

Editorial board representation in Criminology: A call to address racial disparities

BREETZKE, G. D.

Associate Professor, PhD, Department of Geography, Geoinformatics and Meteorology, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002, South Africa (Tel: 0027 12 420 4318; Cell: 0781184870; E-mail: greg.breetzke@up.ac.za; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0324-2254>)

Abstract

There is increased awareness of the structural exclusionary practices that permeate throughout almost all sectors of society, including higher education. One small but meaningful way in which this marginalization manifests itself throughout academia more generally, and within the knowledge production process more specifically, is through editorial board representation. This study investigates the racial breakdown of scholars listed as editorial board members for all journals under the ‘Criminology and Penology’ category of the Clarivate Analytics’ Web of Science database. The study also examines the extent to which the racial representation of editorial board members is associated with journal quality. Almost 90% of all editorial board members across all Criminology journals are White. The findings of this study highlight not only the glaring lack of racial diversity in editorial board compositions within Criminology but is indicative of a broader systematic marginalization of certain groups that continues to perpetuate throughout academia in general. A number of potential strategies that can be used to increase the racial representativeness of editorial boards are outlined.

Plain Language Summary

This study examines the composition of editorial board members within the discipline of criminology. Specifically, the study examines the racial representation of editorial board members. I find that that almost 90% of all editorial board members across all criminology journals are White.

Keywords: racial, diversity, editorial boards, equity, marginalization

Introduction

Systemic racial inequalities are evident - and broadly acknowledged - across almost all sectors of society (see Banaji et al., 2021; Troyna, 2012; Williams, 2012). One sector of society which is particularly notable for its racial and structural inequalities is higher education (see Davis et al., 2015; Denaro et al., 2022). These racial disparities are evident in a myriad of ways including academic faculty profiles (Breetzke et al., 2022), degree attainment (Bhopal, 2017), sense of belonging (Rainey et al., 2018), recipients of major grant (Chen et al., 2022; Ginter et al., 2011; Morris, 2023), and student loan debt (Addo et al., 2016), among numerous others. Analysis on the composition of editorial boards provides further insight into the racial inequalities inherent in higher education in general and the academic publishing process specifically. Bibliometric analyses of editorial boards across a range of disciplines has shown that the vast majority of editorial board members are White (Chakravartty et al., 2018; Holman Jones, 2018; Rakhra et al., 2021), with few exceptions. Within Criminology specifically, researchers have similarly found the under-representation of non-Whites as editorial board members (see Gabbidon et al., 2004; Greene et al., 2018; Young & Sulton, 1991), although this analysis has only ever been undertaken using a sample of journals in the discipline. This study extends this previous work by examining the racial breakdown of scholars listed as editorial board members for all journals under the 'Criminology and Penology' category of the Clarivate Analytics' Web of Science database. The extent to which the racial representation of editorial board members is associated with journal impact factor - as an indication of journal reach and quality - is also examined. Previous work has primarily investigated inequalities in editorial board composition in Criminology and Criminal Justice by gender (see Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Toro-Pascua & Martín-

González, 2021), and regional representation (see Faraldo-Cabana & Lamela, 2021), with far fewer studies investigating the extent to which scholars from certain racial groups are represented on editorial journal boards. This study should be of interest to journal editors and publishers given their responsibility for determining the social character of their editorial boards. In fact, the study is important to all Criminologists who believe that a more diverse and equitable Criminological academe is vital for the future of the discipline.

A Brief History of Crime and Race

The historical relationship between crime and race is complicated and multi-faceted. A detailed explication of this history is beyond the scope of this work (and has been expertly articulated elsewhere (see Peterson, 2017; Phillips et al., 2020)) but one notable paradox within this relationship warrants some attention. That is, the gross over-representation of non-Whites at every stage of the criminal justice process (see Clark, 2019; Dighton, 2003), and the concomitant under-representation of non-Whites theorizing crime, and informing policy aimed at addressing its causes and consequences (see Thomas, 2023). The results of studies examining this racial paradox are truly astounding. In simplified crude ‘chronological’ order, non-Whites are more likely to be stopped and searched (Pierson et al., 2020), frisked (Khan et al., 2021), arrested (Stevenson & Mayson, 2018), incarcerated (Nellis, 2016), wrongly incarcerated (Gross et al., 2022), denied plea bargains (Berdejó, 2018), given harsher sentences (Johnson et al., 2011), convicted (Monk, 2018), wrongly convicted (Gross et al., 2017), sentenced to death (Amnesty International, 2003), and wrongfully sentenced to death (Gross et al., 2022) than Whites. Moreover, non-Whites are also more likely to be victims of crime (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1997), be more fearful of crime (Parker et al., 1993; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981), and, distrust the police (Pryce & Chenane, 2021) than Whites. The existential and epistemological

factors behind these trends are complex but are thought to largely center around the inherent socioeconomic inequalities that exist across racial groups (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1997). According to Ghandnoosh (2015) four features of criminal justice exacerbate these underlying socio-economic disparities. These include a number of ostensibly ‘race-neutral’ criminal justice policies which have a disparate racial impact; implicit racial bias that leads criminal justice practitioners to punish non-Whites more severely than other groups; resource allocation decisions which disadvantage low-income defendants (who are disproportionately non-Whites), and, lastly, criminal justice policies which exacerbate socioeconomic inequalities by imposing collateral consequences on those with criminal records and by diverting public spending away from preventative measures.

