Volume XLI, Issue 4 September 2016

ACJS *Today*

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Tips for Working Toward Tenure in an R1 University

Jodi Lane, University of Florida*

Last year (November 2015), I wrote an article for *ACJS Today* for new scholars on getting yourself to write because publishing is, I believe, the most critical aspect of gaining tenure in an R1 University. Yet, writing and publishing are part of a larger context to getting beyond the major hurdle of being awarded permanency at a university. In this article, I will discuss some general tips to getting tenure, that is, how to approach this career, including publishing, during the first few years of scholarly life beyond graduate school. This article is aimed at those working at an R1 university, officially defined as one that awards doctoral degrees (at least 20 per year) and falls in the "highest research activity" category according to The Carnegie Classification of Institutions for Higher Education (see http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/basic.php). Still, some of the tips may be useful to those working at universities with a primarily teaching mission.

Continued on Page 4

SPECIAL ISSUE
HOW TO SUCCEED IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE HIGHER EDUCATION

President's Message

Lorenzo Boyd, President, ACJS*

During the week of July 4th I attended the British Society of Criminology conference in Nottingham, England. The BREXIT vote had just taken place, the British pound was losing ground, and there had been several recent terrorists attacks in Europe. There was lots of fodder for discussion for even the most novice criminologist. Surely I would have my hands full discussing current events in Europe. However, what would normally have been a very mentally stimulating, if not enjoyable, week was constantly interrupted by reports of several shootings in the United States.

As I sat in my hotel room in the U.K., I fielded several international inquiries about the shooting deaths, first of Alton Sterling in Baton Rouge and then, the very next day, Philando Castile in a suburb of St. Paul, Minnesota. Their similarities? Both were people of color; both were shot and killed by the police. In the conversations with the media, they inevitably listed dozens of black males (and females) that had been killed by the police in recent months. To be honest, I quickly grew tired of yet another series of hashtags, well wishes, social media blitzes, and hollow prayers. A reporter from an international outlet predicted that the response would be that the city would say their hearts go out to the families, there would be prayers raised, and there would be a call for citizens to keep calm. The reporter went on to predict that the investigation inevitably would claim that it was tragic, but not criminal … and again, no one would be held accountable for the deaths.

Just as I was formulating some well-crafted responses to these events, I was made aware of the shooting of the police officers in Dallas. I immediately reflected on my time in uniform and was equally horrified at that turn of events. I was sickened by the things happening at home, and I felt helpless as I continued to answer questions. Before the healing could start in earnest, more officers were shot and killed in Baton Rouge. I was tired of hearing esoteric debates about the disconnect between the police and communities of color. My heart was heavy and I just wanted the barrage of shootings to stop. It was overwhelming!

While still in England, I sent an e-mail to many of the academic Listservs that I am a member of, asking scholars to focus on these events and try to help make sense of it. I do understand how these things tend to happen. I have always said that respect is the currency of the streets, and if people feel disrespected, then they will lash out. I currently teach and am writing about the concept of police legitimacy and that because something is *legal* does not mean it is the *right* thing to do. The president's Task Force on 21st Century Policing said it best: "*People are more*

likely to obey the law when they believe that those who are enforcing it have the legitimate authority to tell them what to do . . . . The public confers legitimacy only on those they believe are acting in procedurally just ways" (p. 9).

We need to stop the rhetoric. It's time to talk about policy changes. I reached out to Dr. Kimberly Dodson, chair of the Minorities & Women's Section, and Dr. John DeCarlo, chair of the Police Section of ACJS, asking them to mobilize their sections and work together on a collaborative effort to help solve this problem. But this is bigger than those two sections. I am reaching out to the members of ACJS to help out as well. My request is that we get together and plan panels, round tables, and research on this issue and collectively present them at the ACJS meeting in March, 2017 in Kansas City. I want social justice, racial justice, officer safety, and community policing to be prominent themes in this conference. I do not want my presidency to pass as a footnote in the academy. I want mine to be the conference that starts the change in the academy and in public policy.

My request to the academy is that members get together with like-minded people (including practitioners) and prepare presentations for Kansas City that could be a good starting point to make our collective voices heard. The abstract portal will close in September, so we have a little time, but let's not wait until the very end to get things together. Let's make our collective voices heard and focus our energies and research on racial justice, social justice, officer safety, and community policing. It's time for change. It's time to make a difference. We are ALL in this TOGETHER!

