

The scholarly productivity of institutions and their faculty in leading criminology and criminal justice journals

Benjamin Steiner*, John Schwartz

Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, 600 Dyer Hall, P. O. Box 210389, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389, United States

Abstract

This study extended the work of Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002) by examining the institutional affiliations of authors in leading criminology and criminal justice journals in the subsequent five-year period after their study. Additionally, this study replicated Fabianic's (2002) study, by assessing the average publications of the faculty at the most productive criminal justice graduate programs. The current study examined the years 2000–2004 and made comparisons to the previous studies, which assessed 1995–1999. Findings revealed the University of Cincinnati and the University of Maryland were the most productive institutions and had the most productive faculty.

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

In baseball, teams are judged not only by the performance of their individual players, but also by how many games their *team* won. In the 2004 season, some teams had many star players, but because their other players were not productive, they were unsuccessful (e.g., New York Mets). On the other hand, several teams had very few stars but had a group of players who all played well (e.g., Boston Red Sox and Minnesota Twins), which made them successful. Some teams had it all; mostly star players, which enhanced their team's overall performance (e.g., New York Yankees). While this simple anecdote is easily generalizable to other team sports and other time periods, its applicability to the scholarly productivity of institutions

and their faculty within criminology and criminal justice journals is at the least subject to empirical inquiry. Findings from such an inquiry can inform as to which academic institutions have shaped the research in criminology and criminal justice for a cross section of time. Additionally, studies that assess scholarly productivity allow trends in criminology and criminal justice scholarship over time to be discerned (Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002).

In this study, two earlier studies that had assessed institution (Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002) and faculty (Fabianic, 2002) productivity were replicated. Both studies assessed scholarly productivity between the years 1995 and 1999. The findings from those studies revealed that the University of Cincinnati had the most total publications (Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002) and publications per faculty member (Fabianic, 2002); however, after the top ranking, there were differences noted between the two measures of success. The analyses reported here replicated those studies and answered which institutions were the most productive in terms of

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 513 556 2036; fax: +1 513 556 3303.

E-mail address: Benjamin.Steiner@uc.edu (B. Steiner).

scholarship for the years 2000 through 2004. By replicating the methods of the two most recent studies, the current study not only expanded on earlier findings, but also allowed for reliable comparisons across time periods to be made.

Scholarly productivity by institution

The existing studies which assessed institutional quality generally assumed one of two forms, prestige perceptions and counts (Thomas & Bronick, 1984). While the former were important, the latter have become preferred in recent years. Although the count method still allows for some researcher subjectivity (see Travis, 1987), it is a more reliable and valid way of assessing quality (Thomas & Bronick, 1984; Travis, 1987), and certainly productivity. The “count” method of assessment was applied here, and thus, only the findings from these types of studies were focused on.

Assessments which used the count method either examined the number of times authors from institutions were cited (Cohn & Farrington, 1998, 1999; Fabianic, 1999; Sorensen, Patterson, & Widmayer, 1992; Thomas & Bronick, 1984; Wright, 2000) or published (Cohn & Farrington, 1998; Fabianic, 1981, 2002; Sorensen, 1994; Sorensen et al., 1992; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002; Stack, 2002). Although citation counts are one way of assessing quality, they are not really a measure of productivity *per se*, but instead a measure of impact or influence (Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002). Additionally, as Sorensen et al. (1992) and Cohn and Farrington (1998) both found, being cited often was highly correlated with being published frequently. It was the publication productivity of institutions and their faculty that was assessed in this study.

Parker and Goldfeder (1979) examined faculty productivity among criminal justice graduate programs in ten criminal justice journals for the years 1972 through 1977. They found that State University of New York (SUNY) at Albany, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Florida State University, and University of Southern California were the top four most productive graduate programs in criminal justice. Michigan State University, University of New Haven, and University of Illinois at Chicago were all tied for the fifth most productive graduate programs in criminal justice. Fabianic (1981) expanded on Parker and Goldfeder’s (1979) findings by examining across all schools when he assessed productivity in six journals between 1974 and 1978. He revealed that SUNY at Albany, Pennsylvania State University, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Ohio State University, and the University of

