual's racial/ethnic identity. Furthermore, it seems Google's search algorithm is easily confused by East Asian and African names.<sup>1</sup> This possibly prevented us from finding some ASC members who may have online photographs, but were missed by this apparently Eurocentric search algorithm. Because of this, 128 cases were not coded for race/ethnicity. Essentially, our method to code for race was imperfect, but was the strongest approach possible for coding the available data.

We used the same approach to code data on top-tier journal authors, award winners, and presidential officeholders in the ASC. However, these individuals had far more visible online presences. Thus, coding for these data was easier and more certain. However, we were still unable to code one case for race/ethnicity. In all, we coded for 232 journal authors, 301 award winners, and 16 presidential officeholders.

## Findings

As stated earlier, our first research objective was to examine the gender and racial/ethnic composition of the U.S. criminological field. Our analysis revealed that the

**Table 2.** ASC Membership by Gender and Race/Ethnicity.

Race	Male (%)	Female (%)
White	93 (67.4)	103 (79.2)
Black	11 (7.8)	8 (6.2)
Hispanic/Latino	16 (11.6)	8 (6.2)
East Asian	15 (10.9)	9 (6.9)
Other	3 (2.2)	2 (1.5)

Note. ASC = American Society of Criminology.

gender split among this sample was relatively even, with 208 male members (52%) and 188 female members (47%). Thus, it seems in terms of general inclusiveness, the field of criminology today is somewhat even. However, our analysis of race produced starkly different results. Table 2 provides the frequencies from our analysis of race.<sup>2</sup>

Table 2 indicates that Whites dominate the ASC membership. Among male members, Whites make up 67.4% of the membership. Among females, Whites make up 79.2% of members. Only 32.5% of male members are non-White, whereas only 20.8% of female members are non-White. The numbers of members from each sex are significantly below their proportion of the overall U.S. population for Blacks and Latinos, though East Asians seem to be overrepresented among men (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). For example, Black Americans make up 13.2% of the U.S. population, but in this sample, Blacks only account for 7.8% of men, 6.2% of women, and 7.1% of total sample. However, it is important to note that for 33.7% of male members and 30.2% of female members, coding for race/ethnicity was not possible. If one were to hypothesize that this group of individuals for whom race was not possible to identify is made up of mostly non-White individuals, it is possible that numbers of non-Whites may be proportionate, or even disproportionately high. Yet, even considering the ethnic bias we perceived in our search engine, we find that an unlikely proposition. It is likely that this group is largely comprised of graduate students and adjunct faculty, who have less visible online presences than tenure-track faculty, and other established members of the field. These are disproportionately White groups—Whites received 72.8% of master's degrees and 74.3% of doctor's-level<sup>3</sup> degrees in the United States from 2009 to 2010 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). Moreover, the previously reviewed statistics on recently granted criminology PhDs support this contention. There is little reason to think that criminology differs profoundly from other disciplines in this regard, especially considering the research we have reviewed and the additional findings that we will discuss as we proceed.

It should also be noted here how these results closely track those of a survey done by James Ptacek (2013) for a panel at the ASC annual meeting. Ptacek found a gender distribution of 51% men versus 49% women among members of the ASC. Furthermore, he found that members reporting their race/ethnicity were 86% White, 6% Black, 5% Hispanic/Latino, 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 2% "Other." Interestingly as well, when comparing the ASC with the American Sociological Association (ASA),

**Table 3.** Gender by Journal, All Authors.

Journal	Male (%)	Female (%)
<i>Criminology</i> (n = 73)	46 (63.0)	27 (37.0)
<i>Justice Quarterly</i> (n = 111)	67 (60.1)	44 (39.6)
<i>Theoretical Criminology</i> (n = 46)	24 (52.2)	22 (47.8)

Ptacek found that the ASA had a higher proportion of women (53%) and a much lower proportion of Whites (64%). Aside from the comparative aspect, it seems our study closely replicated the findings from this previous survey, reaffirming the validity of our methodology.

