

## **Book ‘em Dano: The Scholarly Productivity of Institutions and Their Faculty in Criminal Justice Books**

**Willard M. Oliver**

*Sam Houston State University*

**Sam Swindell**

*Sam Houston State University*

**John Marks, Jr.**

*Sam Houston State University*

**Ken Balusek**

*Sam Houston State University*

### *Abstract*

*A number of studies have assessed the status of criminal justice programs through peer review, institutional affiliation in journals, and citation analysis in both journals and textbooks. No study to date has attempted to analyze the institutional affiliation of authors through criminal justice books. An analysis of books available to criminal justice academics was conducted at the 2006 ACJS annual meeting. This study assesses the leading criminal justice book authors and ranks their institutional affiliation. Findings revealed that John Jay College and Eastern Kentucky University were the most productive institutions and had the most productive faculty.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

As the academic discipline of criminal justice has grown over the past three decades, so too has the body of literature attempting to evaluate and rank criminal justice programs (Cohn, Farrington, & Wright, 1998; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002; Wright, Bryant, & Miller, 2001). The methods for assessing these programs have been primarily conducted through three distinct methodologies: peer review (Fabianic, 1979; U.S. News & World Report, 2005), analysis of institutional affiliation in journals (Fabianic, 1981, 2002; Parker & Goldfeder, 1979; Sorensen, 1994; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002; Steiner & Schwartz, 2006; Taggart & Holmes, 1991), and citation analysis (Cohn & Farrington, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999; Shichor, 1982; Wright, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002; Wright & Cohn, 1996).

Peer review, the most subjective of the three methodologies, has once again come to the forefront of rankings by way of the first such ranking of “criminology” programs by *U.S. News & World Report* (2005). Institutional affiliation studies have looked at the authors and their institutional affiliation in leading criminal justice and criminology journals (Fabianic, 1981, 2002; Parker & Goldfeder, 1979; Sorensen, 1994; Sorensen & Pilgrim, 2002; Steiner & Schwartz, 2006). Finally, citation analysis has looked to both journals (Cohn & Farrington, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999) and textbooks (Wright, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002; Wright & Cohn, 1996), usually introductory textbooks (Shichor, 1982; Wright, 1995), to assess the most-cited authors and articles. To the best of our knowledge, however, no study to date has measured the institutional affiliation of criminal justice academics in criminal justice textbooks. Through an analysis of books available to criminal justice academics at the 2006 annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences from publishers’ display of books in their criminal justice lines, this study reports the leading criminal justice academic book authors and their institutional affiliation.

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

As criminal justice began to emerge in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Morn, 1995) a number of scholars demonstrated concern for the development of criminal justice, or elements thereof, into a well respected academic discipline (Bennett & Marshall, 1979; Pearson, Moran, Berger, Landon, McKenzie, & Bonita, 1980; Sherman, 1978; Ward & Webb, 1984). Highly related to assessing the status of criminal justice as an academic discipline was the ability to develop the appropriate empirical methods to evaluate these programs. Although Wolfgang, Figlio, and Thornberry (1978) would be the first to do so, their methodology was limited to citation analysis, a method which was notably well accepted in other disciplines (See for instance Bain, 1962). It was the work of DeZee (1980), however, that attempted to evaluate criminal justice and criminology programs with the most comprehensive means of empirical analysis. DeZee (1980) opted to use peer review, analysis of author affiliation in journals, and citation analysis of introductory textbooks. These three categories over time have therefore come to be considered the most accepted means for evaluating criminal justice programs: peer review, institutional affiliation, and citation analysis.

## PEER REVIEW

One of the earliest peer rankings in criminal justice was conducted in the late 1970s, which attempted to assess the relative prestige among doctoral programs at the time (Fabianic, 1979). While peer review has always been a means of assessing academic programs, it is not always looked upon with favor. According to Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002) peer reviews “have become the least commonly used method due to their subjective nature” (p. 12). In comparing the number of peer review assessments with the author affiliations and citation analysis studies below, one would conclude this has largely been the case. This may have changed with the new peer review rankings of “criminology” programs by the *U.S. News & World Report* (2005).

The magazine *U.S. News & World Report* has, over the past two decades, created one of the most notorious peer review evaluations of higher education. While they have been both praised and vilified, the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings have become a part of academia. Until

recently, however, criminal justice and criminology programs were not assessed. In the fall of 2004, *U.S. News & World Report* surveyed professors of colleges and universities with doctoral programs in both criminology and criminal justice and had them rate the entire list of programs on a scale of one to five, with one being considered marginal and five outstanding. Although it is unclear whether or not this will become an annual survey, it is the most recent peer review assessment of these programs.

## INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION

The first work to assess the status of criminal justice higher education employed journal publications to determine graduate program productivity in the criminal justice field (Parker & Goldfeder, 1979). This initial attempt to analyze author affiliation in journals bore fruit by inspiring a long line of research examining different journals, different time frames, and different subsets of criminal justice academia, but all of them have been aimed at determining the institutions with the highest faculty productivity in criminal justice and criminology peer-reviewed journals. After Parker and Goldfeder's study, Fabianic (1981) looked at the institutional affiliation of authors in six leading criminal justice journals from 1974 through 1978. Another study analyzed the faculty publications in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* (1976-1988), *Criminology* (1976-1988), and *Justice Quarterly* (1984-1988) by institutional affiliation (Taggart & Holmes, 1991). Sorensen (1994) analyzed the publication productivity of faculty members in both criminology and criminal justice programs. Sorensen (1994) also examined the institutional affiliation of authors in the top ten criminal justice journals from 1983 through 1992. More recently, Sorensen and Pilgrim (2002), examined the institutional affiliation of authors in the top eight criminology and criminal justice journals during the years 1995 through 1999, to build on the works of Fabianic (1981) and Sorensen (1994). Steiner and Schwartz (2006) then replicated Sorensen and Pilgrim's 2002 study with data from 2000-2004.