Southern California were the most productive. Taggart and Holmes (1991) assessed productivity within three journals between 1976 and 1988. Looking only at the first authors of articles, they revealed that Pennsylvania State University, SUNY at Albany, Michigan State University, and University of Alabama at Birmingham were the top four, while four schools tied for the fifth spot. Sorensen (1994) replicated Fabianic’s (1981) assessment methods, but expanded the parameters of his study to include ten journals over a ten-year period, 1983–1992. Using a weighting system to control for coauthorship, he revealed that University of Maryland, SUNY at Albany, Rutgers University, University of Florida, and Indiana University were the most productive institutions. Cohn and Farrington (1998) examined criminal justice doctoral programs across six journals between 1991 and 1995. Using the article as their unit of analysis to control for coauthored works, they found the University of Maryland, University of Cincinnati, University of Missouri at St. Louis, Pennsylvania State University, and Sam Houston State University were the most productive programs. In the most recent study, Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002) reviewed eight journals from 1995 through 1999. Using the same weighting system as Sorensen (1994) to adjust for coauthorship, they found that the University of Cincinnati, the University of Maryland, Temple University, SUNY at Albany, and Sam Houston State University produced the most articles.

Taken together, the findings from the extant studies that assessed institutional productivity revealed that as the criminal justice discipline had evolved, the most productive institutions had been those that also contained doctoral programs. Additionally, SUNY at Albany and the University of Maryland, which both have doctoral programs, had been in the top five in at least three of the five studies. On the other hand, these findings must be taken with caution because they were not adjusted for the number of faculty at each institution. Then again, in the studies that did control for number of faculty in order to assess institutional productivity by faculty member, similar findings emerged.

Scholarly productivity by faculty

Parker and Goldfeder (1979) found that SUNY at Albany, University of New Haven, Rutgers University, Indiana State University, and American University averaged the most publications per faculty member. Sorensen et al. (1992) revealed that between 1986 and 1990 the faculty from SUNY at Albany, Rutgers University, University of California at Berkeley, University of

Maryland, and Washington State University averaged the most publications. In the most recent study, after weighting the publications to control for coauthorship, Fabianic (2002) found that between 1995 and 1999 the faculty from University of Cincinnati, University of Missouri at St. Louis, University of Maryland, Pennsylvania State University, and Temple University averaged the most publications per faculty member. While a limitation of these findings might have been the use of a mean to measure typical productivity, as “publishing stars” might have inflated general faculty productivity, among the top five institutions, findings from studies that controlled for number of faculty were relatively similar to those from the institution level studies. The current study extended these rankings to the next five years. As a result, the status of institutions and their respective faculty’s typical publication productivity for the years 2000 through 2004 was uncovered.

Methods

The methods across the existing studies assessing institution and faculty productivity had varied (see Fabianic, 2002 for a review). There were differences in both the number of, and what journals were assessed, as well as the length of time periods examined. For the purposes of making comparisons and drawing conclusions about the previous ten-year period (1995–2004), the current study replicated the methods used by the most recent studies assessing institution (Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002) and faculty (Fabianic, 2002) productivity for the five years immediately after the five-year period those studies examined. Although some similar earlier studies existed (e.g., Cohn & Farrington, 1998), conclusions beyond the ten-year period (1995–2004) were not appropriate because of the different samples (journals) analyzed in the other studies.

The journals used in this study were *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, and *Crime and Delinquency*. These were the same journals which were assessed by Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002), and with one exception, the same examined by Fabianic (2002) in his analysis. To maintain consistency, this study did not diverge from the selected journals between analyses. Unlike Fabianic (2002), this study did not include *Law and Society Review*, using *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* instead. Similarly to Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002), this study assessed productivity within criminal justice journals. *Law and Society Review*, while a high

quality journal, typically contained articles focused on legal issues, which few authors residing in criminal justice departments examined (see Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002). Thus, it was unlikely the findings reported here would have changed. Regardless, the majority of journals examined by previous studies (e.g., Cohn & Farrington, 1998; Fabianic, 1981; Sorensen, 1994) were included here. Moreover, most of these journals were often regarded as the top journals in criminology and criminal justice (Poole & Regoli, 1981; Regoli, Poole, & Miracle, 1982; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002). After the eight journals were selected, each article was examined for the author(s), the institutions with which they were affiliated, and whether or not the authors were faculty or otherwise (e.g., graduate students). As in the previous studies (Fabianic, 2002; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002), only articles and research notes were included in the analysis. Book reviews, comments, rejoinders, court case reviews, and the like were excluded.