***Lorenzo M. Boyd** is the current president of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. His PhD is in sociology from Northeastern University. He is currently an associate professor and chair of the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore.*

Continued from Page 1

I work at an R1, the University of Florida (UF), and I am now in my 18th year as a professor. I also attended two other R1 universities (Indiana University and the University of California, Irvine), and so most of my life has been connected to one of these institutions. Over the years, I have watched people get tenure, some sailing through pretty easily and others just barely getting through the process. I also have seen others not earn tenure and be forced to look elsewhere for a different job, either after their tenure cases were voted down or before, when they realized earning tenure would be a longshot.

I also just recently completed service on the college-level tenure and promotion committee, which at my institution is the level after the department vote. The committee on which I served was advisory to the college dean, whose letter for each case was submitted to the university-level decision makers. To many, university committees beyond the department level who vote on tenure and promotion are considered mysterious and unpredictable, often because discussions happen in secret and there is not much communication back to the candidate other than the actual vote (how many yeas and nays).

Based on my experience, people on these committees take their tasks very seriously. They realize that although their vote is typically advisory, their votes matter a lot. They really do grasp that people could lose their jobs. Consequently, committee members read typically very lengthy packets very carefully, often taking personal notes and bringing these notes to meetings where discussions are also very focused and comprehensive. Committee members are especially contemplative about "no" votes. I honestly lost sleep over more than one case in which I ultimately decided to vote "no." For these few cases, though, I am pretty sure that the scholars in question knew there were big weaknesses in their records. I think it is unlikely that the mixed or majority negative votes were a complete surprise to the candidate. Specifically, in my experience these committees really are not that mysterious. They carefully consider a person's record, the internal and outside evaluation letters, and the university, college, and department tenure and promotion standards. They do not vote "no" unless they really believe it is warranted based on the record. In fact, at our university, we were not allowed to discuss anything that was not included in the official packet, even if we had personal experience with the scholars up for discussion. Of course, most candidates do not see the outside evaluation letters unless a writer chooses to disclose his or her identity to the candidate, so they often also remain a mystery. However, I have found most letters to be very thoughtfully written as well. Writers understand that the letter impacts a career. With a few exceptions, letter writers also appear to be very careful about giving negative feedback.

Given my experience working as a professor for many years and watching tenure cases from many angles, this article is aimed at helping new scholars plan and organize the first few years of their careers to make the tenure process less stressful. I shall list 10 tips for easing the process.

Continued on Page 6

ACJS 2017 Annual Conference

"Linking Teaching, Practice, and Research"

March 21-25, 2017
Kansas City Marriott Downtown
Kansas City, Missouri

Program Chairs: Nancy Marion, University of Akron, nmarion@uakron.edu
Will Oliver, Sam Houston State University, woliver@shsu.edu

Host Hotel:

Kansas City Marriott Downtown
200 West 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64105
Main Phone: 816-421-6800

The above work has been released into the public domain by its author, KCMODevin.

Continued from Page 4

1. Before you take the job, understand the expectations for earning tenure.

It is important for new scholars to know what they are getting into when they take a job, or at least to know the rules very early in the process. Even R1 universities, which all have very high publishing standards, vary in their expectations for earning tenure. In some places, there will just be university guidelines, but in others, there will be different but related sets of guidelines from the university, college, and department. Department guidelines are often more specific to the field. For example, the department guidelines at my own institution are not specific regarding *where* people must publish because we are clear that we value interdisciplinary work. Rather, ours indicate that it is important to publish in "high quality" peer-reviewed journals or presses. Yet, I have seen department standards at other universities that list particular journals that are valued (e.g., *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, and *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*), and some have indicated that it is expected that people publish an average of one a year in the listed journals in addition to other articles. I have been told that in one criminology/criminal justice department, the list assigns point values for each journal (higher quality journals get more points) and assistant professors are expected to gain a certain number of publication points before submitting their tenure packets. *The key point here is that these written standards exist, and scholars must know what goals they are supposed to reach to be considered a strong case for tenure. The official university expectations should not be a mystery*.