Data from ASC membership lists are useful for a general survey of the criminological field. However, not all members of the field possess equal amounts of the various forms of criminological capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Publishing in top-tier journals gives an individual significant visibility and prestige in the field and, thus, increases capital. With this in mind, we did a content analysis of authors in three top-tier criminological journals from 2013 to investigate the gender and racial makeup in this elevated position. The results of this analysis indicated that the gender parity present in ASC membership is not replicated among authors in top-tier journals. Among the 232 authors in the sample, 135 (58.2%) were male, whereas 95 (40.9%) were female. Thus, it seemed to us that gender inclusiveness was significantly lower in this place of higher prestige. Following this logic, we hypothesized that gender inequity in publishing would be even greater among first authors, as being first author is more prestigious than being a subsequently listed author. When we narrowed our analysis to first authors only, we found slightly greater gender bias. Among the 98 first authors in our sample, 59 (60.2%) were male, whereas 38 (38.8%) were female.

Although these data suggest bias in top-tier journals aggregately, we acknowledge that journals differ significantly in their editorial policies and practices. For example, Eigenberg and Baro (1992) found that male dominance in publishing was not equal across all journals they sampled. Thus, we found it useful to disaggregate the data and examine each journal individually. Table 3 provides the data broken down by journal for all authors, and Table 4 provides data broken down by journal for first authors.

Indeed, these data show gender bias varies significantly across these three journals. It seems that the bias is most severe in *Criminology*—63% of authors and 71.4% of first authors from 2013 were male. On the contrary, *Theoretical Criminology* had the lowest proportion of overall male authors (52.2%), whereas for first authors, *Justice Quarterly* had the lowest proportion of male authors (54.8%). Still, across the board—for all three journals—men were published more frequently than women.

When presenting this research, a colleague posited that the results of our data might be representative not of gender bias, but instead of positivistic bias among journals (G. Barak, personal communication, November, 2014). To explore this possibility, we examined the analytical orientation of each article in each journal. Overall, out of 94 articles, 62 (64.6%) were quantitative, 30 (31.3%) were qualitative or theoretical, and

**Table 4.** Gender by Journal, First Authors.

Journal	Male (%)	Female (%)
<i>Criminology</i> (n = 28)	20 (71.4)	8 (28.6)
<i>Justice Quarterly</i> (n = 42)	23 (54.8)	19 (45.2)
<i>Theoretical Criminology</i> (n = 27)	16 (59.3)	11 (40.7)

**Table 5.** Article Orientation by Journal.

Journal	Quantitative (%)	Qualitative (%)	Mixed (%)
<i>Criminology</i>	25 (89.3)	3 (10.7)	0 (0.0)
<i>Justice Quarterly</i>	34 (82.9)	5 (12.2)	2 (4.9)
<i>Theoretical Criminology</i>	3 (11.1)	22 (88.9)	0 (0.0)

two (2.1%) used mixed data. Thus, the aggregate data support such a hypothesis. However, the data show a different pattern when disaggregated. Table 5 provides data on article orientations broken down by journal.

*Criminology* and *Justice Quarterly* both seem to be heavily weighted toward positivistic research. More than 89% of articles in *Criminology* from 2013 were quantitative, whereas 82.9% of articles in *Justice Quarterly* were as well. On the contrary, *Theoretical Criminology* was almost equally weighted toward qualitative research; 88.9% of articles in this journal were qualitative or theoretical. As all three journals exhibited a significant bias in the gender distribution among their authors, these data suggest to us that such bias is not merely a product of positivistic bias. However, it is important to note that *Theoretical Criminology* demonstrated both the least positivistic and the least gender bias. Based on this, one might conclude that, though it is not the sole cause, positivistic bias does play some part in the gender disparity shown in our data. In fact, positivistic bias is likely intertwined with rote sexism. Many feminist scholars have argued that positivism is a masculinist mode of inquiry, a perspective that is a product of and supportive of male domination (Howe, 2000; MacKinnon, 1991; Reinharz, 1992; Sprague, 2005). Thus, we would argue that positivistic bias, while not the same as material gender discrimination, is indicative of a more general, if abstract, sexism within criminology, which our data illuminate.