The methods of analysis used in the two previous studies (Fabianic, 2002; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002) were also replicated here. First, using the author’s corresponding university at the time each article was published, the total number of publications by university was computed. Then, in order to replicate Sorensen and Pilgrim’s (2002) study, the publications were weighted by equally dividing each article among the number of authors. For example, an institution received one-third of a publication for an article which had three authors. If all three authors were from the same institution, the institution received one article. The same weighting procedure was also used in other prior studies which had assessed institutional productivity (e.g., Fabianic, 1981; Sorensen, 1994).

This study also extended the previous empirical work by using an additional analysis with a different weighting procedure. Fisher, Vander Ven, Cobane, Cullen, and Williams (1998) noted that most of the articles in criminal justice journals between 1990 and 1996 were coauthored. Moreover, almost half of the articles had three or more authors. In the current sample, over 70 percent of the articles were coauthored and 35 percent had three or more authors. Some scholars had suggested that extensive coauthorship could be used to undeservedly inflate productivity (e.g., Fine & Kurdek, 1993; Sever, 2005; Taggart & Holmes, 1991). Thus, it may be that some authors are placing individuals on their articles, while not requiring them to contribute substantively to the article. In an effort to address coauthorship differently than in previous studies, an additional analysis was added that afforded greater weight to the lead authors of each article. Lead authors were awarded credit for one-half of each

article and then the residual portion of the article was divided among the remaining authors. By providing an extra analysis, this study was able to provide a more comprehensive understanding of scholarly productivity across institutions.

In Fabianic's (2002) study, the number of publications by faculty member was computed by dividing the number of faculty publications by the number of faculty at each institution. Accordingly, for these analyses the publications which were contributed by graduate students were dropped from the totals. Fabianic (2002) used both the total number of publications and the same weighting method as Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002). In order to make comparisons, this study did not depart from these methods. Nevertheless, a subsequent analysis using the additional weighting technique described above was also performed. Similar to Fabianic's (2002) study, the number of faculty was based on an Internet search of departments' Web sites on February 15, 2005. All full-time faculty listed

on each department's Web site were included in the denominator.

By replicating the methods from the two most recent studies (Fabianic, 2002; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002), this study added to the extant literature which had assessed institution and faculty productivity. Additionally, by examining the two issues through the use of a different weighting procedure, this study addressed a critique of previous studies (see Sorensen, 1994; Taggart & Holmes, 1991).

Findings

The current study replicated Sorensen and Pilgrim's (2002) study of institutional productivity and Fabianic's (2002) study of average faculty productivity within criminal justice graduate programs in select criminology and criminal justice journals for the years 2000–2004. In Tables 1 and 2, the current results and each institution's corresponding rank are presented

Table 1
The publication productivity of institutions in leading criminology and criminal justice journals 1995–2004

Institution	2000–2004 (current study)			1995–1999 (Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002)		1995–2004 total authorships	
	Publications (rank)	Weighted publications (rank)	Weighted publications favoring first author (rank)	Publications	Weighted publications	Publications	Weighted publications
University of Cincinnati	84 (1)	31.25 (2)	31.25 (2)	86	31.85	170	63.10
University of Maryland	79 (2)	35.55 (1)	35.79 (1)	69	29.78	148	65.33
SUNY-Albany	58 (3)	23.30 (6)	22.54 (6)	50	20.04	108	43.34
University of Florida	54 (4)	25.00 (4)	24.83 (4)	20	8.87	74	33.87
Pennsylvania State University	54 (5)	26.50 (3)	27.22 (3)	24	14.17	78	40.67
Michigan State University	48 (6)	20.65 (6)	19.92 (8)	32	13.38	80	34.03
University of Missouri-St. Louis	42 (7)	20.50 (8)	20.80 (7)	29	16.92	71	37.42
Arizona State University	36 (8)	19.83 (9)	19.58 (9)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of Washington	36 (9)	8.85 (22)	8.70 (22)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of South Carolina	36 (10)	11.62 (14)	16.58 (10)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Northwestern University	32 (11)	23.50 (6)	23.25 (5)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of Nebraska-Omaha	29 (12)	12.66 (10)	13.50 (11)	32	15.67	61	28.33
Georgia State University	29 (13)	11.96 (12)	12.71 (12)	16	10.50	45	22.46
Old Dominion University	28 (14)	12.33 (11)	11.83 (14)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of Central Florida	27 (15)	11.90 (13)	12.54 (13)	32	18.84	59	30.74
University of Pennsylvania	24 (16)	8.94 (21)	9.44 (19)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Northeastern University	24 (17)	11.02 (16)	11.13 (16)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Sam Houston State University	24 (18)	8.16 (24)	8.33 (23)	51	19.77	75	27.93
Florida International University	23 (19)	11.00 (17)	11.17 (15)	16	7.70	39	18.70
University of South Florida	23 (20)	9.17 (20)	9.25 (21)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Ohio State University	22 (21)	11.35 (15)	11.04 (17)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Bowling Green State University	22 (22)	9.75 (18)	9.83 (18)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Florida State University	21 (23)	9.25 (19)	9.42 (20)	28	11.00	49	20.25
Temple University	20 (24)	8.25 (23)	8.00 (24)	44	20.27	64	28.52