There sometimes are also unwritten standards, and young scholars should know them. Some are general to the field, while others are specific to certain departments. For example, I believe that scholars should aim to publish a minimum of two peer-reviewed articles per year, which used to be the general standard in the field, but scholars truly would be better off (i.e., have an easier time with tenure) with three or four per year. Standards in the field seem to be ramping up all the time. Unwritten departmental values matter, too. When I was hired at UF in a once much more interdisciplinary department with criminologists, sociologists, psychologists, and historians, the faculty did not necessarily agree on which journals were the "top" 10 journals. While our official tenure guidelines allowed for variation, conversations with other faculty made it clear that the same journal might be highly valued by one but seen as a lesser place to publish by another. It was important for me to understand what everyone was thinking, rather than rely only on the official guidelines. That is, it is in a new professor's interest to get to know the preferences of the people with whom they work because colleague opinions will factor into their eventual tenure votes. This is especially true in departments where the guidelines are less specific. Keep in mind that while this vagueness can be uncomfortable as you work toward tenure, it can also work in your favor. As noted, tenure and promotion committees pay attention to the guidelines, and those that are less specific may allow more variation in publication outlets. That is, if guidelines say one must have an article in *Criminology*, then committees and letter writers will very likely look for that in the candidate's record. There are also some other general points that probably are not written in most tenure guidelines but which experience shows matters. I will talk about many of these below.

2. Prioritize writing over other tasks.

In my last article on writing (Lane, 2015), I noted the pressure to publish and discussed ways to get past mental and other distractions to get the work done. Now I want to make the broader point that writing for publication must be the number one priority for people working toward tenure in an R1 institution. Publishing is really what makes or breaks a tenure and promotion case. Without it, a case is rarely defensible at an R1. Being an amazing teacher or someone who takes on the majority of the service workload will rarely be enough if there are no or very few peer-reviewed publications (or a book, in some cases). In contrast, having those qualities and then also publishing good stuff makes one a highly regarded case. *In academia, the best colleague is typically one people can count on to do his or her share of work-related tasks—generally, research, teaching, and service*.

Because publishing a peer-reviewed article takes a lot of time from initiation to publication, it is important to start writing as soon as the job starts. People who settle in first and wait a year or two typically have trouble catching up. It helps to work on publications from dissertation or other data collected in graduate school first, to make sure work is in the pipeline early. Writing these articles while creating new projects helps ensure that something is always in the publishing pipeline. I generally like to have some under review, some in the revise and resubmit stage, and some in press most of the time. Honestly, though, now that I have a son who keeps me busy driving him to school, practice, travel ball on weekends, etc. all the time, my own pipeline and productivity looks different than it used to. I am post tenure and promotion, meaning I can slow some, but I still carry work with me to these other activities and do it when I can. Truly, it's what productive people do. We juggle—all the time. We do work at our kids' activities, at the car mechanic, on the airplane, etc.

Some may be wondering how to prioritize writing when there are so many other tasks, including teaching, service, and social lives. Being a good teacher can take a lot of time. New course preparations and updating old courses can be serious time killers, as can working with students. The truth is, though, that no scholar can do everything perfectly. Being *good* at teaching is *good enough* at an R1. As long as teaching evaluations are at or above department/college/university means and an assistant professor is serving on graduate student committees, tenure and promotion committees will likely see teaching as fine. If an instructor had a bad semester or two of teaching evaluations, it will probably be okay if the instructor is able to explain why as well as shows improvement in effort and evaluations in future semesters. That is, if one's approach is revised after a bad semester, the teaching statement explains how he/she responded, and evaluations get better, the committee likely will notice the improvement and not fret too much over it. If there is an anomaly that can be explained, it also helps to do so in the teaching statement. For example, in my promotion packet to full professor, I had one class in which I earned an average of 3 out of 5 and had some ratings under 3 (ouch!). These were my worst evaluations ever, but I could easily explain them. These average evaluations were based on six students who were taking the hardest methods class in our department (Evaluation Research), and I had a baby a month before the semester ended. There were a couple of students in the class who really struggled with the material and were very stressed by my not being on campus readily available during the last month, even though I had covered

all class material; was available to call, e-mail, or visit; and had given them a month to work on their big final project.