Several studies have also added unique elements to this analysis of author affiliation in peer-reviewed journals. One study included authors' races and found that there have been a limited number of publications by African-American scholars in criminal justice and criminology journals (del Carmen and Bing, 2000). Another unique twist to this type of analysis was published by Cohn, Farrington, and Sorensen (2000), where they assessed the quality of 12 criminal justice doctoral programs by analyzing the publication rates of their Ph.D. graduates in criminal justice journals. A follow-up to this original study, in order to find out "where they are now?" was also recently published (Rice, Cohn, & Farrington, 2005).

## CITATION ANALYSIS

Another common method to assess criminal justice academic programs and individual scholars is through citation analysis in both journals (Cohn & Farrington, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999) and textbooks (Wright, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002; Wright & Cohn, 1996). The earliest citation analysis was conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio, and Thornberry (1978), in which they analyzed citations in journals and research books in criminology and criminal justice from 1945 to 1972. Shichor (1982) would soon follow with an analysis of citations in criminology textbooks, published between 1976 and 1980, as Wolfgang et al. (1978) had ignored these in their study.

One study used the *Social Science Citation Index* to rank programs by looking at faculty citations (Thomas & Bronick, 1984) and another used the *Index* to list the 75 most cited articles in criminology and criminal justice from 1979 to 1993 (Cohn & Farrington, 1996). Another looked at citations from the top six criminal justice/criminology journals (Cohn & Farrington, 1998) and still another study looked at citations of faculty as found in forty-three introductory criminal justice and criminology textbooks (Sorensen, Patterson, & Widmayer, 1992).

There can be little doubt that the most extensive citation analyses of criminal justice and criminology textbooks has been conducted by Richard Wright (1994, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002) along with associates (Wright & Cohn, 1996). In addition, Wright and associates have explored the most-cited scholars in regard to critical criminology (Wright & Friedrichs, 1998; Wright, Miller & Gallagher, 2000), police studies (Wright & Miller, 1998), corrections (Wright & Miller, 1999), women and crime (Wright & Sheridan, 1997), criminological theory (Wright & Rourke, 1999), and white-collar crime (Wright, Bryant & Miller, 2001).

There have been variations on citation analysis, such as Fabianic's study (1999) analyzing the educational backgrounds of the most-cited scholars finding that the majority had a sociology background and most earned their degrees from the top "scholar-producing universities." Another study assessed the most cited African-American scholars in criminology textbooks and the most cited publications by these scholars (Gabbidon & Greene, 2001).

## THE CURRENT STUDY

While there have been numerous institutional affiliation studies, all of them have focused on journal publications. Citation analysis studies have focused on both journals and books, but they have, as their name implies, only assessed citations rather than the book authors themselves. Some studies have examined textbooks specifically, but they have either dealt with content (e.g., Burns, 2002), or they have topically compared textbooks (e.g., Withrow, Weible, & Bennett, 2004). To the best of our knowledge, no study has attempted to look at the institutional affiliation of the authors of criminal justice texts.

There are perhaps a number of reasons why no study has analyzed the scholarly productivity of institutions and their faculty in criminal justice books to date. One reason is that in criminal justice, as in most of academia, the most respected endeavor is to publish in the peer-reviewed journals. These journals lend prestige to the author and institutions due to the nature of the work that gets published in them, namely original research and ideas. Criminal justice books, at least the workbooks, textbooks, and edited collections that usually feature journal articles, are compilations of the original research found in the journals. When edited books feature original research, either by an author or editor (e.g., collections of original research), they often stem from research the authors have previously published in the journals. Books are often seen as non-theoretical as well, as the typical criminal justice book simply conveys descriptive information, hence they are not held in as high esteem. Despite these reasons, the authors argue that assessing books is important to understanding criminal justice as an academic discipline.

First, while the peer-review process has ensconced such journals as the most prestigious of academic publications, the publication of books is generally acknowledged nonetheless as having great value. They are generally part of the faculty evaluation process, are typically included in the author's vitae, and can be one of the factors that contribute to faculty tenure. Second, criminal justice books can contribute significantly to the discipline, especially those consisting

of original research. Third, these books are adopted by other faculty for use in the classroom to educate criminal justice students on various aspects of the criminal justice discipline; they are the basis for educating future criminal justice practitioners and academics. Finally, studying the institutional affiliation of authors publishing textbooks in the field offers some benefit for identifying the top-producing institutions in criminal justice, thus specifically contributing to the body of research on institutional affiliation. Therefore, it is the aim of this study to address a gap in the literature by extending the analysis of institutional affiliations of authors in journals to the criminal justice book publishing world.

## METHODS

Although no assessment of institutional affiliation of criminal justice books has been done to date, numerous studies related to journals have been, and it was, therefore, the intent of these researchers to adhere closely to the methodology of these previous studies. In particular, the methodology of Fabianic (2002), Sorenson and Pilgrim (2002), and Steiner and Schwartz (2006) were selected to serve as a basis for developing this study's methodology.

After Steiner and Schwartz (2006) selected their journals and time frame, they examined each article for the author(s), their institutional affiliation, and whether or not the authors were faculty or otherwise. In order to achieve this for the books, a preliminary assessment of criminal justice academic book authors was conducted by the researchers, which analyzed the publisher catalogs of Prentice Hall, Wadsworth, Sage Publications, LexisNexis (Anderson Publishing), Allyn & Bacon, Waveland Press, Inc., and Carolina Academic Press. This verified that the author's name is listed alongside the books, as well as their institutional affiliation, in both the books and catalog entries. The majority of books listed an institutional affiliation of the author as long as there was one to be listed. All of the catalogs did list the name of the author(s), but some did not list institutional affiliation (LexisNexis and Waveland Press, Inc.). This identified the need to verify the institutional affiliation for some publisher's books during the actual data collection.