N = 1,108 (articles).

NG = not given.

NA = not applicable.

Table 2
Average publications of faculty in top criminal justice graduate programs 1995–2004

Institution (number of faculty)	2000–2004 (current study)			1995–1999 (Fabianic, 2002)		1995–2004 composite averages	
	Publications per faculty (rank)	Weighted publications per faculty (rank)	Weighted publications favoring first author per faculty (rank)	Publications per faculty	Weighted publications per faculty	Publications per faculty	Weighted publications per faculty
University of Maryland (18)	3.89 (1)	1.79 (1)	1.78 (1)	2.11	.96	3.00	1.38
University of Cincinnati (21)	3.43 (2)	1.30 (3)	1.26 (4)	4.50	1.78	3.97	1.54
SUNY-Albany (16)	3.06 (3)	1.20 (5)	1.17 (5)	.62	.32	1.84	.76
University of Florida (17)	2.88 (4)	1.37 (2)	1.36 (2)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of South Carolina (12)	2.75 (5)	1.27 (4)	1.28 (3)	.80	.42	1.78	.85
Bowling Green State University (8)	2.50 (6)	1.14 (6)	1.17 (5)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Pennsylvania State University (21)	2.14 (7)	1.03 (7)	1.07 (7)	1.58	.79	1.86	.91
Georgia State University (13)	2.08 (8)	.87 (9)	.93 (9)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of Missouri-St. Louis (18)	2.06 (9)	.99 (8)	1.00 (8)	2.64	1.73	2.35	1.36
University of South Florida (17)	1.94 (10)	.48 (17)	.49 (17)	.60	.34	1.27	.41
University of Pennsylvania (12)	1.83 (11)	.69 (11)	.75 (11)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Michigan State University (22)	1.68 (12)	.65 (13)	.62 (14)	1.10	.59	1.39	.62
Florida International University (14)	1.64 (13)	.79 (10)	.80 (10)	NG	NG	NA	NA
Old Dominion University (18)	1.44 (14)	.65 (13)	.63 (13)	NG	NG	NA	NA
University of Central Florida (20)	1.30 (15)	.59 (15)	.60 (15)	1.92	1.25	1.61	.92
University of Nebraska-Omaha (19)	1.21 (16)	.54 (16)	.55 (16)	1.15	.62	1.18	.58
Arizona State University (27)	1.19 (17)	.67 (12)	.65 (12)	.14	.10	.67	.39
Northeastern University (25)	.96 (18)	.44 (18)	.45 (18)	.62	.26	.79	.35
Florida State University (23)	.74 (19)	.34 (19)	.36 (19)	.71	.30	.73	.32
Temple University (23)	.70 (20)	.29 (20)	.30 (20)	1.50	.78	1.10	.54
Sam Houston State University (27)	.52 (21)	.18 (21)	.18 (21)	.93	.35	.73	.27

$N = 1,108$ (articles).

NG = not given.

NA = not applicable.

adjacent to those from the previous study. For the institutional analysis, ten-year totals were computed, while composite averages of the findings from the current and Fabianic's (2002) study were computed for the faculty analysis. The former, limited to those schools which had at least twenty unweighted publications, are presented in Table 1.