In general, I believe that if writing gets done, course preparation and grading will, too, but the reverse is not necessarily true. Professors are unlikely to walk into a class full of students unprepared for a lecture. The truth is that if one must work late into the night to finish something, it is easier to concentrate on preparing to teach something one already knows or on grading than to come up with new ideas for research and writing when one is already tired from the day. Reading the work of graduate students is also easier, in most cases, than concentrating on new ideas, although clearly, reading and editing the work of some graduate students can be very taxing. This is especially true if they do not turn in their best work. Consequently, my students know to turn in the absolute best they can do before asking me for detailed comments and critiques. For me, it works best to offer to answer specific questions along the way or look at certain passages to ensure the preferred message is being conveyed but wait to read each dissertation chapter, for example, in total when the student believes there is nothing left to add without getting my help. This helps reduce the time and brain power I must devote to giving my students the best feedback, which I take very seriously.

Service responsibilities typically take the least amount of hard thinking, so they also can be done when the brain is not as fresh (meaning after writing is done for the day). As Silverman (1999) noted, if one blocks time in the morning to write—even if it is an hour or so a day every day—there will be plenty of time to do all of the other tasks without the stress of worrying about "when" writing will occur. Time management is the key. Keep a list of tasks, so that worrying about getting them done does not occupy important thinking space in the brain. Do the writing, and the other things will get done.

I think, for some people, one of the toughest aspects of publishing for tenure is that it leaves very little time for a social life. I must admit that I had very little social life before tenure because I worked evenings and weekends. I waited to get married and have a child until after tenure because I knew I could not give both the time and energy needed concurrently. It was a risk to wait, but it worked out. It did not work out perfectly; I always wanted two children. I got one wonderfully challenging one. There were tradeoffs. I understand that not all can or are willing to plan their lives this way. *However, the best piece of advice I have is to work first and use play as a reward.* This helps relieve the guilt one often feels during social activities when there is always more work to do back on the desk.

When I was working toward tenure, I worked first and then allowed myself fun things, such as shopping or dinner or movies with friends in the evening. I still manage my time this way. On my at-home work days, I try to wait until I get my writing or other work done for the day before I run errands or do other things I want to do. On the days I do errands first (like do a "quick" stop at Target after I drop my son at school), it is much harder to get into the mental groove. The point is that a social life is doable if it is fit into the work schedule. As noted above, some of the most productive people take work with them to fun things (such as children's activities or vacation) or "must do" things (such as servicing the car or doctor appointments) and sneak work in when they can. For example, I often take papers to grade in between baseball games during weekend

travel ball tournaments. I also have a long drive to work, so I often listen to criminology books if they are available in audio format. I assign the book *Picking Cotton: Our Memoir of Injustice and Redemption* by Jennifer Thompson-Cannino and Ronald Thompson in my introductory course. I first heard it in the car, listening to what Coramae Richey Mann, one of my early professors, used to call a "talking book." I also have talked to students about their work while driving the hour home. Successful scholars tend to find ways to do work whenever they can so they can enjoy the fun things, too.

3. Publish in the best peer-reviewed outlets available for your work.

Peer-reviewed articles are generally the key to getting tenure at an R1 university, although some criminology and criminal justice programs are open to the book model more traditionally seen in fields such as the humanities (see Gabbidon, Higgins, & Martin, 2011). There are different ways to judge peer-reviewed publication outlets, and it is important to know which journals both your own department and the broader field consider to be the best. Some departments care about a journal's ranking in the field, or its impact factor, and weigh this information in determining the value of a scholar's record. The *InCites™ Journal Citations Reports* database, available through most university libraries, contains a list of "Criminology & Penology" journals (as well as journals in other fields) and provides a ranked list based on impact factors. There are also published articles ranking criminology and criminal justice journals (e.g., Soreson, Snell, & Rodriguez, 2006). Some departments are more interested in a journal's traditional importance in the field. That is, a journal's generally perceived reputation as a "good" or "top" theory or policy or specialty journal may be as important as its particular position in the rank order of impact factors in a particular year. As noted above, some departments may have a list of preferred journals.