The methods of analysis used in the aforementioned studies (Fabianic, 2002; Sorenson & Pilgrim, 2002; Steiner & Schwartz, 2006) were also replicated in this study. The author's institutional affiliation at the time the book was published was utilized, and the total number of publications by each university/college was computed. Then, in order to replicate both Sorenson and Pilgrim (2002) and Steiner and Schwartz (2006), the publications were weighted by equally dividing each book among the number of authors. If all four authors were from the same academic institution, the university/college received one book (See also Fabianic, 1981; Sorenson, 1994). In order to then extend the methods used by Steiner and Schwartz (2006), because co-authored books, like co-authored journals, could be used to inflate productivity (See Fine & Kurdek, 1993; Sever, 2005; Taggart & Holmes, 1991), a second analysis gave the lead author a half-credit weight, and the remaining half-credit was divided equally among the remaining co-authors.

Unlike the journal studies, however, books presented a somewhat unique problem in the fact that they will often be updated in new editions, and the level of prestige is not necessarily found in the publisher. Therefore, it was determined that two additional weights would have to be employed for this study. The first of the weighting measures proceeded from the publishing edition of the books being reviewed. The justification for this is that publishing companies will



presumably not enter into a contract for a second edition of a book if the first edition has not sold well. If a book has sold well, that generally signifies that the book has been widely adopted in classrooms, hence increasing the book's value. As it is generally individual faculty members or faculty committees that determine which books are adopted, it can be said that those books that have higher edition numbers are more readily accepted in the criminal justice field. Thus, a book in its first edition was given an additional weighting of one credit, while a second or subsequent edition was given as weighting of two.

The second weighting is slightly more difficult to assess. Criminal justice academic books come in many different forms. Some books feature original research or expanded versions of an authors' research first published in a journal article. Others are simply student workbooks that are created in a tear-sheet three-hole punched format to create a consumable text. The contribution of these books to the criminal justice academic discipline is clearly different, but determining a ranking method can be highly subjective. The researchers, therefore, determined the categories of books, and then ranked them categorically in order of prestige. The order of prestige is, in descending order by category: original research, collections of original research from multiple authors, textbooks, brief format textbooks, collections of reprinted articles, and workbooks. These categories of books were correspondingly assigned the weights ranging from six to one. The weights assigned to each authorship were then totaled for each author, and separately for each affiliated institution. The final *weighted score* was then determined by combining the prestige ranking with the numbered edition of the publication.

Next, in order to deal with the numerous publishing companies that publish books on either criminal justice or a related subject, not to mention the difficulties of assessing "criminal justice" versus "criminology" books, the authors decided to use the commercial decisions of the major criminal justice book publishers to determine which books to include in the final database. Thus, the book vendor fair at the 2006 annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) in Baltimore, Maryland, served as our sampling frame. Book vendor fairs at the ACJS conference are a common mechanism for criminal justice publishing companies or publishers with a criminal justice line of books to show their publications to the widest audience of criminal justice academics. What criminal justice academics had available to peruse at the conference book fair from the largest publishers therefore became the basis for data collection. The resulting publishers were Allyn & Bacon, American Correctional Association, Carolina Academic Press, Copperhouse, Foundation Press, Jones and Bartlett, Lexis-Nexis (Anderson), McGraw-Hill, Peter Lang, Prentice Hall, Roxbury Publishing, Sage, Thomson Wadsworth, Thomson West, and Waveland Press.

Once the data was collected and entered into a spreadsheet, a process of verifying authors and institutions was conducted. In many cases there was no institutional affiliation either listed or discernible for the author, and these were removed from the database. As a result, the publisher Copperhouse no longer had any books in the database and, hence, does not appear in the final analysis. In other cases, the institutional affiliations listed were non-academic institutions such as police and fire academies, and these were removed from the database. Where the author was listed as deceased with no institutional affiliation listed, the book was likewise removed from the final database.

In addition, many authors listed their institutional affiliations as a particular university without designating the specific location of the university. Therefore, a further Internet inves-

tigation was conducted to determine the actual affiliation at the time the book was published. For instance, an author may have listed their institutional affiliation as University of Nebraska without specifying either Omaha, Lincoln, or Kearney. Every effort was made to determine the specific affiliation at the time of publication. In many cases, on-line vitas were used to trace the publication dates of a specific book and the institutional affiliation listed at that time. Finally, in several cases the names of the college or university had changed since the publication of the book, or the method by which the author listed their institutional affiliation differed from other authors. In these cases, every effort was made to create uniformity among the institutional affiliations in order to ensure the institutions were not split based simply on a name change.

**RESULTS**

At the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences annual meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, in 2006, excluding non-publishing and international publishers, there were 14 publishers with 586 books representing the work of 627 authors from 305 different colleges and universities for a total of 1,010 entries in the database. Of the publishing companies (See Table 1, below), Prentice Hall had the largest number (121) and percentage (20.9%) of books out of the publishers assessed. The second largest was the Thomson Wadsworth line of books with 93 total books and 14.8% of the 586 books in this study. Even if the Thomson West publishing line was included with the Thomson Wadsworth line, which they were not, Thomson would still remain in second place with 119 books and 18.9% of the sample. The third largest number of books, associated with Prentice Hall through its parent company Pearson Education, was Allyn & Bacon with 69 books and 11% of the total database.<sup>1</sup> The smallest publisher represented was the

TABLE 1. PUBLISHING COMPANIES			
Ranking	Publishing Companies	<i>n</i>	Percent
1	Prentice Hall	131	20.9
2	Thomson Wadsworth	93	14.8
3	Allyn & Bacon	69	11.0
4	Lexis Nexis/Anderson	68	10.8
5	Roxbury Publishing	48	7.7
6	Sage	47	7.5
7	Waveland Press	31	4.9
8	Peter Lang	30	4.8
9	Carolina Academic Press	29	4.6
10	Thomson West	26	4.1
11	Foundation Press	20	3.2
12	Jones and Bartlett	18	2.9
13	McGraw-Hill	13	2.1
14	American Correctional Association	4	.6

1. It should be noted that in September of 2007, Pearson Education realigned their criminal justice holdings by placing the Allyn & Bacon Criminal Justice line of books under Prentice Hall.