Regardless of the reasons provided for these disparities it seems a remarkable fact that non-Whites are largely absent from playing any meaningful role in the main scientific discipline tasked with understanding crime and its causation. As a discipline, Criminology is, or should be, fundamentally connected to individuals involved in the criminal justice system (Tapia et al., 2022), yet there appears to be a fundamental disconnect in this regard. Indeed, non-White scholars are grossly under-represented in Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJ) programs both as students and faculty. In terms of the former, Heard and Bing (1993) found that there were fewer African Americans with doctorates in CCJ in the US in 1987 than were states in the country. Over 25 years later, Greene et al. (2018) found that African American doctoral students are still grossly under-represented in CCJ doctoral programs throughout the US with only 11% of doctoral students being classified as African American. In terms of faculty profiles, a recent study by Leon (2021) found that over 80% of academic faculty at 32 ‘top graduate schools for Criminology’ in the US were White. The researcher also found that there were numerous large and highly-ranked CCJ departments with *zero* African American tenure-line faculty members. Moreover, when attempts are made at redressing this imbalance, Mitchell

(2020) notes that most often only one African American tenured/tenure track professor is appointed in each CCJ programme which, he argues, amounts to 'racial tokenism' (pg. 338). Within criminological scholarship itself there are systemic racial inequalities. That is, mainstream criminological texts are predominantly authored by White males (Gabbidon & Martin, 2010), while prescribed reading lists are mainly authored by Whites (Stockdale & Sweeney, 2022). In terms of academic publishing, the trends are equally discouraging with non-Whites having substantially lower number of publications than their White counterparts (del Carmen & Bing, 2000; Potter et al., 2011). Non-White scholars were also recently found to endure longer waiting times between the submission and acceptance of their manuscripts (Liu et al., 2023), and, when published, their papers most often received fewer citations (Kozlowski et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2023).

A final manifestation of these racial imbalances lies in editorial board composition. Editors, and their editorial boards, determine which articles are published and in doing so, conjointly determine the direction and trajectory of a particular discipline. As a result, they have been labelled as 'gatekeepers' of disciplinary values and knowledge in that they exert considerable control over scientific discourse (Burgess & Shaw, 2010; Fogarty & Liao, 2009; Newhouse & Brandeau, 2021). Past studies on ethnic and racial diversity in editorial boards has found that the majority of members across a range of disciplines are White (Beath et al., 2021; Rakhra et al., 2021; Rianoet et al., 2022; Shim et al., 2021). Only a handful of studies have examined editorial board membership in Criminology by racial group. These include Young and Sulton (1991) who found that only two of the 157 editorial board members listed in 10 of the leading refereed journals' in Criminology were African-American. Roughly a decade later Gabbidon et al. (2004) again found that only 16 African Americans had served on the editorial boards of the 10 leading journals in the discipline since 1992 while more recently Greene et al. (2018) found that only 18 African Americans had served on editorial boards of

the ten leading journals in Criminology since 2004. These studies have similarly found the consistent and gross under-representation of African Americans on editorial boards in the discipline. More worryingly, these trends do not appear to have changed over the past thirty years despite an increase in the number of African American students enrolled in CCJ programs (Updegrave et al., 2018), and an increase in the number of African American tenured faculty in CCJ programs (Greene et al., 2018).

This study extends this literature by examining editorial board memberships of all 69 journals listed under the ‘Criminology and Penology’ categories of the Clarivate Analytics’ Web of Science database. In doing so, the study answers the following two questions: (1) What is the racial representation of editorial board members in Criminology and Penology? And (2) to what extent is the racial representation of editorial board members associated with journal impact factor?

Data and Method

The race of editorial board members for all 69 journals listed under the Criminology and Penology¹ category of the Clarivate Analytics’ Web of Science database was considered in this study. It is readily acknowledged that grouping all Criminology journals together in the analysis could mask subtle variations in the composition of editorial boards across sub-disciplines. The focus of this study was, however, to provide a broad overview of editorial board composition by race, future research could tease out the nature of the relationship between race and editorial board membership by sub-discipline or any other another categorization. One journal (i.e. *Revija za Kriminalistiko in Kriminologijo*) did not list the

¹ From this point onwards, the Criminology-Penology category in the WoS database is referred to only as ‘Criminology’.

composition of the editorial boards and was, excluded in the analysis. Following similar studies (see Gabbidon et al., 2004; Greene et al., 2018), a content analysis as well as a manual review was undertaken to group editorial board members as either White and non-White (see Morgan et al., 2021). This process included, among others, an initial inspection of the editorial board members' full name and available data (including institutional website, available photos, and published media); for cases in which race was not certain, attempts were made to discern this through Internet searches using photographs, and other publicly available information. It is readily acknowledged that the intentional bifurcation of race into Whites and non-Whites necessarily excludes certain categories of race that individuals may identify as. Moreover, it is acknowledged that race is a concept that is notoriously hard to define, and can never be reduced to 'self-evident and visually obvious human differences' (Obasogie, 2010, p.586). Indeed, this broad binary categorization could also mask other racial subtleties that could exist when examining editorial board membership. Specifically, the under-, and/or over-representation of certain groups within the non-White category such as African Americans, Latinos, or Asian-Americans as editorial board members. This will necessarily influence the results somewhat and not allow any specific inferences to be made regarding finer racial disparities in editorial board membership. This issue notwithstanding, the aim of this study was simply to provide some initial insight into the representation of editorial board members by race. Importantly, all members of academic editorial boards were included regardless of title (e.g. Editor, Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor, Assistant Editor, Editorial Board, International Advisory Board). Data were collected between February-June 2021. The resulting descriptive analysis is based on 2627 editorial board members. The percentage of each racial group was then calculated.

Last, the journal impact factor was used to determine the relationship between the racial composition of editorial board membership and journal quality. This was done in order to determine whether certain racial groups are more likely to serve on the editorial boards of

‘higher’ or ‘lower’ ranked journals (based on their impact factor). In order to do this, the mean number of editorial board members for journals within each impact factor quartile (1-4) per racial group was initially calculated. Next, the mean number of editorial board members in quartile four (the lowest ranked journals) was divided by the mean number of editorial board members in quartile one (the highest ranked journals) to create a Q4:Q1 ratio for each racial group. A Q4:Q1 ratio below one indicates a higher mean number of editorial board members in quartile one journals (higher ranked), relative to the mean number of editorial board members in quartile four journals (lower ranked), while a Q4:Q1 ratio greater than one indicates the opposite. The significance of this association is determined using a Spearman’s rank correlation (r^2). That is, a correlation was run between the mean number of editorial board members across journal quartiles (1-4) for each racial group (White and non-White). It is acknowledged that the use of impact factors to measure journal quality is contentious. Impact factors have been found to be prone to manipulation (to increase a journals’ ranking) (Hickman et al., 2019), abuse (such as coercive and self-citations) (Fong & Wilhite, 2017) and fraud (such as the emergence of journals touting fake impact factors) (Larivière, 2019), among others. These issues notwithstanding, the use of an industry-standard, universally known metric (however flawed) assessing scholar publishing ‘quality’ globally was most applicable in the analysis.