As Table 1 makes clear, the University of Cincinnati had the most publications between 2000 and 2004. University of Maryland ranked second, followed by SUNY at Albany, University of Florida, and Pennsylvania State University. While the top two schools remained the same and SUNY at Albany was ranked number four in Sorensen and Pilgrim's (2002) analysis, University of Florida and Pennsylvania State University were newcomers to the top five schools.

In the weighted analyses, slightly different results emerged. As Table 1 reveals, when the publications were divided among the authors equally, University of Maryland was the most productive institution. University of Cincinnati dropped to second, while Pennsylvania State University rose to third. University of Florida remained in the top five and was joined by Northwestern University,

which replaced SUNY at Albany. In Sorensen and Pilgrim's (2002) study, University of Cincinnati and University of Maryland were both in the top five, as were SUNY at Albany, Temple University, and Sam Houston State University.

In addition to the weighting procedure used by Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002) and Fabianic (2002), the current study went one step further by using an additional weighting technique that awarded half of the credit for each article to the lead author. As can be seen in Table 1, weighting the articles in this manner caused no changes among the top five schools. Outside of the University of South Carolina, which moved from fourteenth place to tenth, minimal differences were noted between the two weighted analyses.

This study replicated Sorensen and Pilgrim's (2002) methods exactly and therefore allowed for ten-year totals (1995–2004) to be compiled for the schools included in their study. Not surprisingly, the University of Cincinnati, University of Maryland, and SUNY at Albany were in the top five, as was Pennsylvania State University. Michigan State University, which was not in the top five in either study, rose to fourth in the ten-year

analysis by being consistently productive in both time periods.

Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002) used the weighting technique which equally distributed credit among all coauthors. As such, the total publications weighted equally for each coauthor for the ten-year period were computed. In this analysis, University of Maryland and University of Cincinnati remained in the top two positions. SUNY at Albany, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Missouri at St. Louis, which replaced Michigan State University once the publications were weighted, rounded out the top five.

The aforementioned findings were important in that they revealed which institutions were the most productive in terms of publications in selected criminology and criminal justice journals between 1995 and 2004. The findings were also limited in that they did not take into account the number of faculty members at each institution. In other words, institutions with more faculty could have been more likely to exhibit higher productivity. The next set of analyses, which replicated Fabianic's (2002) study, accounted for the number of faculty at each institution. For the purpose of comparison with Fabianic's (2002) study, these analyses were limited to only those schools which had a graduate program in criminology or criminal justice.

As Table 2 reveals, University of Maryland produced the most publications per faculty member in 2000–2004. University of Cincinnati ranked second, while SUNY at Albany, University of Florida, and University of South Carolina filled out the top five. University of Maryland and University of Cincinnati were both in the top five in Fabianic's study, while the faculties from the other three schools were not. Instead, the faculties from University of Central Florida, University of Missouri at St. Louis, and Michigan State University comprised the rest of the top five in 1995 through 1999.

In the first weighted analysis, which distributed each article equally among the coauthors, University of Maryland continued to be ranked number one. The rest of the top five also remained the same; however, University of Cincinnati dropped to number three and was replaced by University of Florida, while University of South Carolina moved to number four, ahead of SUNY at Albany. In Fabianic's (2002) study, University of Cincinnati and University of Maryland were in the top five, numbers one and five respectively. Michigan State University, University of Missouri at St. Louis, and University of Central Florida made up the rest of the top five.

In the second weighted analysis, which accorded half of the credit of each article to the lead author, University of Maryland and University of Florida held at numbers one

and two, respectively. University of South Carolina moved up to number three, while University of Cincinnati dropped to number four. Fifth place was shared by SUNY at Albany and Bowling Green State University.

The comparisons with the previous study (Fabianic, 2002) were somewhat tenuous in that one of the journals examined here replaced *Law and Society Review*, which was examined by Fabianic (2002). On the other hand, this study provided the closest replication of journal selection between studies to date (see Fabianic, 2002). Additionally, the two journals which were switched provided the fewest contributions to the findings in either study (see Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002). With this caveat in mind, the mean production per faculty member derived from each study was averaged to provide a ten-year (1995–2004) estimate of typical faculty productivity. As can be seen in Table 2, the University of Cincinnati averaged the most productivity among their faculty over the ten-year period. The faculty from the University of Maryland was second followed by the faculties from the University of Missouri at St. Louis, Pennsylvania State University, and SUNY at Albany.