American Correctional Association (ACA) with only four books in the final database. This was not because the ACA only brought four books to display, but rather because the majority of the ACA’s authors are non-academics and thus were excluded from the final analysis.

In assessing the number of books by edition (See Table 2, below), it is not surprising to find that the majority of books in the study were first editions: 347 books consisting of 59.2% of all the books analyzed. For the most part, the number and percentage of the books in the study fall off precipitously as one increases edition numbers. There were four books in their 10th edition and another four in their 11th edition.

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF BOOKS BY EDITION		
Edition	<i>n</i>	percent
1	347	59.2
2	81	13.8
3	38	6.5
4	41	7.0
5	26	4.4
6	18	3.1
7	14	2.4
8	6	1.0
9	7	1.2
10	4	.7
11	4	.7
Total	586	100.0

The majority of books in the study were classified as textbooks with 391 books representing 66.7% of the sample (See Table 3, below). The next largest category was edited collections of reprinted articles consisting of 109 books accounting for 18.6% of the sample. There were 17 (2.9%) books classified as original research and another 38 (6.5%) books that were collections of original research. The smallest category included 10 workbooks accounting for 1.7% of the sample.

Turning to the author and institutional rankings, this study expanded slightly the goal of obtaining the top 25 producing institutions, measured by the institutional affiliations of

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF BOOKS BY PRESTIGE		
Level of Prestige	<i>n</i>	percent
6 – Original Research	17	2.9
5 – Collection of Original Research	38	6.5
4 – Textbook	391	66.7
3 - Abbreviated Textbook	21	3.6
2 – Edited Collection (Reprints)	109	8.6
1 – Workbook	10	1.7



authors as originally conceived by Fabianic (1981, 2002), Sorenson and Pilgrim (2002), and Steiner and Schwartz (2006) to 37, but similarly ranked the productivity of authors. As a result, Table 4 [below] presents the top producing book authors by raw authorships and then with authorships divided per capita.

**TABLE 4. AUTHOR RANKING WEIGHTED BY BOTH PRESTIGE & EDITION**

Author  (ranks)	Publications by contribution				Publications w/ prestige and edition				Raw Publications	
	Divided equally		Favoring first author		Divided equally		Favoring first author			
Roberson, Cliff	(1)	5.83	(1)	5.75	(1)	38.64	(2)	38.00	(1)	8
Schmalleger, Frank	(2)	5.50	(2)	5.50	(3)	36.00	(3)	36.00	(9)	6
Kappeler, Victor E.	(3)	5.33	(2)	5.50	(6)	31.64	(6)	33.00	(1)	8
Siegel, Larry J.	(3)	5.33	(2)	5.50	(1)	39.64	(1)	41.00	(4)	7
Pollock, Joycelyn M.	(3)	5.33	(5)	5.25	(5)	34.32	(5)	34.00	(4)	7
Champion, Dean J.	(6)	5.00	(6)	5.00	(3)	36.00	(3)	36.00	(1)	8
Stevens, Dennis J.	(6)	5.00	(6)	5.00	(16)	18.00	(16)	18.00	(13)	5
Bartollas, Clemens	(8)	4.50	(8)	4.50	(8)	25.50	(10)	25.50	(9)	6
Smith, Christopher E.	(9)	4.33	(8)	4.50	(13)	21.32	(13)	22.00	(9)	6
Albanese, Jay S.	(9)	4.33	(8)	4.50	(12)	21.65	(12)	22.50	(13)	5
Oliver, Willard M.	(11)	4.00	(11)	4.00	(15)	20.00	(15)	20.00	(13)	5
Holmes, Stephen T.	(12)	3.83	(13)	3.75	(19)	17.64	(18)	17.00	(4)	7
Walker, Samuel E.	(12)	3.83	(11)	4.00	(11)	22.64	(11)	24.00	(13)	5
Abadinsky, Howard	(14)	3.50	(14)	3.50	(7)	28.00	(7)	28.00	(20)	4
Holmes, Ronald M.	(15)	3.33	(16)	3.25	(20)	16.64	(20)	16.00	(4)	7
Peak, Kenneth J.	(15)	3.33	(14)	3.50	(9)	24.64	(9)	26.00	(13)	5
Crank, John P.	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(16)	18.00	(16)	18.00	(20)	4
Muraskin, Roslyn	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(29)	10.00	(29)	10.00	(20)	4
Reichel, Philip L.	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(14)	21.00	(14)	21.00	(25)	3
Conklin, John E.	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(22)	15.00	(21)	15.00	(25)	3
Martin, Gus	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(23)	14.00	(24)	14.00	(25)	3
Reese, Renford	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(25)	12.00	(26)	12.00	(25)	3
Weizer, Paul I.	(17)	3.00	(19)	3.00	(30)	8.00	(30)	8.00	(25)	3
Gaines, Larry K.	(24)	2.99	(28)	2.75	(18)	17.96	(18)	17.00	(4)	7
del Carmen, Rolando V.	(25)	2.86	(16)	3.25	(10)	23.80	(8)	27.00	(9)	6
Thurman, Quint C.	(26)	2.83	(19)	3.00	(26)	11.82	(25)	12.50	(13)	5
Walker, Jeffery T.	(26)	2.83	(28)	2.75	(21)	15.64	(21)	15.00	(13)	5
Arrigo, Bruce A.	(26)	2.83	(19)	3.00	(28)	11.32	(27)	12.00	(20)	4
Worrall, John L.	(26)	2.83	(28)	2.75	(27)	11.65	(28)	11.25	(20)	4
Hemmens, Craig K.	(30)	2.82	(16)	3.25	(24)	12.92	(21)	15.00	(4)	7