One might also consider the positivistic bias in these journals in relation to academic neoliberalism. The two journals exhibiting the greatest positivistic bias analyzed here, *Criminology* and *Justice Quarterly*, are also the highest ranked journals among the three. Currently, Google Scholar Metrics ranks *Criminology* as the most influential academic journal dedicated to Criminology, Criminal Law, and Policing ("Top Publications—Criminology, Law & Policing," 2015). *Justice Quarterly* is ranked number 6, whereas *Theoretical Criminology* is ranked number 19. Indeed, impact factor figures indicate that *Criminology* (3.089) and *Justice Quarterly* (2.889) are more highly cited than *Theoretical Criminology* (1.4). Of course, this is nowhere

**Table 6.** Non-White<sup>a</sup> Authors by Gender.

	Male	Female
Non-White authors (%)	15 (10.9)	12 (12.9)
Non-White first authors (%)	9 (15.3)	4 (10.5)

<sup>a</sup>Numbers of authors from individual non-White gender/racial groups were so small that it was of limited use to disaggregate them in this analysis.

**Table 7.** Non-White Authors by Journal.

Journal	Non-White authors
<i>Criminology</i> (%)	9 (12.3)
<i>Justice Quarterly</i> (%)	7 (6.3)
<i>Theoretical Criminology</i> (%)	11 (23.4)

near a definitive sample, but it does indicate that, among the data sampled here, those criminological journals exhibiting positivistic leanings are ranked higher and cited more often. This supports the argument that the current neoliberal academic regime promotes the valuation of more scientific forms of research over others. Furthermore, it evidences a mutually supportive affinity between neoliberalism and the dominance of masculinist modes of inquiry. Given the growing influence of academic neoliberalism, such an obstacle to the publication of women and women's insights is clear.

We also coded journal authors in regard to race/ethnicity. This examination yielded similar results to our queries in relation to the gender of authors. Overall, 27 authors (11.6%) were non-White. Thus, non-White criminologists seem to make up an even smaller proportion among top-tier journal authors than they do among ASC members. Furthermore, we examined the proportion of non-White authors by gender. Table 6 presents these frequencies. These results generally differed little from the overall pattern. Generally, non-White authors made up about 10% to 12% of all authors. On the contrary, male non-White first authors comprised 15.3% of all male first authors. Yet, such variation should not be overemphasized. The number of male first authors (59) is small enough that small numerical variations create rather significant proportional variations.

Finally, we examined the amount of non-White authors by journal. Table 7 provides the results from this analysis. It seems that non-White authors are a far more common presence in *Theoretical Criminology*, making up 23.4% of all *Theoretical Criminology* authors in 2013, compared with non-White authors in *Criminology* (12.3%) and *Justice Quarterly* (6.3%). Thus, it seems in regard to race, as it was in relation to gender, *Theoretical Criminology* is less biased toward the dominant group than its more quantitative counterparts. Such bias is less likely a product of individual discrimination as it is the aggregation of institutional racism within the academy. However, here again, the implications of neoliberal epistemic valuation should be noted. Considering the fact that non-White scholars' contributions, particularly feminist ones, often arise

**Table 8.** Percentage of Male, White, and White Male for ASC Research Awards.

Award (n)	Percent Male	Percent White	Percent White male
ASC Fellows (156)	81.4	89.7	73.7
Hindelang Award (33)	84.8	93.9	73.5
Sutherland Award (53)	90.5	96.2	88.7
Outstanding Article Award <sup>a</sup> (8)	87.5	62.5	62.5

Note. ASC = American Society of Criminology.

<sup>a</sup>First authors only.

from alternative epistemologies, it seems only logical that positivistic bias poses an obstacle to insights from people of color as it does to feminist insights, especially because these are often mutually inclusive categories.

Being an author in a top-tier journal is among the most prestigious spaces a criminologist can occupy. However, there are clearly even more prestigious spaces. Serving as an executive officer for the ASC and receiving major awards from that organization are among the most prestigious spaces one might occupy. Thus, the final stage in our hierarchical analysis was to examine who occupies these spaces.

First, we examined ASC presidents since 1980.<sup>4</sup> The last three people named to be president of ASC have been women, and the latest is a woman of color. However, there have been 37 ASC presidents in this time frame. Of these 37, 29 (78.4%) have been men (all of these were White men), whereas only eight (21.6%) have been women (all but one White women). In addition, since the year 2000, there have been four female ASC presidents (25%),<sup>5</sup> suggesting only very slight improvement in this respect.