Results

Descriptive statistics of the list of journals used in the study are shown in Table 1. Included in the table is the total number of editorial board members across all journals as well as for journals stratified by journal quartile (ranging from 1-4). Also included is the minimum, maximum, and mean number of editorial board members in all journals and by journal quartile.

Table 1: The number of editorial board members of Criminology and Penology journals listed on the Clarivate Analytics' Web of

Science database

| | Count | Min | Mean | Max | SD | Mean impact factor |
|------------|-------|-----|------|-----|------|--------------------|
| All | 2627 | 6 | 38.6 | 112 | 18.4 | 1.7 |
| Quartile 1 | 783 | 7 | 46.1 | 112 | 24.4 | 3.2 |
| Quartile 2 | 650 | 6 | 38.2 | 72 | 16.7 | 1.6 |
| Quartile 3 | 658 | 7 | 38.7 | 65 | 14.5 | 1.2 |
| Quartile 4 | 536 | 9 | 31.5 | 63 | 15.1 | 0.7 |

The mean impact factor for all journals as well as for journals stratified by quartile is included in the last column. There are two main observations from Table 1. First, journals in the highest quartile have, on average, 14.6 more editorial board members per journal than journals in the lowest quartile. Interestingly, journals in the highest quartile also have the highest variability in terms of the number of editorial board members (indicated by the highest standard deviation score). A cursory review of the data shows that, for example, *Crime and Justice-A Review of Research* (Q1) has six editorial board members while the *Psychology of Violence* (Q1) has over 100 editorial board members. Second, journals in the highest quartile have, on average, impact factors more than 4.5 times higher than journals in the lowest quartile which suggests significant differences in quality, at least by this metric, between the most and least prestigious journal outlets.

Approximately 89% of all editorial board members for journals listed under Criminology and Penology in the Web of Science are White (see Table 2). There is little variation in the percentage of non-White editorial board members by journal quartile with percentages hovering consistently around 11%.

Table 2: The percentage of editorial board members in Criminology and Penology by race

| | White | | Non-white | | Total | |
|------------|-------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | No | Percent |
| All* | 2333 | 89 | 294 | 11 | 2627 | 100 |
| Quartile 1 | 701 | 90 | 82 | 10 | 783 | 100 |
| Quartile 2 | 573 | 88 | 77 | 12 | 650 | 100 |
| Quartile 3 | 586 | 89 | 72 | 11 | 658 | 100 |
| Quartile 4 | 473 | 88 | 63 | 12 | 536 | 100 |

A list of the ten most racially diverse journals in terms of the composition of their editorial boards is shown in Table 3. The most diverse journal in terms of its editorial board composition

is the *Asian Journal of Criminology* with 65% of its editorial board being non-White²; this is followed by *Race and Justice* of which 54% of its editorial board are non-White. Interestingly, these are the only two journals (out of 69 journals) which have more non-White editorial board members than White editorial board members. For these two journals in particular it is somewhat understandable that they exhibit such racial profiles. For the *Asian Journal of Criminology*, the editorial board composition is strongly linked to the region in which the journal was originally founded. The *Asian Journal of Criminology* was co-founded in 2006 by scholars at the University of Macau, and the University of Hong Kong respectively. Moreover, the journal advances the study of Criminology and Criminal Justice, focusing specifically on Asian contexts so it is understandable that the majority of editorial board members are of non-White origin. It is interesting to note, however, that despite its racial diversity roughly 40% of editorial board members at this journal have academic affiliations outside of Asia. *Race and Justice* on the other hand advances scholarship on race, ethnicity, and justice issues with a specific focus on the deconstruction of racialized normative beliefs, perspectives, institutions, and structures which lends itself to a more inclusive and diverse editorial base. These, and other journals such as the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* (30% non-White editorial board membership) and *Feminist Criminology* (30% non-White editorial board membership) were created, in part, to increase internationalization and diversity of representation in the field. If you exclude these four journals, then roughly 92% of editorial board members for the remaining 65 journals are White. Approximately 17% (n = 12) of journals do not have a single non-White editorial board member. This includes the second highest ranked journal – by impact factor - *Trauma Violence & Abuse* with all of its editorial board members being White.

² Incidentally, the largest percentage of editorial board members for this journal are affiliated with higher education institutions in Hong Kong (23%), followed, surprisingly, by the United States (20%), and China (13%).

Table 3: Top 10 journals with highest percentage non-White editorial board membership (ranked by the percentage of non-White board members)

| | Total number of board members | Percentage of non-White board members | Impact factor |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Asian Journal of Criminology | 37 | 65 | 1.056 |
| Race and Justice | 39 | 54 | 1.625 |
| International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology | 63 | 30 | 1.026 |
| Feminist Criminology | 49 | 27 | 1.535 |
| Journal of Interpersonal Violence | 32 | 25 | 3.573 |
| Women & Criminal Justice | 40 | 25 | 0.875 |
| American Journal of Criminal Justice | 44 | 23 | 1.181 |
| Theoretical Criminology | 51 | 22 | 2.818 |
| Journal of Aggression Maltreatment & Trauma | 52 | 17 | 1.030 |
| Security Journal | 61 | 16 | 0.838 |

The relationship between the race of editorial board members and journal quartiles (by impact factor) is shown in Table 4. The Q4:Q1 ratios for both racial groups are both below one which indicates that there are, on average, more editorial board members in quartile one journals (higher ranked) relative to quartile four journals (lower ranked) for both racial groups. In fact, there is a subtle negative gradient for editorial board members in both racial groups. This could be due to the fact that there are, on average, roughly 15 more editorial board members in quartile one journals than quartile four journals. It is notable, however, that editorial board membership from both racial groups increase across journals stratified by impact factor however this trend is only significant for Whites. Notably, re-analysis of the data excluding the two journals with the highest number (and percentage) of non-White editorial board members (i.e., *Asian Journal of Criminology* and *Race and Justice*) reinforces the trends observed in Table 4, particularly for non-Whites. In fact the Spearman's *rho* changes from -0.08 to -0.11 which indicates that after excluding these two journals from the analysis, the negative gradient observed is stronger for non-Whites.