The key is to send your work to the best journals that publish the kind of work you do. Journals clearly state on their websites or in the first few pages of an issue the type of studies they consider. Fit matters because scholars need the quickest and best route to publication. Poor fit may mean a quick desk rejection (sent directly back to the author from the editor rather than sent out for review) or one later after reviews return. For example, a strictly policy article probably will be poorly received by a strictly theory journal and vice versa. Send the best version of the article to the best fitting journal and wait. Have a list of a couple of other journals where it will go next. If the article is rejected, correct all valid issues that the reviewers raise and send it quickly to the next journal on the list. Getting it back out quickly (within a few weeks) not only helps ease the sting of the rejection but helps keep the publishing process moving toward tenure. In most cases, scholarly work will find a home somewhere if it has value. Start at the best journal and move down the list, fixing where necessary, until it hits. Do not dwell on the rejection. Move on.

While one is an assistant professor, it is important not to spend much time on work that is not peer-reviewed. I recommend that my former graduate students not write book chapters or encyclopedia entries until after tenure, unless invited by someone really important in the field or asked to contribute to a book that likely will be widely read and cited and therefore boost their reputation in the field. There are some books that are a big deal, and being invited to contribute is

an honor. Writing chapters for these books is worth it because people will likely get to know your work. However, in most cases, R1s do not value book chapters as much as they do peer-reviewed articles, even when they are listed as peer-reviewed. Committees know that most book chapters are not reviewed with the same rigor as journal articles are, even if a few people read and give comments for improvement. Yet, book chapters often take as much time as peer-reviewed articles to write, meaning a book chapter may take the place of a possible peer-reviewed article on the vita. It is not worth the tradeoff unless there are already plenty of peer-reviewed articles published/in press to make tenuring the person an easy decision. Specifically, if there are enough peer-reviewed journal articles in terms of quality and quantity, book chapters and encyclopedia entries are seen as a bonus on the record. However, if there are not enough peer-reviewed articles, or if there are questions about quantity, quality, or the scholar's contributions to them (e.g., whether they were key players in the work), it may appear that the person chose "easier" non-peer-reviewed publications instead. The latter situation can lead committees to question one's priorities and future publishing trajectory, which matters a lot in the promotion decision from assistant to associate professor.

4. Show your scholarly independence and focus.

Some criminologists flourish doing research alone while others are much more productive working in teams. There are differing opinions in the field on how to value co-authored work. *The key, though, is to show that you have important ideas and are an important scholar in your own right.* Tenure and promotion committees value scholarly independence. This means that publishing with your graduate school mentor is okay, but to be safe, there should be more articles without that mentor's name attached than with it when the tenure dossier is submitted. It is also helpful if the assistant professor is the lead author on some of the articles co-authored with graduate school mentors, as well as with other co-authors. If possible, I believe that untenured professors should publish at least a couple sole-authored pieces before tenure. The more the better, meaning that tenure and promotion committees will be more likely to see the scholar's contribution as "obvious" if there are a number of sole and lead-author works.

The goal is to leave no question in the record as to the importance of the scholar's work. This value can be shown by managing the order and balance of authorships. However, it can also be shown clearly in the record by ensuring that published works are related in a way that a research narrative can easily incorporate them to show a guiding theme to one's work. That is, you do not want to be seen as someone who jumps on any opportunity to publish, no matter what the topic. Rather, it should appear to the tenure and promotion committee that you have a clear research focus and do your work with methodical purpose. For example, maybe this means each article focuses on a different piece of a larger puzzle. Maybe it means that there is some broader idea that can weave together seemingly disparate paper topics. For example, at tenure, I had two broad topics on which I wrote: fear of crime and evaluation of juvenile justice programming. Two broad topics are fine. Yet, while some might have considered these to be very different research foci, I was driven to both topics by a much broader interest in reactions to crime. From my perspective, both of these areas looked at reactions to crime but from a different angle. One

looked at the public's reaction and the other looked at official reactions. I clearly pointed out this connection in my research statement. The point is that choices of publishing projects should be informed by your intended expertise area, so that writing the research narrative to be included with the tenure packet materials is easier rather than harder.