Although being ASC President surely brings with it much social capital, it is also quite labor-intensive, particularly for faculty from less well-funded institutions. However, receiving major awards is nearly, if not equally, as prestigious without requiring voluminous amounts of free labor. Thus, one could argue that winning awards is also more desirable than being ASC President. The history of awards given by the ASC exhibits an even more unequal gender and racial distribution than the record of those named ASC president. Table 8 provides the percentages of male, White,<sup>6</sup> and White male recipients of four of the most prestigious awards given by the ASC.

Clearly, men and Whites dominate the field in terms of prestigious ASC research awards. More than 80% of ASC fellows are male, nearly 90% are White, and about three quarters have been White men. The Hindelang Award, given for publishing an outstanding book in criminology, has been given to men 84.8% of the time, to Whites 93.9% of the time, and to White men 73.5% of the time. The Sutherland Award, given for general contributions to research on the causes of crime, has been given to males 90.5% of times it was awarded, while 96.2% of recipients have been White and 88.7% were White men. Finally, of the 8 times the Outstanding Article Award was given, every first author was a male, while six recipients were White men. These awards comprise some of the most prestigious research honors awarded within the field of criminology, and it seems such honors are nearly always awarded to White men. On



**Table 9.** Percentage of Male, White, and White male for ASC Nonresearch Awards.

Award ( <i>n</i> )	Percent Male	Percent White	Percent White male
Herbert Bloch Award (41)	61.0	92.7	58.5
Teaching Award (4)	50.0	100.0	50.0
Mentor Award (9)	66.6	100.0	55.5

Note. ASC = American Society of Criminology.

the contrary, the ASC gives out awards for activities other than research and publishing, such as service and teaching. Table 9 provides the percentage of male, White, and White male award winners for some of these nonresearch awards.

These figures show less male and White male domination in nonresearch awards, though equal or greater domination of Whites in general. The Herbert Bloch Award for outstanding professional service has been granted to males 61.0% of the times it was awarded, and six out of the last seven award winners were female. However, one might also note that the number of years that no award was given is only three fewer than the number of times it was given to women. Moreover, 92.7% of award winners were White, 58.5% were White males. The Teaching Award has been given to women twice out of the 4 times it has been given, though all award winners have been White. Finally, two thirds of the Mentor Award winners were men, and all but one were White.

The numbers regarding the nonresearch awards are more encouraging, at least in regard to gender, showing that a substantial number of women are winning major awards within the field of criminology, especially recently. However, they also suggest a disparity in the types of awards women are most often receiving—essentially women are less often receiving major awards for research. It is important to consider this in relation to the forms of labor from which criminologists (and academics in general) gain most prestige. Although universities have begun to more highly value diverse accomplishments, innovative and influential research is still considered the gold standard by which criminologists are measured. The most lucrative criminology positions are research heavy, while the least lucrative (and generally least pleasant) positions, such as adjunct faculty appointments, are focused almost solely on teaching. Moreover, teaching, service, and mentoring often involve a great deal of unpaid labor, and unpaid labor is often feminized labor. Given this, one might conclude that while women are being recognized by receiving major awards within criminology, they tend to be granted awards for performing gendered forms of less prestigious labor. Thus, even when women are granted major awards, they tend to be in a form that bestows upon them less criminological capital. At the same time, non-Whites seem to be shut out of the awards nearly completely.

## Discussion

This research has revealed several ways in which gender and race function to affect one's "place" within the field of criminology. Clearly, women have made, and continue to make, significant inroads in gaining inclusion and a degree of status within the

field of criminology. ASC membership roles suggest women make up a proportion of criminologists nearly equal to that of men. In addition, though publishing figures in top-tier journals do not indicate the same level of parity, female authors are a significant presence in this publishing sector. Also, in regard to professional position, awards, and honors, a substantial number are going to female criminologists, and it seems this trend is intensifying (particularly in terms of elective office). Essentially, it might be unfair to characterize criminology simply as a “males only” club today.