*(italicized rankings skip intermediate authors not ranked in top 30 for first column)*



**TABLE 5. BOOK PUBLICATION PRODUCTIVITY BY INSTITUTION,  
WEIGHTED BY CONTRIBUTION, PRESTIGE AND EDITION (CONTINUED)**

Institution (ranks)	Publications by contribution				Publications w/ prestige and edition				Publications unweighted	
	Divided equally		Favoring first author		Divided equally		Favoring first author			
University of South Florida	(16)	6.90	(16)	6.92	(23)	31.88	(23)	31.34	(16)	11
Texas State University- San Marcos	(17)	6.83	(17)	6.58	(7)	52.14	(8)	51.17	(9)	14
Virginia Commonwealth University	(18)	6.33	(18)	6.50	(26)	30.15	(25)	31.00	(24)	8
Washburn University	(19)	5.83	(19)	5.75	(14)	38.64	(14)	38.00	(24)	8
St. Johns University	(19)	5.83	(19)	5.75	(24)	31.64	(25)	31.00	(28)	6
University of Florida	(21)	5.82	(22)	5.58	(20)	34.62	(21)	33.25	(16)	11
University of Cincinnati	(21)	5.82	(19)	5.75	(25)	31.57	(24)	31.25	(16)	11
Univ. of North Carolina- Pembroke	(23)	5.50	(23)	5.50	(17)	36.00	(17)	36.00	(28)	6
East Carolina University	(23)	5.50	(23)	5.50	(27)	30.00	(27)	30.00	(26)	7
University of Miami	(25)	5.32	(25)	5.25	(33)	26.28	(33)	26.00	(23)	9
Texas A&M International University	(26)	5.00	(27)	5.00	(10)	46.00	(10)	46.00	(26)	7
University of South Carolina	(27)	4.99	(25)	5.25	(36)	24.28	(35)	25.00	(12)	12
California State Univ.- Long Beach	(28)	4.83	(29)	4.75	(16)	36.64	(17)	36.00	(28)	6
Florida Atlantic University	(28)	4.83	(29)	4.75	(19)	35.32	(19)	35.00	(20)	10
Bowling Green State University	(30)	4.75	(27)	5.00	(32)	27.00	(30)	29.00	(16)	11

Table 4 gives the number one ranking to Cliff Roberson (Washburn University) in four of five measures, with Larry J. Siegel (University of Massachusetts at Lowell) rising to first ranking on the most complex weighting and sharing it with Roberson on the closely related weighting. On the raw number of books on display at the ACJS conference in 2006, Roberson shares the number-one rank, at eight publications, with Victor E. Kappeler (Eastern Kentucky University) and Dean J. Champion (Minot State University). Frank Schmalleger (University of North Carolina - Pembroke) was in second (publications by contribution) or third place (publication by contribution with prestige and edition) on the weightings, though he shared the ninth rank for his six raw publications with Rolando V. del Carmen (Sam Houston State University), Clemens Bartollas (University of Northern Iowa) (consistently in the top 10), and Christopher E. Smith (Michigan State University). Jocelyn M. Pollock (Texas State University - San Marcos) was ranked fifth in most of the weighted rankings, third in the equally shared publications,

and shared the fourth rank for raw publications with Larry Siegel, Stephen T. Holmes, Ronald M. Holmes, Larry K. Gaines, and Craig K. Hemmens, all with seven books on display. Some authors, such as Dennis J. Stevens and Jay S. Albanese, ranking sixth and eighth respectively on the simpler rankings, sank out of the top ten on the more complex weightings, which in turn buoyed others like del Carmen, Howard Abadinsky, and Kenneth J. Peak into the top ten.

Turning to institutional productivity, in Table 5, the number one place was held by John Jay College of Criminal Justice, tied and closely followed or led by Eastern Kentucky University on all measures. The top six on Table 5 really did not change significantly across the alternate weightings and included these two institutions followed by California State San Bernardino, Sam Houston State University, the University of Louisville, and Michigan State University. As can be seen, the two alternate methods of dividing authorships mattered little; we report both, as Steiner and Schwartz (2006) did, but similarly the differences are slight, never causing more than a change of two places in the rankings. The rankings weighted just by dividing authorships then placed Wichita State University, Boise State University, Northeastern University, and Central Florida University to round out the top ten. Weighting by edition and prestige did have more effects on these next places as East Tennessee State University, University of Massachusetts - Lowell, Texas State - San Marcos, and Texas A & M International rounded out the top ten. Interestingly enough, whereas most of the top journal article producing institutions came from doctoral programs (Sorenson & Pilgrim, 2002; Steiner & Schwartz, 2006), several top book-producing institutions do not have a doctoral programs, but rather noted masters programs. Raw authorships are also reported, and the top six are largely the same with minor shuffling—the ascent of Northeastern University to the fifth spot, and the sharing of the sixth spot between Sam Houston State University and East Tennessee State University.

Table 6 [next page] presents the averaged productivity of criminal justice authors, which takes the reported productivity from Table 5 and divides it by the number of faculty in the department. This had the intuitive effect of boosting a few very small departments that did not make the original list and now placed them at the top of the list, such as the University of Massachusetts - Boston and Normandale Community College, which moved into the top three, and Castleton State College and California State Polytech - Pomona, which moved into the top ten. The inclusion of these four institutions into the top ten is revealing in itself, but it is conversely revealing that when faculty size increases above the mean of 12.9, the descent down the list increases dramatically. John Jay College, Central Florida University, and the University of Cincinnati were pushed off the list completely, while others, such as Michigan State University and South Florida University were pushed further down the list. The positions of the top six or seven were reasonably stable across the table, similar to the productivity reported in Table 5, with California State University - Bernardino, Texas A&M International, and Washburn University filling these ranks. The exceptions were Boise State University and Eastern Tennessee State University, whose positions were more effected by the weighting methodology, with Boise State University making the fourth rank on the divided weighting, and Eastern Tennessee State University in sixth (favoring first author) and seventh (divided equally) when the weighting of edition and prestige were added.