5. Create and maintain relationships with multiple mentors.

People who are successful rarely do it all alone. It is important for graduate students to create a good relationship with their graduate school mentors and to maintain it throughout the assistant professor years. First, these professors have a vested interest in the success of their students, so they can help new professors navigate the academic job search process and the effort toward tenure. They can be co-authors, which makes learning the ins and outs of the publishing process both easier and less stressful. As noted above, I believe it is important to ensure that at least half of one's publications are not with the primary mentor, so that one can show academic independence from the graduate school mentor. Yet, it is a much harder road if all publications are without graduate school mentors because learning is more likely to happen through trial and error.

Former professors also are important sources of advice more broadly, including which journals are best for particular works (especially if one is weighing the pros and cons of different outlets) and which work should be the priority in terms of time (if one is has multiple projects going). Maybe most important, graduate school professors can be critical in helping new professors navigate departmental politics and troubles. When there are tensions among faculty (e.g., over policies, hiring, money, or personalities), a graduate school mentor can help untenured professors know how to manage and react to the problems. Specifically, mentors can give advice on how to balance giving input in departmental meetings and conversations while managing personal concerns about the effect of one's input on colleagues' future tenure votes. That is, graduate school mentors who are not involved in the politics at hand can be terrific sources of advice about when to speak up and when to stay silent. There were a number of contentious issues in our department when I was untenured, and Jim Meeker often told me to stay out of it as much as possible. I certainly tried. One of the best pieces of advice that my primary mentor, Joan Petersilia, ever gave me was to give noncommittal responses when I heard others giving negative views of common colleagues, friends, or acquaintances. This advice can apply in many career situations—when working with departmental or university colleagues, with practitioners or policymakers, at conferences, etc. Examples of noncommittal responses include phrases such as "Oh, I didn't know that," or "Oh, really?" I believe that engaging in career- or colleague-related gossip should only occur within a close circle of friends who can be trusted.

Still, I want to mention here, as an aside, that a negative or tense encounter or two with a departmental colleague is not something that one generally needs to worry about in terms of tenure votes, unless it is an ongoing problem. In my experience, people generally will look at the whole record and not allow periodic professional personality differences to affect their votes, although there are exceptions. In the latter case, a chair's letter in the promotion packet may be able to explain a negative vote. On one occasion while I was an assistant professor, I made a tenured professor so angry at a faculty meeting (by

agreeing with another person he did not like) that he was screaming and flailing his arms at me in the hallway afterward. I did not sleep at all that night, and when I told him the next day that I needed to be able to express opinions in faculty meetings, he completely agreed with me. It did not occur to him that I was referring to his screaming episode the day before—in other words, he had already forgotten! On the other hand, if there are big issues and other faculty members make you feel uncomfortable about the current situation or the future, graduate school mentors are often a great sounding board and source of advice.

It is also important to have a mentor in the department where one works. Some departments have a formal process whereby all assistants are assigned a faculty mentor or mentoring committee. Departmental mentors can serve as important resources also. First, they can give important advice about how to navigate the particular university and what is expected in terms of publishing, teaching, and service. Second, they can informally review one's record once or twice a year to ensure progress toward tenure is being made and give critical advice on what to do when it is not. When I was an assistant, I met with my mentoring committee at least every spring semester (when our annual activities report was due), giving them a list with the following general headings: published, in press, under review, under revision, in progress. They reviewed this information and provided sound advice, but they also watched how this list changed each year and noticed if something in progress one year did not progress, often asking why. Finally, mentors in the department can step in when needed to defend the untenured professor, whether in a faculty meeting or dealing with political issues or when they believe the teaching or service load has become too cumbersome. This may mean talking to the chair to request the junior faculty member get no more service assignments or talking to the person himself/herself about not volunteering or accepting more assignments until publishing increases or tenure is awarded. As my departmental mentor, Chuck Frazier, once told me, if you turn down service (e.g., for the American Society of Criminology) they will ask again later. If you are good at it, they will ask again and again.

Finally, it is important to establish mentors in the broader field, typically those who do research on the same topics. These mentors are useful because they may read your work before submission to journals, invite you onto projects or to co-author, and some may serve as reviewers for your tenure case. However, universities typically do not allow co-authors to serve as external reviewers on promotion cases, so it is important not to publish with everyone in the field. One way to connect with mentors in the field is to write e-mails complimenting their work or asking if they would be willing to review and comment on your own. Another way, which I like better, is to go to division meetings at national conferences, where these colleagues are usually available in a more intimate setting where conversations can start.