Table 4: The mean number of White and non-White editorial board members per journal quartile

| | High | | Low | | | r ² | p-value |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|-------|----------------|---------|
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q4:Q1 | | |
| White | 41.2 | 33.6 | 34.5 | 27.8 | 0.68 | -0.27 | <0.05 |
| Non-White | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 0.77 | -0.08 | ns |

Discussion

The fact that there is systemic racism in academia is not new. There is a long history of the marginalization of certain groups of individuals across scientific disciplines based on their underlying demographics, especially racial origin. This is, sadly, also true for Criminology. In fact, the writings of one of the world’s first ‘criminologists’ (as defined by Spierenburg (2016)), Cesare Lombroso were overtly racist (deLisi, 2019). While generally vilified by the criminological community, Lombroso’s belief that a criminal could be identified based on certain physical characteristics has left a detectable intellectual impression on criminological scholars since his work (Bernard & Cooperdock, 2018). So, while researchers may argue against the Black-White dualism in conceptualizing difference and understanding cultural hybridity in Criminology (see Phillips & Bowling, 2003), the fact remains that non-Whites have been historically marginalized and maligned in Criminology and continue to be so. One small but meaningful way in which this marginalization manifests throughout Criminology more generally, and within the knowledge production process within the discipline, more specifically is through editorial board representation. This study found that almost 90% of all editorial board members across all Criminology journals are White. Worryingly, the limited number of editorial board members that are non-White are most often editorial board members of journals with the lowest impact factors. A more detailed analysis of the data revealed that approximately 17% of journals do not have a single non-White individual in any editorial capacity whatsoever, and almost 70% of journals have less than five non-White editorial board

members. Only two journals (3%) (*Race and Justice* and *Asian Journal of Criminology*) have more non-White editorial board members than White. These gross inequities highlight not only the glaring lack of racial diversity in editorial board compositions in Criminology but is also indicative of a broader systematic marginalization of non-Whites that continues to perpetuate throughout academia in general.

But why should we care about the racial composition of editorial boards? Editors and their editorial boards are typically well-known and/or respected ‘leaders in the field’ (Dunne et al., 2022), who ultimately select which papers to publish and, in doing so, are able to define the trajectory of their discipline. Concomitantly, they represent both a critical outcome and a potential driver of equity in their discipline more generally (Altman & Cohen, 2021). Increasing the diversity of these so-called ‘gatekeepers’ of scientific knowledge (see Fogarty & Liao, 2009; Newhouse & Brandeau, 2021) is therefore essential if a more representative Criminological academe is to be achieved. But why is diversity good? First, diversity breeds innovative science (Hofstra et al., 2020), and is essential to building solutions to challenges faced by all communities, both marginalized and non-marginalized (Barber et al., 2020). Second, a racially diverse editorial board could increase interracial awareness more broadly which may reduce racial disparities in society. This awareness could also help academic faculty acknowledge racial issues as they engage with fellow faculty and students. In a time of great social and economic transition, addressing equality, diversity and inclusion is critical to ensure that Criminology remains relevant, vibrant and accessible to society. Finally, more diverse editorial boards will significantly impact which articles are published because they bring a variety of different perspectives, experiences, and expertise to the decision-making process. This diversity can help ensure that a wider range of topics, voices, and research methodologies are considered, reducing bias and promoting a more inclusive representation of ideas. Previous studies have found how diverse editorial boards facilitate the publication of papers across a

wider range of research paradigms, methods and topics (see Braun & Diospatonyi, 2005; Kim et al., 2018; Rosenstreich & Wooliscroft 2006; Harzing & Metz 2013). In particular, a study by Goyanes and Demeter (2020) examined the whether the diversity of editorial boards affected the diversity of research papers across 84 Communications journals and found diverse editorial boards are more likely to publish more diverse research articles, based on the country of origin of the first author and on where the data were collected. Other empirical research supporting the fact that the geographic diversity of editorial boards affects the diversity of published articles include Lauf (2005) and Demeter (2018), among numerous others. Significantly impacting which articles are published will enhance inclusion which will allow the development of more balanced, appropriate, and sustainable science. Given the fact that non-Whites are over-represented at every stage of the criminal justice process (Hinton et al., 2020), it seems appropriate then that scholars from historically oppressed and marginalized groups are increasingly represented as editorial board members. Indeed, as Shim et al. (2021, 1161) notes: “While people of any race and ethnicity can and should be sensitive to issues of oppression and marginalization, they often have specific expertise, including lived experiences that underscore the need for such expertise.”

In truth, there is growing acknowledgment among Criminologists that the discipline needs to be more equitable, diverse, and inclusive (EDI) (see Stockdale & Addison, 2024 for a summary), with most researchers now in favour of a “more equal representation and diversification of scholars and studies from around the world in publications, conferences, and faculties” (Waisbord, 2019, p. 93). Others, such as Blount-Hill et al. (2022) advocate for “inclusive Criminology” as a conceptual framework for integrating criminological inquiry into a cohesive whole which asserts societies’ rights to valid and complete knowledge as requiring inclusion of previously marginalized identities. From a purely publishing perspective, a number of steps have been undertaken to improve the diversity of editorial boards, notably the

issuing of pledges and commitments to promote diversity (see Clark & Horton, 2019; Fontanarosa et al., 2021). Other possible strategies to increase diversity could include setting up a diversity working group within each journal to identify potentially qualified future editorial board members and/or editors, while also targeting an increase in diversity. An active program could also be instituted to recruit and develop non-White reviewers. This could include encouraging existing editorial board members to act as mentors to potential future editorial board members and editors who are of diverse backgrounds and identities. Being invited to serve on a journal's editorial board is a prestigious recognition of an individual's expertise in a particular field but one that also involves often time-consuming responsibilities such as reviewing submissions and guiding the editorial process. Mentorship of non-White scholars is, therefore, vital for increasing their representation on editorial boards as it provides essential support, guidance, and resources needed for non-White scholars to navigate and succeed in the competitive academic landscape. This mentorship can ultimately contribute to the dismantling of existing barriers that historically marginalized groups continue to face in attaining academic leadership positions. Journals could also present an infographic of the diversity of their editorial board and/or the geographical scope of the published articles. This may attract attention from diverse researchers, as well as raise awareness of diversity/equity/inclusion in the scientific publishing space. Other actions, outlined by Mahdjoub et al. (2022), include promoting multilingual publications, inviting EDI perspectives, and recognizing and valuing efforts on EDI initiatives by researchers and editors by providing prizes and awards for such contributions. It is important to acknowledge that a potential paradox may emerge in this space. That is, non-White scholars who *are* editorial board members may be increasingly asked to serve on additional editorial boards. This structural problem arises due to the general under-representation of non-Whites in academia as a whole (National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2022), but especially at the ranks