However, such characterization still holds more than a mere kernel of truth. If we imagine criminology as a field à la Pierre Bourdieu (1986), women do occupy significant positions within that field, but the great majority of the most powerful positions are still held by White men. White men still make up a significant majority of authors in top-tier journals, especially first authors. And, they are still the more likely recipients of professional honors and awards, particularly in regard to research awards.

Moreover, one could make a persuasive argument that these disparities are structured according to the dominance of White masculinist epistemology and male labor privilege. Our findings indicate publishing biases are partially a product of the hegemony of a masculinist epistemology—positivism, which is the historically dominant paradigm among the social sciences. Also, a gendered division of academic labor, which mirrors classical patriarchal familial relations, structures how and which awards women win. Women are more likely to engage in undervalued academic labor, bringing them less power and prestige (Potter, Higgins, & Gabbidon, 2011). Accordingly, women are most often awarded honors corresponding to their disproportionate involvement in such second-class labor.<sup>7</sup>

Although criminology has made strides in terms of gender inclusion, the same cannot be said in terms of the racial/ethnic makeup of the field. Although our data are partial, they strongly suggest that Whites occupy not only the top positions within this hierarchically arranged field, such as those of influential authors and award winners, but also nearly all positions. On the contrary, people of color are almost a nonpresence in criminology, with a few key exceptions. Essentially, though White women are making inroads, the spaces of power and privilege within the field of criminology are clearly preoccupied almost exclusively by White men. It would be myopic to ignore the influence non-Whites have had within the field. For example, recent work by African American scholars such as Michelle Alexander (2010) have had an enormous impact within the field and publicly. Yet, it would be intellectually dishonest to overlook how limited the presence of non-White criminologists remains today.

Finally, the ways in which these findings speak to the influence of neoliberalism should be noted. One cannot help but notice that the basic demographic contours we have identified here correlate with the broader social stratification that characterizes the current neoliberal age. Under neoliberalism, U.S. society features a degree of ostensible diversity as many legalized forms of discrimination have been dismantled and outright prejudice is stigmatized (Entman & Rojecki, 2001; Harvey, 2007). Significant numbers of women and non-Whites occupy positions of power, prestige, and fame. However, various forms of indirect discrimination persist, such as the gendered wage gap and racialized mass incarceration. As a consequence, poverty and disenfranchisement disproportionately plague women and non-Whites. And, of course,

they most intensely affect non-White women. Criminology today seems to reproduce such conditions in that female, and to a lesser degree, non-White scholars are a noticeable presence, but continue to be denied proportionate amounts of power, prestige, and compensation. Essentially White males still control the centers of power and prestige, while the tokenistic presence of othered groups maintains a veneer of meritocratic diversity.

As well, though the hegemony of positivism within criminology is not a novel phenomenon, it must be considered in relation to academic neoliberalism. Anyone familiar with the history of the social sciences would identify the dominance of positivism as a historically persistent phenomenon, rather than an emergent one. Yet, it should be noted that such dominance is highly resonant with the academic neoliberal logics that promote scientific research over forms of research producing influence that is less ostensibly quantifiable. Put simply, positivistic bias predates the neoliberal turn, but it is only logical to assume that it is exacerbated by broader cultural saturation characterized by the valuation of quantification, calculability, and means–ends rationality. Thus, academic neoliberalism and the dominance of positivism are interrelated, and mutually strengthening phenomena, which constitute a significant, and growing obstacle to the ascendance of feminist research, and, as well, culturally diverse research (Ishikawa, 2014; Jenkins, 2014). Indeed, this likely works through various mechanisms. Neoliberalism does not only contribute to positivistic bias in journals' editorial selection but also promotes the valuation of elements such as impact factors and journal rankings when evaluating individual scholars' bodies of work. Given that the most highly ranked criminology journals exhibit a White masculinist-positivist bias, neoliberalism will not only hinder feminist and culturally diverse scholars from publishing in these venues but also jeopardize their general advancement within the field.

## **Conclusion**

Ultimately, this study provides both good news and bad. The good news is that women criminologists are a very substantial presence within the field, surely wielding influence that cannot be ignored. The bad news is that the field, while inclusive, is far from egalitarian. Today, historic sexism and racism couple with the more insidious influence of neoliberalism to perpetuate academic stratification. Although women might be present in equal numbers, White men generally hold firm control over the most prestigious spaces within the field, and non-Whites are largely excluded. Although these data firmly support these points, we must note some limitations of the study.