6. Make good friends in graduate school and stay connected.

I regularly tell my graduate students to get connected with others in their cohort and in the program more generally and that this should be a priority. It has been my experience that people outside of academia—including family (even spouses) and friends—rarely understand the workload or pressures and stresses of this academic

lifestyle. The ability to work at home and the generally flexible schedule leads some to think that we hardly work. They do not necessarily see the late nights, the work done in the car while waiting on a child at practice, or the work done on weekends. Graduate school colleagues get it—they understand the struggles of being a graduate student and later an untenured professor, including the self-doubt, the lack of structure, and the worry about the future. Like graduate faculty mentors, they also deal with the same departmental politics, personalities, and struggles once graduate school is over and the march toward tenure begins. They understand the external and internal pressure involved in being untenured. They also do not need anything from you except friendship. Consequently, they are the perfect people with whom to talk and express frustration, anger, and worry about the future. Untenured scholars can feel much more comfortable complaining and expressing self-doubt to their friends because there is no worry about future judgment and decisions that can affect one's career. Depending on the person, sharing doubts about one's abilities with a departmental colleague can backfire by putting doubt in the other person's mind, too. Still, almost 20 years later, I talk to my graduate school friends when I am frustrated with departmental colleagues or when I am struggling to balance work and family life with finding time to take care of myself. Still, we stay together at conferences, spending time catching up until the wee hours of the night.

8. Be organized with teaching materials and update regularly where relevant.

As noted, teaching is important but not as important as publishing, even though it takes a lot of time. In my opinion, the best teachers come across as entertaining and caring, while also expecting students to learn. I am known as a tough teacher, and truthfully, I could be better at entertaining. But, I work very hard on my classes. I update lectures every semester where relevant (e.g., when new crime or incarceration statistics are published). Being organized is especially important. First, while working toward tenure, it is a waste of time to redo teaching materials that do not need a complete overhaul (lectures, exams, quizzes, etc.). I have known of some who have had to re-prepare because they were so harried when they last taught that they cannot find the materials. This redoing took unnecessary time away from publishing efforts. It is my recommendation to have a computer folder for each class, with subfolders for each week that include all relevant files — lectures, readings, etc. Other folders can include prior tests. If one keeps track of all exams and does not let students keep them (I number them and ask students to write the number on their scantron and turn both in to me when they finish), tests can be updated each semester also without completely rewriting every question. Keeping a bank of test questions allows for multiple versions, too, which can help prevent cheating. Second, being organized and methodical about teaching helps keep students happy and reduces complaints and fixes after the fact. I would much rather take the time to write a good exam than have to fix grades after the exam because questions or answers were ambiguous. In the long run, it saves me time. Another benefit is that students are more likely to trust a professor who is not sloppy with grading.

7. Choose committee work that matters.

I am lucky to work at a university that protects untenured professors from excessive

Service assignments. Of course, this means that those of us who are tenured must do more, sometimes much more. It is my experience that service work easily interferes with writing if scholars are not diligent in watching their time. First, some service work is fun and easy to mark off the task list, meaning it is less stressful than writing. Second, some people never say no when asked to do something. This is a mistake if service loads are not balanced in the department. One or two people should not be doing the majority of the service work, especially if they are assistant professors. If an untenured professor feels overburdened but does not feel the freedom to say no, a tenured mentor in the department can do so for him/her. *In my experience, at an R1 university, one cannot excuse a lack of publishing by pointing to the excessive service efforts on the record*.

Still, it is important to do departmental service work to show you are a good citizen. Barb Zsembik, one of the senior people on my mentoring committee while I was untenured, gave good advice in this regard: When given a choice, it is best to choose service jobs that involve money or hiring. Committees that deal with these two issues are important because they affect one's future, whether it be how raises or resources are distributed or with whom one will work. I also think it is important to at least start doing some national service for the professional organizations, but the amount of time and effort should be limited. It is not always easy to become an officer for an organization, but there are a lot of committees that need help. As an assistant professor, national service shows that one is branching out and getting involved in the broader field. One way to get involved is to go to division meetings at conferences and volunteer. Another way is to write one of the officers of the organization and offer to help.