considered eligible for these forms of professional service (Breetzke et al., 2022). Non-white scholars already experience a range of disproportional negative effects in their academic workplace including micro-aggressions (Arday, 2022), racial stereotyping and bullying (Rollock, 2019) and covert racism (Bhopal, 2016). Overburdening the same coterie of non-White scholars onto an increasing number of editorial boards would seem to be counter-productive. Rather it would be more appropriate to expand the existing pool of non-White scholars in order to increase and build capacity. This may take longer than expected. A report by the National Science Foundation (NSF) (2022) stated that only 3,389 (5.9%) of the 57,596 doctorates awarded in the United States were to Black or African Americans while 4,619 (8%) were awarded to Hispanic or Latinos. Moreover, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2022), Black faculty comprise roughly seven percent of all faculty in colleges and universities (six percent for Hispanic or Latinos), despite representing 13 percent of the national population. Roughly eight percent of junior faculty are Black. These numbers drop as professorial ranks increase with only four percent of full professors being Black. Regardless, change needs to happen because having a higher number of non-White scholars in higher education should lead to their greater representation on editorial boards. As more diverse scholars advance through academia, they would be able to contribute new perspectives and research areas, and become increasingly 'qualified' for leadership roles in the publication process. Their increased presence should also expand the pool of candidates eligible for editorial boards, which often draw from established experts in various fields. Additionally, institutions and journals may become more proactive in promoting diversity, further opening opportunities for non-White scholars to influence editorial decisions and expand the range of voices represented in academic discourse. Much like addressing racial academic faculty imbalances, there are no quick fixes to increasing diversity in Criminology scholarship more broadly and within editorial board composition specifically, and neither

should there be. Rather, increasing diversity should be a long-term goal that all Criminologists should aspire to but there needs to be a plan and a starting point.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the study that are worth mentioning. First, the use of the terms ‘White’ and ‘non-White’ in this study is, admittedly, a broad representation of racial identity. Indeed, this binary categorization neglects the diverse array of ethnic and cultural groups within this categorization, and risks oversimplification and obscuring critical differences in experiences among, and within, these groups in the knowledge production process. Race is a complex continuum and there are a vast number of sub-categorizations each with their own unique experiences, especially when dealing with the criminal justice system. For example, ‘Black’ individuals are overrepresented in the American criminal legal system (Clark, 2019; Dighton, 2003) but this is not the case with Asian-Americans who are also referred to as ‘non-White’ in this study. Similarly, African-American and Latino scholars are grossly under-represented when the racial classification methodology combines them with Asian Americans and other international scholars who are editorial board members of international journals. Moreover, African-American and Latino scholars, among others, have unique lived experiences in higher education (see De Luca & Escoto, 2012; Warren-Gordon & Mayes, 2017) with important implications for future academic success. This categorization was, however, done in order to highlight broad patterns and trends in diversity, or lack thereof, across editorial boards in criminology. This categorization also allowed for a more accessible analysis of editorial board representation which can enable stakeholders to quickly identify which broad groups are underrepresented and address diversity gaps more effectively. This approach can also help in making data more manageable and comprehensible, especially when dealing with large datasets or when more granular data is unavailable or difficult to obtain.

Regardless, it is acknowledged that this binary categorization is a generalized representation of racial identity and note that the individuals within these categories should not be considered at all homogenous.

Second, the total number of editorial board members included a small number of duplicate counts as individuals may be listed on multiple editorial boards. Excluding these members or weighing them as a proportion of one, for example, skews the results even further towards non-White under-representation, however, similar to previous studies (see Hedding & Breetzke, 2021) all members were individually included in the analysis. Moreover, the quality of the data on which the analysis was undertaken was limited by the accuracy of the information on editorial boards available by journals. If the information provided is inaccurate (i.e., outdated, incorrect), the subsequent results may contain errors. While this may be considered as a limitation, most prior research of this nature has successfully employed similar methods (see Ozbilgin, 2004; Cummings & Hoebink, 2017). A final limitation is that the data represents a 'snapshot' in time and it is largely unknown whether the general patterns found in this study are improving (or not) over time. On the one hand there is evidence that the representation and scholarly contributions of African-American faculty and doctoral students in criminology and criminal justice programs have increased (Gabbidon et al., 2018). On the other hand, Wilder et al. (2015) highlights the numerous unique challenges faced by African-American faculty in increasing their representation and scholarly productivity in academia despite numerous diversity efforts. Future research could examine the nature and magnitude of non-White scholarly contributions and aim to determine whether increased scholarly productivity necessarily translates into greater representation of editorial boards.

Conclusion

Improving diversity is a pressing concern in the academic community. This concern is particularly applicable to Criminology which has historically been the purview by a group of six predominantly 'White' countries (the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Italy, the Netherlands, and Australia) who have dominated key institutional mechanisms that play a vital role in knowledge production and the development of the discipline. This 'White' homogeneity contributes to what Pickering et al. (2016, p. 158) refer to as "Northern empirical realities" and continues to exacerbate "inequalities of academic knowledge production." One of the many ways in which this lack of diversity continues to manifest itself is through editorial board composition. This study found that almost 90% of all editorial board members across all Criminology journals are White. More than twenty years after Shaun Gabbidon and colleagues published their landmark article "*Still Excluded: An Update on the Status of African-American Scholars in the Field of Criminology and Criminal Justice*" (Gabbidon et al., 2004) in which they highlighted the gross underrepresentation of non-Whites on a sample of editorial boards in Criminology, and not much has changed. In fact, in some instances, the levels of underrepresentativeness in editorial boards has increased. This simply has to change in order to ensure that the academic knowledge production process encompasses a broader range of perspectives, voices, and expertise. Individuals from different backgrounds, experiences, and viewpoints can uncover and address biases and assumptions in the literature that might go unnoticed otherwise. Currently, editorial boards are simply not representative of the societies they aim to improve.