While “average publishing productivity” alone may seem important for an administrator, here the approach of Fabianic (2002), of comparing like to like, shows its merit. Trying to judge the relative merit of a small college faculty to a large Ph.D. granting institution where refereed publications are the primary coin of the realm may seem a distraction. This table may be seen

**TABLE 6. BOOK PUBLICATION PRODUCTIVITY BY INSTITUTION,  
AVERAGED PER CAPITA AND WEIGHTED BY CONTRIBUTION, PRESTIGE AND EDITION**

# Faculty	Institution  (ranks)	Publications by contribution				Publications w/ prestige and edition			
		Divided equally		Favoring first author		Divided equally		Favoring first author	
4	University of Massachusetts-Boston	(1)	1.75	(1)	1.75	(3)	7.49	(3)	7.50
8	California State University- San Bernardino	(2)	1.44	(2)	1.41	(4)	6.99	(4)	6.84
3	Normandale Community College	(3)	1.33	(3)	1.33	(1)	10.67	(1)	10.67
9	Boise State University	(4)	1.05	(4)	1.08	(12)	3.93	(10)	4.08
5	Texas A&M International University	(5)	1.00	(5)	1.05	(2)	9.20	(2)	9.20
6	Washburn University	(6)	0.97	(7)	0.96	(5)	6.44	(5)	6.33
15	Eastern Kentucky University	(7)	0.95	(6)	0.97	(6)	5.57	(7)	5.67
12	University of Louisville	(8)	0.90	(8)	0.92	(9)	4.73	(9)	4.82
4	California State Polytechnic-Pomona	(9)	0.88	(10)	0.88	(10)	4.00	(11)	4.00
5	Castleton State College	(10)	0.86	(12)	0.85	(38)	1.86	(41)	1.60
11	Wichita State University	(11)	0.86	(9)	0.89	(20)	3.09	(19)	3.18
9	East Tennessee State University	(12)	0.81	(10)	0.88	(7)	5.31	(6)	5.82
4	University of Northern Colorado-Greeley	(13)	0.75	(13)	0.75	(8)	5.25	(8)	5.25
9	Virginia Commonwealth University	(14)	0.70	(14)	0.72	(18)	3.35	(18)	3.44
8	East Carolina University	(15)	0.69	(15)	0.69	(14)	3.75	(14)	3.75
7	University of Northern Iowa	(16)	0.64	(16)	0.64	(15)	3.64	(16)	3.64
8	Bowling Green State University	(17)	0.59	(17)	0.59	(17)	3.38	(17)	3.63
6	University of Scranton	(18)	0.58	(18)	0.58	(10)	4.00	(11)	4.00
13	University of Massachusetts-Lowell	(19)	0.55	(19)	0.56	(13)	3.87	(13)	3.92
8	University of Nevada-Reno	(20)	0.54	(19)	0.56	(16)	3.58	(14)	3.75
15	Rutgers University-Newark	(21)	0.53	(21)	0.54	(28)	2.57	(26)	2.66

(Continued on next page)

**TABLE 6. BOOK PUBLICATION PRODUCTIVITY BY INSTITUTION, AVERAGED PER CAPITA AND WEIGHTED BY CONTRIBUTION, PRESTIGE AND EDITION (CONTINUED)**

# Faculty	Institution  (ranks)	Publications by contribution				Publications w/ prestige and edition			
		Divided equally		Favoring first author		Divided equally		Favoring first author	
9	University of Minnesota-Duluth	(22)	0.52	(22)	0.53	(25)	2.70	(27)	2.61
9	New Mexico State University	(23)	0.50	(23)	0.50	(19)	3.11	(20)	3.11
22	Michigan State University	(24)	0.47	(24)	0.48	(25)	2.70	(25)	2.73
10	Southern Illinois University-Carbondale	(25)	0.45	(25)	0.45	(30)	2.30	(29)	2.30
13	University of North Carolina-Pembroke	(26)	0.42	(27)	0.42	(24)	2.77	(25)	2.77
27	Sam Houston State University	(27)	0.41	(27)	0.42	(32)	2.06	(30)	2.11
19	University of Nebraska-Omaha	(27)	0.41	(28)	0.41	(29)	2.38	(29)	2.37
11	University of Nevada-Las Vegas	(27)	0.41	(28)	0.41	(36)	1.93	(33)	2.00
12	University of South Carolina	(27)	0.41	(26)	0.44	(31)	2.03	(31)	2.09
17	University of South Florida	(27)	0.41	(28)	0.41	(37)	1.88	(37)	1.84

more as a footnote to overall productivity, but it also gives administrators an insight into the productivity of some large masters programs like Eastern Kentucky University, and others such as Bowling Green State University, which has presented previously in Steiner and Schwartz (2006) and also in this study.

It should also be noted that the institution of the author holding the top spot is actually ranked eighth and lower in the results. Although Larry Siegel was crucial to the University of Massachusetts at Lowell placing fourteenth or eighth, he was not the sole reason. This finding reflects the results of Sorenson and Pilgrim’s (2002) study on institutional affiliation of authors in leading criminal justice and criminology journals, that although individual faculty members were crucial to the overall productivity of an institution, the institutions (at least in the top ten) did not make it there through the efforts of only one author. It should also be pointed out that many of the colleges/universities were greatly assisted by the proclivity of several academic institutions to collaborate in authoring books by its faculty. While this assuredly boosted a number of these institutions, including the one holding the top spot, Eastern Kentucky University, it is generally acknowledged that collaboration is held in high esteem, not only among criminal justice academics but academia as a whole.