This study also derived the ten-year average of the faculty productivity using the means for weighted publications. In this analysis, four of the top five schools from the unweighted analysis, University of Cincinnati, University of Maryland, University of Missouri at St. Louis, and Pennsylvania State University, remained the same. University of Central Florida replaced SUNY at Albany in the top five for 1995 through 2004.

An important qualification to both of the ten-year analyses was that not all schools could be included. Neither Sorensen and Pilgrim's (2002) nor Fabianic's (2002) study included data for all of the schools in the current study. While this would not have been likely to alter the findings with regard to the top five in the institutional analyses, it might have altered the top five in the average publications per faculty member analyses. Three of the top ten schools in the current study were not included in Fabianic's (2002) study. As such, including data for these schools might have changed the make up of the top five. Nonetheless, because the current study replicated the two most recent studies as precisely as possible, the ten-year analysis and comparisons reported here were far superior to those reported in previous studies.

Discussion

An assessment of institutional and faculty productivity in leading criminology and criminal justice journals is

not only important for determining which schools contain the best collections of criminologists in the discipline. Studies such as the current one also inform about trends occurring within the field. For example, [Sorensen and Pilgrim \(2002\)](#) noted that coauthorship was pretty much the norm in criminal justice. [Fisher and her colleagues \(1998\)](#) found this to be true not only in criminal justice, but throughout other disciplines in the social sciences. The data examined in this study revealed much the same, as over 70 percent of the articles assessed here were coauthored and 35 percent had three or more authors.

A possible explanation for this trend was mentorship. Faculty members routinely work on research projects which lead to articles with their students. The findings here lent some support to this notion. In the institutional analyses, nine of the top ten programs in terms of publications contained doctoral programs. While many of these programs remained in the top ten in the analyses of average productivity of faculty, the number of total publications which was used in the calculations declined substantially. Additionally, several institutions that did not necessarily contain doctoral programs moved into the top ten. Furthermore, subsequent analyses revealed that the top five institutions in terms of total publications averaged from 3.08 (University of Cincinnati) to 2.43 (Pennsylvania State University) authors per article. Students at the top five institutions also accounted for a substantial percentage of their schools' total publications ranging from 18 percent (University of Maryland and SUNY at Albany) to 10 percent (University of Florida). Consequently it seemed, at least for doctoral programs, mentorship was a frequent occurrence.

The aforementioned findings also illuminated the fact that those institutions with doctoral programs were the most productive in the period assessed here (2000–2004) and over the ten-year period (1995–2004). Institutions with doctoral programs also averaged the most productivity among faculty in the period assessed in this study (2000–2004) and over the ten-year period (1995–2004). These findings were not surprising, as doctoral programs tend to hire scholars who publish frequently in the top journals (see Appendix A). Additionally, faculty at doctoral programs will often be given lower teaching loads so that they may conduct more research and produce more articles.

In both analyses and across both time periods, the University of Cincinnati and the University of Maryland asserted themselves as the most productive institutions with the most productive faculty. Other doctoral programs (i.e., SUNY at Albany) were consistently

productive and found themselves ranked among the top five in several of the analyses. On the other hand, several programs which only contained masters programs averaged a fair amount of productivity among their faculty, with South Carolina yielding the most publications with nearly three per faculty member. An important qualification to the finding regarding the average productivity among faculty members was the possibility of one or two faculty members driving the findings. While certain institutions did have their publication stars (see Appendix A), most of their faculty did need to be productive in order for them to achieve a high rank among the top faculty averages. This was confirmed by subsequent analyses which revealed that among the top five schools, most of the faculty published in these journals, ranging from 100 percent (University of Maryland and SUNY at Albany) to 71 percent (University of Cincinnati). Accordingly, it seemed that top institutions not only had great scholars, but that they were great *teams* as well.