References

- Addo, F. R., Houle, J. N., & Simon, D. (2016). Young, Black, and (still) in the red: Parental wealth, race, and student loan debt. *Race and Social Problems*, 8, 64-76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-016-9162-0>.
- Altman, M., & Cohen, P. N. (2021). *Openness and diversity in journal editorial boards: Patterns of gender and international diversity in open science publications and open access journals*.
<file:///C:/Users/u97199649/Downloads/Gender%20and%20national%20diversity%20of%20editors-1.pdf>
- Amnesty International. (2003). *United States of America: Death by discrimination-The continuing role of race in capital cases*. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/amr510462003en.pdf>
- Arday, J. (2022). No one can see me cry: Understanding mental health issues for Black and minority ethnic staff in higher education. *Higher Education*, 83, 79–102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00636-w>
- Banaji, M. R., Fiske, S. T. & Massey, D. S. (2021). Systemic racism: Individuals and interactions, institutions and society. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 6, 82. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-021-00349-3>.
- Barber, P. H., Tyrone B. H., Johnson, T. L., Marquez-Magana, L., & 10,234 signatories. (2020). Systemic racism in higher education. *Science*, 369, 1440-1441. <https://doi:10.1126/science.abd7140>
- Beath, C., Chan, Y., Davison, R. M., Dennis, A. R., & Recker, J. C. (2021). Editorial board diversity at the basket of eight journals: A report to the college of senior scholars.

Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 48, 236–247.

<https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04830>.

Berdej6, C. (2018). Criminalizing race: Racial disparities in plea bargaining (September 13, 2017). *Boston College Law Review*, 59. Loyola Law School, Los Angeles Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2017-39. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3036726>

Bernard, R. E., & Cooperdock, E. H. G. (2018). No progress on diversity in 40 years. *Nature Geosciences*, 11, 292–295. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0116-6>

Bhopal, K. (2016). *The Experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic Academics: A Comparative Study of the Unequal Academy (1st ed.)*. Routledge.

Bhopal, K. (2017). Addressing racial inequalities in higher education: Equity, inclusion and social justice. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(13), 2293-2299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1344267>

Blount-Hill, K.-L., St. John, V., Moton, L. N., & Ajil, A. (2022). In their experience: A review of racial and sexual minority experience in academe and proposals for building an inclusive Criminology. *Race and Justice*, 12(3), 457-480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21533687221087352>

Braun, T., & Di6spatonyi, I. (2005). World flash on basic research: The counting of core journal gatekeepers as science indicators really counts. The scientific scope of action and strength of nations. *Scientometrics*, 62(3), 297–319. <https://doi:10.1007/s11192-005-00237>

Breetzke, G. D., Hedding, D. W., & Pijper, L. (2022). The academic staff profile of Geographers at higher education institutions (HEIs) in South Africa: The challenges of

- transformation. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 46(2), 222-240.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2020.1856797>
- Burgess, T. F., & Shaw, N. E. (2010). Editorial board membership of management and business journals: A social network analysis study of the Financial Times. *British Journal of Management*, 21(3), 627–648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00701.x>
- Chakravartty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V., & McIlwain, C. (2018). #CommunicationSoWhite. *Journal of Communication*, 68(2), 254–266. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy003>
- Chen, C. Y., Kahanamoku, S. S., Tripathi, A., Alegado, R. A., Morris, V. R., Andrade, K., & Hosbey, J. (2022). Systemic racial disparities in funding rates at the National Science Foundation. *Elife*, 29(11), e83071. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.83071>
- Clark, S. (2019). *Overrepresentation of Indigenous people in the Canadian Criminal Justice System: Causes and Responses*. Department of Justice Canada. Ministère de la Justice Canada.
- Clark, J., & Horton, R. (2019). What is The Lancet doing about gender and diversity? *Lancet*. 393(10171), 508–510. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)30289-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30289-2)
- Cummings, S., & Hoebink, P. (2016). Representation of academics from developing countries as authors and editorial board members in scientific journals: Does this matter to the field of development studies? *European Journal of Development Research*, 29(2), 369–383. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-016-0002-2>
- Davis, S. N., Jacobsen, S. K., & Ryan, M. (2015). Gender, race, and inequality in higher education: An intersectional analysis of faculty-student undergraduate research pairs at a diverse university. *Race, Gender & Class*, 22(3-4), 7-30.

- del Carmen, A., & Bing, R. L. (2000). Academic productivity of African Americans in Criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11(2), 237–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511250000084891>
- De Luca, S. M., & Escoto, E. R. (2012). The recruitment and support of Latino faculty for tenure and promotion. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 11(1), 29-40.
- DeLisi, M. (2019). Cesare Lombroso. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780195396607-0165>
- Demeter, M. (2018). Changing center and stagnant periphery in communication and media studies: National diversity of major international journals in the field of communication from 2013 to 2017. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 2893-2921.
- Denaro, K., Dennin, K., Dennin, M., & Sato, B. (2022). Identifying systemic inequity in higher education and opportunities for improvement. *PloS one*, 17(4), e0264059. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0264059>
- Dighton, D. (2003). Minority overrepresentation in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. *The Compiler: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Summer*, 1-6.
- Dunne, E., Zuhlke, L., Kumar, R. K., Casey, F. A., Penny, D. J., & McMahon, C. J. (2022). Editorial board composition among pediatric cardiology journals: time to cast the net wider. *JACC: Advances*, 1(5), 100137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacadv.2022.100137>
- Faraldo-Cabana, P., & Lamela, C. (2021). How international are the top international journals of Criminology and criminal justice? *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 27(2), 151–74. <https://doi:10.1007/s10610-019-09426-2>
- Fogarty, T. J., & Liao, C-H. (2009). Blessed are the gatekeepers: A longitudinal study of the editorial boards of The Accounting Review. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 24(3), 299–318. <https://doi:10.2308/iace.2009.24.3.299>