First, the partial nature of our coding through Internet searches needs to be noted. Internet searches are far from a comprehensive way to research individuals' identities. Not everyone, even among academics, has a visible online presence. Those who do not are inevitably excluded from Internet research. Furthermore, even for those who do have an Internet presence, ostensible markers (e.g., photographs, names, pronouns) are incomplete and can be misleading. Thus, there is an unavoidable degree of error built into our methodology. Yet, these are the data that exist, and we must work with them. The concurrence between our findings and previous studies suggests that any error in our sampling does not reach the degree that it threatens validity (Ptacek, 2013).

Furthermore, our research objective was not to simply count criminologists and their respective genders and races. Instead we aimed to investigate a hierarchal field, and particular positions of power within it. Those areas of power are among the most visible. Thus, although our data are partial in many ways, they are strongest in regard to examining spaces of power. However, moving forward, research using self-report surveys based on more representative data might be used to confirm the tentative findings that we present here.

Second, our data on publishing is somewhat limited. As we used several data types to achieve our research objectives, we were forced to limit the scope of these particular data types in some respects. Still, using cross-sectional data on publishing is not totally reliable. Further research using a larger, longitudinal sample of publishing data could refute or confirm the conclusions our data have generated. This is particularly true in regard to investigating the neoliberal character of criminological publishing today. Further study might conduct a systematic survey of top-tier journals, examining the types of research most commonly published in these volumes, both in regard to the positivistic and feminist characteristics of such studies.<sup>8</sup> Such inquiry could produce more substantial conclusions regarding the influence of neoliberalism on criminology, the dominance of positivism, and the interrelations among the two.

Third, though we do not use any sophisticated statistical analyses, one must note that this study is fundamentally quantitative, as much of what we have done here consists of basically counting. Given this, we must acknowledge that mere numerical inclusion of women and non-Whites within the academy does not necessarily mean better representation of these groups' intellectual perspectives. In fact, tokenistic diversity logically works to strengthen hegemonic domination by concealing it. Future research that scrutinizes the intellectual character and epistemic diversity of contemporary criminological knowledge would add a valuable complement to this research.

Finally, our study only begins to include race into the conversation about academic bias within criminology. There is a wealth of scholarly literature on racism in the justice system and the ways that racism contributes to criminalized social problems. There is, however, very little research on the obstacles that people of color face within our field. More work is surely needed. Furthermore, as feminist criminologists, we are keenly sensitive to the necessity of intersectional analyses. The limitations of our data precluded a more comprehensive intersectional analysis that explored variations among non-White groups by gender. Future studies could surely make important additional contributions by doing so.

Ultimately, our study was a broad survey of the field, and our conclusions must be taken as general and tentative. However, the patterns we identified, especially in regard to race, were so stark that any error margins are unlikely to change the overall contours of our findings—Although the degree of disparities may or may not be as severe as our numbers suggest, they surely do exist. Thus, we can firmly assert our general conclusion that White men still largely dominate the field of criminology. Furthermore, no data are needed to also conclude that these White men, and the White women who increasingly comprise significant parts of the field, are generally economically privileged. One need only look at the lavish environments in which annual

meetings of the ASC are held, not to mention noting the ever-increasing cost of elite higher education, to make such an observation. Capital in our field is allocated along lines of gender, race, and economic privilege. And, considering the current neoliberal regime, there is little reason to think this will change any time soon.