Finally, it was important to distinguish the scholars who published multiple times in these journals. Publishing in these journals is not an easy task and requires much time and effort. Of the 1,594 different authors who published in these journals between 2000 and 2004, nearly 74 percent of them did so only once. About 15 percent did so twice, while just under 6 percent did so three times. Approximately 5 percent of these authors published more than three times in these journals, and only about 1 percent published more than five articles. When the articles were weighted equally by the number of coauthors, in order to facilitate comparisons between the current study and [Sorensen and Pilgrim's \(2002\)](#) findings, only ten scholars published in these journals more than four times (see Appendix A). Given the fact that the scholars who published in these journals were hardly representative of the criminal justice scholars nationally, the ability to publish in these journals multiple times should be recognized.

All told, this study added to the extant literature assessing institutional and faculty productivity. Publication productivity is not the only measure of institutional quality ([Travis, 1987](#)), and thus, findings cannot be generalized to student training, securing of grants, or any of the other measures of institution or faculty quality. On the other hand, the findings here did inform about what institutions were shaping criminology and criminal justice research by generating knowledge about what predicts, what works, what doesn't, or what might within criminology and criminal justice.

Appendix A. Authors with four or more articles published in leading criminology and criminal justice journals 2000–2004

Author	Weighted publications	Publications	Current affiliation	(Sorensen & Pilgrims, 2002)	
				Weighted publications	Publications
Alex Piquero	12.85	30	University of Florida	6.77	16
Francis Cullen	7.78	23	University of Cincinnati	6.20	25
Robin Engel	5.92	10	University of Cincinnati	NG	NG
Greg Pogarsky	5.67	10	SUNY-Albany	NG	NG
Brian Payne	4.58	9	Old Dominion University	NG	NG
Eric Silver	4.58	9	Pennsylvania State University	NG	NG
Doris MacKenzie	4.42	10	University of Maryland	NG	NG
Scott Decker	4.33	8	University of Missouri-St. Louis	4.60	7
David Farrington	4.00	8	Cambridge University	NG	NG
Ronald Weitzer	4.00	6	George Washington University	NG	NG

NG = not given.

References

- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1998). Assessing the quality of American doctoral program faculty in criminology and criminal justice, 1991–1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9, 187–210.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1999). Changes in the most-cited scholars in twenty criminology and criminal justice journals between 1990–1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26, 99–116.
- Fabianic, D. (1981). Institutional affiliation of authors in selected criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 9, 247–252.
- Fabianic, D. (1999). Educational backgrounds of most-cited scholars. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 517–524.
- Fabianic, D. (2002). The publication productivity of criminal justice faculty in criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 549–558.
- Fine, M., & Kurdek, L. (1993). Reflections on determining authorship credit and authorship order on faculty-student collaborations. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1141–1147.
- Fisher, B., Vander Ven, T., Cobane, C., Cullen, F., & Williams, N. (1998). Trends in multiple-authored articles in criminology and criminal justice: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9, 19–38.
- Parker, L. C., & Goldfeder, E. (1979). Productivity ratings of graduate programs in criminal justice based on publications in ten critical journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7, 125–133.
- Poole, E., & Regoli, R. (1981). Periodical prestige in criminology and criminal justice: A comment. *Criminology*, 19, 470–478.
- Regoli, R., Poole, E., & Miracle, A. (1982). Assessing the prestige of journals in criminal justice: A research note. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10, 57–67.
- Sever, B. (2005). Ranking multiple authors in criminal justice scholarship: An examination of underlying issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16, 79–100.
- Sorensen, J. R. (1994). Scholarly productivity in criminal justice: Institutional affiliation of authors in the top ten criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22, 535–547.
- Sorensen, J. R., Patterson, A. L., & Widmayer, A. G. (1992). Publication productivity of faculty members in criminology and criminal justice doctoral programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3, 1–33.
- Sorensen, J. R., & Pilgrim, R. (2002). The institutional affiliation of authors in leading criminology and criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 11–18.
- Stack, S. (2002). Gender and scholarly productivity: The case of criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 175–182.
- Taggart, W., & Holmes, M. (1991). Institutional productivity in criminal justice and criminology: An examination of author affiliation in selected journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 549–561.
- Thomas, C., & Bronick, M. (1984). The quality of doctoral programs in deviance, criminology, and criminal justice: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12, 21–37.
- Travis, L. (1987). Assessing the quality of doctoral programs in deviance, criminology, and criminal justice: A response to Thomas and Bronick. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15, 157–163.
- Wright, R. (2000). Recent changes in the most-cited scholars in criminology: A comparison of textbooks and journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 117–128.