One final point of interest is that when compared with the most recent study of institutional affiliation of authors in leading criminal justice and criminology journals from 1995-2004 (Steiner & Schwartz, 2006), of the top 30 book-producing institutions only 6 were also on the list of top journal productivity: Michigan State University, Sam Houston State University, University of Cincinnati, University of Central Florida, University of Florida, and University of Nebraska at Omaha. In fact, three of the top book-publishing institutions were not even on the top 24 journal list: Eastern Kentucky University, John Jay College, and University of Louisville; Northeastern University ranked 16th in 2000-2004, but did not appear in the 1995-1999 list (Steiner & Schwartz, 2006; Sorenson & Pilgrim, 2002). This suggests that journal article producing institutions may produce less books and vice versa. Another way of looking at this finding is the fact that only one of the top five journal-producing institutions, University of Cincinnati, even appeared on the top 30 book ranking.

## CONCLUSION

The present study assessed the institutional affiliation of criminal justice book authors by analyzing the books available at the 2006 annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. From these 586 books, written by 627 different authors, from 305 institutions for a total of 1,010 authorships, we were able to identify the top authors and the top 30 institutions producing books in the field of criminal justice. We reported the data in two manners, once by reporting the productivity by institution including weights for contribution, edition, and prestige. The second manner in which our data was reported was by controlling for the size of each institution's faculty by averaging per capita and including weights for contribution, edition, and prestige. In both cases, the weighting by contribution reported two sets of data as well, the first dividing credit equally among multiple authors and the second by giving the lead author half-credit and the remaining authors being divided equally by the remaining half-credit.

The top author position was given to Cliff Roberson (Washburn University) by a nose over Larry J. Siegel (University of Massachusetts at Lowell), with strong showings, ties and inconsistencies among weightings considered, from Frank Schmalleger, Victor E. Kappeler, and Dean J. Champion. The top institutions, when the publications were not divided by the number of faculty, were consistently two universities: Eastern Kentucky University and John Jay College. As Eastern Kentucky University placed first more often, we conclude that Eastern Kentucky University has the faculty that is most productive in publishing criminal justice books. The top three institutions, when the publications were divided by the number of faculty, were Normandale Community College, California State University at San Bernardino, and the University of Massachusetts at Boston.

We found that although top publishing authors do have the effect of increasing an institutions ranking, they are typically not the sole reason for where an institution places on the list. We also found, however, that when controlling for faculty size, many institutions with few full-time criminal justice faculty move rapidly up the list, while many of those institutions with large full-time criminal justice faculty move farther down the list. Finally, it should be noted that when compared with the most recent analyses of institutional affiliation of authors in leading criminal justice and criminology journals (Sorenson & Pilgrim, 2002; Steiner & Schwartz, 2006), we found few institutions producing both journal articles and books on an equal footing, as most institutions are ranked in only one or the other.

As previously noted, there are a number of limitations to our study. We did not look at the entire population of books published in the criminal justice field, nor did we look at book publications longitudinally, but rather only those presented at ACJS in February of 2006. In addition, we did not analyze every publisher but kept with the main publishers of criminal justice books with predominately United States authors, thus excluding from this study several publishers whose books come overwhelmingly from international authorships (e.g., Willan Publishing Company). Further, we eliminated any non-academic affiliations from the final analysis, thus purposefully looking to only academically-affiliated authors. Moreover, our analysis relied on the two weighting methodologies for authorships, and then further factored in weightings developed for this study. We did not report the effects of all combinations of these weightings, such as using or giving full weight to each author and then weighting by prestige and edition. We have tried to avoid, by dual reporting, the debate regarding multiple authorship versus sole authorship (See Rice, Cohn, & Farrington, 2005). And it must be said that any analysis that attempts a relative ranking of institutions will, in fact, be affected by the measures and methodology employed (Again, See Rice, Cohn, & Farrington, 2005). Recognizing that this study is essentially a snap-shot in time with many limitations, we still believe the results carry some weight as no other assessment to date has been conducted on institutional affiliation of authors of criminal justice books, thus we have created an alternative mechanism for assessing the criminal justice discipline.

Future studies could look at the broader scope of available criminal justice books from such venues as international publishers, university presses, and the myriad of independent publishers. In addition, future studies could simply replicate this study to assess trends in the discipline, for as Sorenson and Pilgrim (2002) point out, “trends in the discipline can be discerned when studies using a similar methodology to rate institutions are tracked over time” (p. 17). Further study using actual commercial sales information might also provide further insight, should that information be available.

Finally, we must also agree with Sorenson and Pilgrim (2002) in that examining the institutional affiliation of authors in criminal justice books is “more than a simple popularity contest” (p. 16). We believe this analysis is important for several reasons. First, we believe that books make an important contribution to the criminal justice academy and, therefore, should not be ignored as an area of research. Books are widely read by our peers, sometimes given to peer review analysis and very often post-peer review analysis (book reviews), and they disseminate knowledge through the education of the next generation of criminal justice leaders and academicians. Second, we believe that this analysis of institutional affiliation of authors in criminal justice books will present us with a deeper understanding about the specific authors and institutions that are disseminating criminal justice knowledge. Lastly, we believe that along with assessing the top producing authors and institutions, this study assists us in understanding our discipline and the type of literature it produces.