We find this problematic based on our general rejection of any privilege-based inequalities. However, it is also troubling in regard to the larger intellectual project of criminology. As we have argued in preceding sections of this article, by ignoring issues of gender and race, early American criminology was crucially flawed as it was untethered from the totality of experiences lived by the people in those communities being scrutinized. Following the same logic, we might also acknowledge that a contemporary American criminology is equally untethered from those experiences if it does not include within the field those that are most affected by crime and the CJS. The academy may look less like a boys' club today, but if it retains a glass ceiling and only admits Whites, our ability to study and ameliorate the effects of crime and punitive control will remain severely limited.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Notes**

1. Searching for some East Asian and African names generated seemingly illogical responses. For example, sometimes the search return entries were objects instead of people.
2. Figures presented in Table 2 are for those cases for whom coding both race and gender was possible.
3. This statistic includes not only PhD degrees but also EdH, MD, and DDS degrees.
4. We chose this date because it was significantly after the era of second-wave feminism that spurred greater inclusion of women within criminology. Thus, gains made by women should be reflected within this time period.
5. Our analysis included the person named American Society of Criminology (ASC) President for 2015 as well.
6. Here too there were so few non-White individuals within this group that it was not useful to break down the data into various non-White groups.
7. It should be noted that we do not seek here to be dismissive of the value of teaching and service labor. Instead, we believe it would be optimal for these forms of labor to be fairly valued, while, women and non-Whites occupy research-heavy positions.
8. We do not contend that positivist and feminist criminologies are mutually exclusive. Feminist methodologists have long acknowledged that positivistic research has a place within the larger corpus of feminist research (Reinharz, 1992; Sprague, 2005). It is only when positivism becomes a monolithic form of inquiry that drowns out others that it becomes an obstacle to feminism.

## References

- Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness* (1st ed.). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Baro, A., & Eigenberg, H. (1993). Images of gender: A content analysis of photographs in introductory criminology and criminal justice textbooks. *Women & Criminal Justice, 5*(1), 3-36. doi:10.1300/J012v05n01\_02
- Belknap, J. (2014). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice* (4th ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2003, July). *Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination* (Working Paper No. 9873). National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w9873>
- Bonner, Fred A., F. A., marbley, aretha f., Tuitt, F., Robinson, P. A., Banda, R. M., & Hughes, R. L. (Eds.). (2014). *Black Faculty in the Academy: Narratives for Negotiating Identity and Achieving Career Success* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Bowker, L., Arbitell, M., & McFerron, J. R. (1988). On the relationship between wife beating and child abuse. In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 158-174). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Brown, W. M. (2006). American nightmare neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-democratization. *Political Theory, 34*, 690-714. doi:10.1177/0090591706293016
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of race, class, gender, and crime future directions for feminist criminology. *Feminist Criminology, 1*, 27-47. doi:10.1177/1557085105282899
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2012). Campus crime beat: The challenges of doing feminist criminology in the academy. *Women & Criminal Justice, 22*, 54-67. doi:10.1080/08974454.2012.636290
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2015). Gendered pathways into delinquency. In F. T. Cullen, P. Wilcox, J. Lux, & C. L. Johnson (Eds.), *Sisters in crime revisited: Bringing gender into criminology* (pp. 83-102). London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Chagnon, N. (2015). Gender, delinquency, and youth justice: Issues for a global century. In M. Krohn & J. Lane (Eds.), *The handbook of juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice* (pp. 103-120) (1st ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Morash, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Feminist theories of crime*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (1966). *Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Covington, S. S., & Bloom, B. E. (2007). Gender responsive treatment and services in correctional settings. *Women & Therapy, 29*(3-4), 9-33.
- Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly, 5*, 497-538. doi:10.1080/07418828800089871
- Eigenberg, H., & Baro, A. (1992). Women and the publication process: A content analysis of criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 3*, 293-314. doi:10.1080/10511259200082681