- Fong, E. A. & Wilhite, A. W. (2017). Authorship and citation manipulation in academic research. *PLoS ONE*, *12*, e0187394. <https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0187394>
- Fontanarosa, P. B., Flanagin, A., & Ayanian, J. Z., et al. (2021). Equity and the JAMA Network. *JAMA*, *326*(7), 618–620. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.9377>
- Gabbidon, S. L., & Martin, F. (2010). An era-based exploration of the most significant books in Criminology/criminal justice: A research note. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *21*(3), 348–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2010.487833>
- Gabbidon, S. L., Greene, H. T., & Wilder, K. (2004). Still excluded? An update on the status of African American scholars in the discipline of Criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *41*(4), 384–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427803260268>
- Ghandnoosh, N. (2015). *Black Lives Matter: Eliminating Racial Inequity in the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: Sentencing Project.
- Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, *333*, 1015–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1196783>.
- Goyanes, M., & Demeter, M. (2020). How the geographic diversity of editorial boards affects what is published in JCR-ranked communication journals. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *97*(4), 1123–1148. <https://doi:10.1177/1077699020904169>
- Greene, H. T., Gabbidon, S. L., & Wilson, S. G. (2018). Included? The status of African American scholars in the discipline of Criminology and criminal justice since 2004. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *29*(1), 96–115. <https://doi:10.1080/10511253.2017.1372497>
- Gross, S. R., Possley, M., & Stephens, K. (2017). *Race and wrongful convictions in the United States*. The National Registry of Exonerations.

- Gross, S. R., Possley, M., Otterbourg, K., Stephens, K., Paredes, J., & O'Brien, B. (2022). *Race and wrongful convictions in the United States 2022*. University of Michigan Public Law Research Paper No. 22-051.
- Harzing, A. W., & Metz, I. (2013). Practicing what we preach: The geographic diversity of editorial boards. *Management International Review*, 53(2), 169–187.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-011-0124-x>
- Heard, C., & Bing, R. (1993). African American faculty and students on predominantly White university campuses. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 4(1), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511259300082741>
- Hedding, D. W., & Breetzke, G. D. (2021). ‘Here be dragons!’ The gross underrepresentation of the Global South on editorial boards in Geography. *The Geographical Journal*, 187(4), 331-345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12405>. IF: 3.0
- Hickman, C. F., Fong, E. A., Wilhite, A. W., & Lee, Y. (2019). Academic misconduct and criminal liability: Manipulating academic journal impact factors. *Science and Public Policy*, 46(5), 661-667. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scz019>
- Hinton, E., Henderson, L., & Reed, C. (2018). An unjust burden: The disparate treatment of Black Americans in the criminal justice system. *Vera Institute of Justice*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V.V., Munoz-Najar Galvez, S., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D.A. (2020). The diversity–innovation paradox in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(17), 9284-9291.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915378117>
- Holman Jones, S. (2018). Making our stories count: Racial, gendered, and sexualized antagonisms in the academy. *Departures in Critical Qualitative Research*, 7(2), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/dcqr.2018.7.2.1>

- Johnson, S. L., Blume, J. H., Eisenberg, T., & Hans, V. P. (2011). The Delaware death penalty: An empirical study. *Iowa Law Review*, *97*, 1925.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2019913>
- Khan, M. R., Kapadia, F., Geller, A., Mazumdar, M., Scheidell, J. D., Krause, K. D., ... & Halkitis, P. N. (2021). Racial and ethnic disparities in “stop-and-frisk” experience among young sexual minority men in New York City. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(8), e0256201.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256201>
- Kim, B., Merlo, A. V., & Seo, C. (2018). Internationality of women specialty journals: content analysis and survey of editors. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, *13*(3), 231–249.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-018-9268-y>
- Kozlowski, D., Larivière, V., Sugimoto, C. R., & Monroe-White, T. (2022). Intersectional inequalities in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(2), e2113067119 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2113067119>
- Larivière, V. (2019). The journal impact factor: A brief history, critique, and discussion of adverse effects. In: W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch and M. Thelwall (Eds.), *Springer Handbook of Science and Technology Indicators* (pp. 3-24). Springer.
- Lauf, E. (2005). National diversity of major international journals in the field of communication. *Journal of Communication*, *55*(1), 139-151.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02663.x>
- León, K. S. (2021). Critical criminology and race: Re-examining the Whiteness of US criminological thought. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, *60*(3), 388-408.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12441>
- Liu, F., Rahwan, T., & AlShebli, B. (2023). Non-White scientists appear on fewer editorial boards, spend more time under review, and receive fewer citations. *Proceedings of the*

- National Academy of Sciences*, 120(13), e2215324120.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2215324120>
- Lowe, C. C., & Fagan, A. A. (2019). Gender composition of editors and editorial boards in seven top criminal justice and Criminology journals from 1985 to 2017. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 30(3), 424–443.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2018.1548629>
- Mahdjoub, H., Maas, B., Nuñez, M. A., & Khelifa, R. (2022). Recommendations for making editorial boards diverse and inclusive. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 37(12), 1021-1024.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2022.09.011>
- Mitchell, O. (2021). Tokenism in Criminology and criminal justice departments: Problems and solutions. *Race and Justice*, 11(3), 338-346.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368720976764>
- Monk, E. P. (2019). The color of punishment: African Americans, skin tone, and the criminal justice system. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(10), 1593-1612.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2018.1508736>
- Morgan, A., Shah, K., Tran, K., & Chino, F. (2021). Racial, ethnic, and gender representation in leadership positions at National Cancer Institute-Designated Cancer Centers. *JAMA Network Open*, 1;4(6), e2112807. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.12807>
- Morris, V. (2023). Systemic racial disparities in funding rates at the National Science Foundation, implications to science equity, and possible countermeasures. *Bulletin of the American Physical Society*. Available at
<https://meetings.aps.org/Meeting/MAR23/Session/W28.3>
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2020). Race/ethnicity of college faculty.
<https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>