## REFERENCES

- Bain, R. (1962). The most important sociologists? *American Sociological Review*, 27, 746–748.
- Bennett, R. B., & Marshall, I. H. (1979). Criminal justice education in the United States: A profile. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7, 147–172.
- Burns, R. (2002). Assessing jail coverage in introductory criminal justice textbooks. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 13, 87–100.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1994). Who are the most-cited scholars in major American criminology and criminal justice journals? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22, 517–534.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1996). Crime and justice and the criminal justice and criminology literature. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (pp. 265–300). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1998a). 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. (1998b). Changes in the most-cited scholars in major American criminology and criminal justice journals between 1986–1990 and 1991–1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26, 99–116.
- Cohen, E. G., & Farrington, D. P., (1998c). Changes in the most-cited scholars in major international journals between 1986–1990 and 1991–1995. *British Journal of Criminology*, 38, 156–170.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1999). Changes in the most-cited scholars in twenty criminology and criminal justice journals between 1990 and 1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 345–359.
- Cohn, E. G., Farrington, D. P., & Sorensen, J. R. (2000). Journal publications of Ph.D. graduates from American criminology and criminal justice programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11, 35–48.
- Cohn, E. G., Farrington, D. P., & Wright, R. A. (1998). *Evaluating criminology and criminal justice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- DeZee, M. R. (1980). *The productivity of criminology and criminal justice faculty*. Chicago, IL: Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.
- del Carmen, A., & Bing, R. L. (2000). Academic productivity of African Americans in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11, 237–249.
- Fabianic, D. A. (1979). Relative prestige of criminal justice doctoral programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7, 135–145.
- Fabianic, D. A. (1981). Institutional affiliation of authors in selected criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 9, 247–252.
- Fabianic, D. A. (1999). Educational background of most-cited scholars. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 517–524.
- Fabianic, D. A. (2002). 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.

- Gabbidon, S. L., & Greene, H. T. (2001). The presence of African American scholarship in early American criminology texts (1918-1960). *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 12, 301–309.
- Morn, F. (1995). *Academic politics and the history of criminal justice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Parker, L. C., Jr., & 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.
- Pearson, R., Moran, T. K., Berger, J. C., Landon, K. C., McKenzie, J. R., & Bonita III, T. J. (1980). *Criminal justice education: The end of the beginning*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Rice, S. K., Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Where are they now? Trajectories of publication ‘stars’ from American criminology and criminal justice programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16, 244–264.
- Sever, B. (2005). Ranking multiple authors in criminal justice scholarship: An examination of underlying issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16, 79–100.
- Shichor, D. (1982). An analysis of citations in introductory criminology textbooks: A research note. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10, 231–237.
- Sherman, L. J. (1978). *The quality of police education: A critical review with recommendations for improving programs in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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., Patterson, A. L., & Widmayer, A. (1992). Publication productivity of faculty members in criminology and criminal justice doctoral programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3, 1–33.
- Sorensen, J., & Pilgrim, R. (2002). The institutional affiliation of authors in leading criminology and criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 11–18.
- Steiner, B., & Schwartz, J. (2006). The scholarly productivity of institutions and their faculty in leading criminology and criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 293–400.
- Taggart, W. A., & Holmes, M. D. (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. W., & Bronick, M. J. (1984). The quality of doctoral programs in deviance, criminology, and criminal justice: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12, 21–37.
- U.S. News & World Report. (2005). America’s best graduate schools. *U.S. News & World Report*, 138, 48–78.
- Ward, R. H., & Webb, V. J. (1984). *Quest for quality*. New York: University Publications.
- Withrow, B. L., Weible, K., & Bennett, J. (2004). Aren’t they all the same? A comparative analysis of introductory criminal justice textbooks. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15, 1–18.
- Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Thornberry, T. P. (1978). *Evaluating criminology*. New York: Elsevier.
- Wright, R. A. (1994). Criminology textbook, 1918 to 1993: A comprehensive bibliography. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 5, 51–256.

- Wright, R. A. (1995). The most-cited scholars in criminology: A comparison of textbooks and journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23, 303–311.
- Wright, R. A. (1997). The most-cited scholars in criminology and criminal justice textbooks, 1989 to 1993. *The Justice Professional*, 10, 199–213.
- Wright, R. A. (2000). Recent changes in the most-cited scholars in criminology: A comparison of textbooks and journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 117–128.
- Wright, R. A. (2002). Recent changes in the most-cited scholars in criminal justice textbooks. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 183–195.
- Wright, R. A., Bryant, K. M., & Miller, J. M. (2001). The most-cited authors and works in white-collar crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 17, 383–399.
- Wright, R. A., & Cohn, E. G. (1996). The most-cited scholars in criminal justice textbooks, 1989 to 1993. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 459–467.
- Wright, R. A., & Friedrichs, D. O. (1998). The most-cited scholars and works in critical criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9, 211–231.
- Wright, R. A., & Miller, J. M. (1998). The most-cited scholars and works in police studies. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 21, 240–254.
- Wright, R. A., & Miller, J. M. (1999). The most-cited scholars and works in corrections. *The Prison Journal*, 79, 5–22.
- Wright, R. A., Miller, J. M., & Gallagher, P. (2000). Citations to critical criminology in introductory criminology textbooks. *The Justice Professional*, 13, 125–142.
- Wright, R. A., & Rourke, J. (1999). The most-cited scholars and works in criminological theory. In W. S. Laufer & F. Adler (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory* (pp. 493–512). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Wright, R. A., & Sheridan, C. (1997). The most-cited scholars and works in women and crime publications. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 9, 41–60.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

**Willard M. Oliver** is a Professor of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. He is the author of eight books, including *Community-Oriented Policing* 4th Edition (Prentice Hall, 2004), *A History of Crime and Criminal Justice* (Allyn & Bacon, 2006), *Policing for Homeland Security* (Prentice Hall, 2007) and *The Public Policy of Crime and Criminal Justice* (Prentice Hall, 2006). His research interests include policing, public policy, and criminal justice history.

**Sam Swindell, J.D.**, is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at West Virginia State University, where he teaches criminal law. He is completing his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. His research interests include criminal law, procedure and the courts.

**Ken Balusek, J.D.** is a Visiting Assistant Professor at The University of Houston Downtown where he teaches ethics, corrections, research methods, and statistics. He is completing his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. His research interests include corrections, criminological theory and sex offenders.

**John J. Marks, Jr.** is a Doctoral Student in the Criminal Justice program at Sam Houston State University. His research interests include small-town policing, rural sheriffs, and game wardens.