- Entman, R. M., & Rojecki, A. (2001). *The black image in the white mind: Media and race in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hagan, J. (1988). *Structural criminology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hagan, J., Gillis, A. R., & Simpson, J. (1985). The class structure of gender and delinquency: Toward a power-control theory of common delinquent behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 1151-1178.
- Hagedorn, J., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2014). America's war on gangs: Response to a real threat or a moral panic. In S. Mallicoat & C. Gardner (Eds.), *Criminal justice policy* (pp. 175-189). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Hannon, L., & Dufour, L. R. (1998). Still just the study of men and crime? A content analysis. *Sex Roles*, 38, 63-71. doi:10.1023/A:1018712511855
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Howe, A. (2000). Postmodern criminology and its feminist discontents. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 33, 221-236. doi:10.1177/000486580003300208
- Hughes, L. A. (2005). The representation of females in criminological research. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 16(1-2), 1-28. doi:10.1300/J012v16n01\_01
- Ishikawa, M. (2014). Ranking regime and the future of vernacular scholarship. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22, Article 30. doi:10.14507/epaa.v22n30.2014
- Jenkins, F. (2014). Epistemic credibility and women in philosophy. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 29, 161-170. doi:10.1080/08164649.2014.928190
- 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.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (2013). Gender and crime. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 291-308. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145605
- Leonard, E. B. (1981). *Women, crime and society: A critique of theoretical criminology*. New York, NY: Longman Group United Kingdom.
- Love, S. R., & Park, S. m. (2013). Images of gender twenty years later: A content analysis of images in introductory criminal justice and criminology textbooks. *Feminist Criminology*, 8, 320-340. doi:10.1177/1557085113492993
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1991). *Toward a feminist theory of the state* (Reprint ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Milan, L. (2015). *Survey of earned doctorates*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctorates/#tabs-1>
- Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M., & Chugh, D. (2014). What happens before? A field experiment exploring how pay and representation differentially shape bias on the pathway into organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Retrieved from <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2063742>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Fast facts—Degrees conferred by sex and race*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72>
- National Science Foundation. (2003). *Gender differences in the careers of academic scientists and engineers: A literature review*. Arlington, VA: NSF, Division of Science Resources Statistics.
- Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W., McKenzie, R. D., & Wirth, L. (1925). *The city* (1st ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Potter, H. (2006). An argument for black feminist criminology understanding African American women's experiences with intimate partner abuse using an integrated approach. *Feminist Criminology*, 1, 106-124. doi:10.1177/1557085106286547



- Potter, H., Higgins, G. E., & Gabbidon, S. L. (2011). The influence of gender, race/ethnicity, and faculty perceptions on scholarly productivity in criminology/criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22, 84-101. doi:10.1080/10511253.2010.517653
- Ptacek, J. (2013, November 20-23). *Author meets critics: Feminist criminology by Claire Renzetti*. Panelist presented at the American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research* (1st ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1993). On the margins of the malestream (or, they still don't get it, do they?): Feminist analyses in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 4, 219-234. doi:10.1080/10511259300086111
- Sharp, S. F., & Hefley, K. (2007). This is a man's world . . . or least that's how it looks in the journals. *Critical Criminology*, 15, 3-18. doi:10.1007/s10612-006-9016-y
- Shaw, C. R. (1931). *The jack-roller: A delinquent boy's own story* (2nd impression ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1972). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shaw, C. R., McKay, H. D., McDonald, J. F., Hanson, H. B., & Shaw, E. (1938). *Brothers in crime* (1st ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sprague, J. (2005). *Feminist methodologies for critical researchers: Bridging differences*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Thrasher, F. (1927). *The gang: A study of gangs in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Top publications—Criminology, Law & Policing. (2015). Retrieved from [https://scholar-google-com.eres.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/citations?view\\_op=top\\_venues&hl=en&vq=soc\\_criminologycriminallawpolicing](https://scholar-google-com.eres.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/citations?view_op=top_venues&hl=en&vq=soc_criminologycriminallawpolicing)
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). *State & Country Quickfacts—USA*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>
- Waite, C. L. (1996). *Oberlin college and the decision to admit black students*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED394436>
- Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's Universities* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Wold, A., & Wenneras, C. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer review. *Nature*, 387, 341-343.

## Author Biographies

**Meda Chesney-Lind**, PhD, teaches women's studies at the University of Hawaii. Nationally recognized for her work on women and crime, her testimony before Congress resulted in national support of gender responsive programming for girls in the juvenile justice system. She has just finished two edited collections: one on trends in girls' violence, titled *Fighting for Girls: Critical Perspectives on Gender and Violence* (2010) and the other a collection of international essays titled *Feminist Theories of Crime* (2011).

**Nicholas Chagnon**, MA, is an ABD student in sociology at the University of Hawaii where he teaches courses in sociology and criminology. His research interests include feminist criminology, gender violence, and media and crime. He has published in journals such as *Critical Criminology*, *Crime Media Culture*, and *Radical Criminology*.