- National Science Foundation (NSF). (2022). Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities.
<https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf24300/data-tables>
- Nellis, A. (2016). *The Color of Justice: Racial and Ethnic Disparity in State Prisons*.
Available at <https://www.sentencingproject.org/reports/the-color-of-justice-racial-and-ethnic-disparity-in-state-prisons-the-sentencing-project/>
- Newhouse, L. J., & Brandeau, M. L. (2021). Who are the gatekeepers? An examination of diversity in Informs journal editorial boards. *Service Science*, 13(3), 109-132.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/serv.2021.0274>
- Obasogie, O. K. (2010). Do blind people see race? Social, legal, and theoretical considerations. *Law & society review*, 44(3-4), 585-616. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2010.00417.x>
- Ozbilgin, M. (2004). “International” human resource management: academic parochialism in editorial boards of the “top” 22 journals on international human resource management. *Personnel Review*, 33(2), 205–221.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00434804105180559>
- Parker, K. D., McMorris, B. J., Smith, E., & Murty, K. S. (1993). Fear of crime and the likelihood of victimization: A bi-ethnic comparison. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133:723–732. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1993.9713928>
- Peterson, R. D. (2017). Interrogating race, crime and justice in a time of unease and racial tension: The American Society of Criminology’s 2016 Presidential Address. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 55(2): 245–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12140>
- Phillips, C., & Bowling, B. (2003). Racism, ethnicity and Criminology. Developing minority perspectives. *British journal of Criminology*, 43(2), 269-290.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/43.2.269>

- Phillips, C., Earle, R., Parmar, A., & Smith, D. (2020). Dear British Criminology: Where has all the race and racism gone? *Theoretical Criminology*, 24(3), 427-446.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480619880345>
- Pickering, S., Bosworth, M., & Aas, K. F. (2016). The Criminology of mobility. In: Carlen, P. and Franca L. R. (Eds.), *Alternative Criminologies* (pp 382-398). Routledge.
- Pierson, E., Simoiu, C., Overgoor, J., Corbett-Davies, S., Jenson, D., Shoemaker, A., ... & Goel, S. (2020). A large-scale analysis of racial disparities in police stops across the United States. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(7), 736-745. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0858-1>
- 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(1), 84–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2010.517653>
- Pryce, D. K., & Chenane, J. L. (2021). Trust and confidence in police officers and the institution of policing: The views of African Americans in the American South. *Crime & Delinquency*, 67(6-7), 808-838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128721991823>
- Rakhra, A., Ogedegbe, G., Williams, O., Onakomaiya, D., & Ovbiagele, B. (2021). Representation of racial/ethnic minority individuals in the leadership of major medical journals. *Journal of Health Disparities Research and Practice*, 14(4), 69.
- Rainey, K., Dancy, M., Mickelson, R., Stearns, E., & Moller, S. (2018). Race and gender differences in how sense of belonging influences decisions to major in STEM. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 5(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0115-6>
- Rianoet, I., Patel, S. R., Abuali, I., Ai, A., Geiger, A., Pimienta, J.... al. (2022). Self-identification of gender and race/ethnicity in Hematology and Oncology journal editorial

- boards: What is the state of diversity? *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 40(16), 11058–11058. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2022.40.16_suppl.11058
- Rollock, N. (2019). Staying power: The career experiences and strategies of UK Black female professors. Available at https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/10075/Staying-Power/pdf/UCU_Rollock_February_2019.pdf
- Rosenstreich, D., & Wooliscroft, B. (2013). An improved method for assessing the impact of management journals. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 18(2), 37–54.
- Sampson, R. J., & Lauritsen, J. L. (1997). Racial and ethnic disparities in crime and criminal justice in the United States. *Crime and Justice*, 21, 311-374. <https://doi.org/10.1086/449253>
- Shim, R. S., Tully, L. M., Yu, G., Monterozza, E. C., & Blendermann, M. (2021). Race and ethnicity of editorial board members and editors as an indicator of structural racism in psychiatry and neuroscience journals. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 78(10), 1161–1163. [10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.1983](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.1983)
- Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with Crime and Neighborhood Reaction*. Sage.
- Spierenburg, P. (2016). The rise of Criminology in its historical context. In: P. Knepper and A. Johansen (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Crime and Criminal Justice* (pp. 373–395). Oxford University Press.
- Stevenson, M., & Mayson, S. (2018). The scale of misdemeanor justice. *Boston University Law Review*, 98, 731–777
- Stockdale, K., & Sweeney, R. (2022). Whose voices are prioritised in Criminology, and why does it matter? *Race and Justice*, 12(3), 481-504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21533687221102633>

- Stockdale, K. J., & Addison, M. (2024). *Marginalised Voices in Criminology*. Taylor & Francis.
- Tapia, N. D., Pollock, W., & Kelly, C. (2022). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for female and minority criminal justice majors. *Race and Justice, 12*(2), 431–447. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368719885434>
- Thomas, I. (2023). Addressing the under-representation in the criminal justice system. Available at <https://www.Blackhistorymonth.org.uk/article/section/cjs-careers/addressing-the-under-representation-in-the-criminal-justice-system/>
- Toro-Pascua, J. C., & Martín-González, Y. (2021). Presence of women on the editorial boards of Criminology journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 33*(4), 491-508. <https://doi:10.1080/10511253.2021.1991410>
- Troyna, B. (2012). *Racial Inequality in Education*. Taylor & Francis.
- Updegrove, A. H., Cooper, M. N., & Greene, H. T. (2018). Room for all? Comparing Criminology and sociology completion rates across sex, race, and degree level. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 29*(2), 267–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2017.1395058>
- Waisbord, S. (2019). *Communication: A Post-Discipline*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wilder, J., Osborne-Lampkin, L. T., & Jackson, E. N. (2015). Rearticulating Black faculty diversity efforts in the age of ‘postracialism’ and Obama. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 39*(3), 174.
- Williams, D. R. (2012). Miles to go before we sleep: Racial inequities in health. *Journal of health and social behavior, 53*(3), 279-295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146512455804>
- Young, V., & Sulton, A. T. (1991). Excluded: The current status of African-American scholars in the field of Criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28*(1), 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002242789102800100>