9. Find time for fun and relaxation.

I noted above ways to manage a work schedule so that one can have a social life without guilt. Here I just want to stress the importance of finding time for fun and relaxation. It is easy to burn out when there is no end to the work one can do. In academia, no one ever really says "that's good enough." Rather, there is always the sense that one should work harder, faster, and better. Of course, there is a point when it's good enough, but rarely will someone say "it's okay to take a break." Consequently, untenured professors should schedule their own well-deserved breaks, not counting household chores such as laundry and grocery shopping. Beyond the daily "work first, play later" strategy I used as an assistant professor, I also gave myself certain times of the year when I could just relax and not worry about work. I always visited family over the holiday break. My friend, Crystal Garcia, and I usually added a day to conference travel to sight see. I allowed myself a day or two each month to do nothing work related but to truly relax. I participated in yoga classes two or three evenings a week, depending on work craziness. That is, I limited these breaks to ensure the work got done, but I scheduled time for myself. After becoming a parent, scheduling this time for myself became much harder. Yet, I still believe it is critically important to give yourself a break from the internal pressure we often put on ourselves. For some this might be daily exercise, while for others it might be an all-day movie marathon once a month. Whatever it is, the goal should be to feel relaxed and refreshed when work starts again.

10. Do not give up.

Balancing all the tasks of professor life is tough. In some ways, we do three different jobs—research, teaching, and service—while people in

other fields often focus on one. There are times when the goal of earning tenure, or sometimes just getting through all the current week's tasks, seems like too much. The internal and external pressure on assistant professors in R1 universities can be immense. If it really is too much and the career does not make you happy, you can seek a job that does. There is no shame in realizing that the job is not for you. In fact, it takes courage to completely change your life course. Life is too short to stay in a job that you do not want to do. However, if you want tenure and are just struggling with whether you can do it, hang in there. Just keep at it. Do the best *you* can at publishing, teaching, and service until the packet is submitted. However, once your tenure and promotion materials have been submitted, let it go emotionally. No one can expect you to do more than your best. There is nothing you can do to change the weaknesses in your record once materials are submitted, and in my experience, all records have some weaknesses. There are no perfect tenure and promotion packets, although there are very strong ones. Your goal should be to make yours as strong as you can; that is all. Once you get tenure, your life will be easier and much less stressful. It might seem scary to hear that the workload often increases after tenure (e.g., especially because of more departmental and other service responsibilities). Yet, that feeling that a great big animal is sitting on your chest all the time goes away almost immediately. Time management and writing also get easier over time. And, the guilt that often accompanies something fun also lessens. If you just keep plugging, you will likely have a long-term job that allows you the freedom to do the work you want to do, the flexibility to teach and research what you want when you want, and the ability to impact students and probably others. You can do it.

References

Gabbidon, S. L., Higgins, G. E., & Martin, F. (2011). Moving through the faculty ranks: An exploratory study on the perceived importance of book publishing and publishing in peer-reviewed journals in criminology/criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22*(2), 165–180.

Lane, J. (2015). Getting yourself to write: Tips for graduate students and new scholars. *ACJS Today*, *XL*(5), 12–21.

Silverman, F. H. (1999). *Publishing for tenure and beyond*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Sorenson, J., Snell, C., & Rodriguez, J. J. (2006). An assessment of criminal justice and criminology journal prestige. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 17*(2), 297–322.

Thompson-Cannino, J., Cotton, R., & Toreno, E. (2009). *Picking Cotton: Our memoir of injustice and redemption.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Griffin.

***Jodi Lane** is a professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law at the University of Florida. Her research interests include fear of crime, corrections, juvenile justice policy, and program evaluation. Professor Lane was listed as one of "The Most Prolific Sole and Lead Authors in Elite Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals 2000-2009" and has been identified as one of the top 20 female "academic stars in criminology and criminal justice.*

ACJS Summer Highlights

ACJS President, Lorenzo Boyd at the Northeastern Association of Criminal Justice meeting.

Society of Criminology Meeting in Beijing.

Craig Hemmens, Lorenzo Boyd, and Emily Rose at the British Society of Criminology Meeting.

Lorenzo Boyd travelled to Stockholm Sweden and spent some time with Travis Hirschi (University of Arizona), Chet Britt (Iowa State), and Barbara Costello (University of Rhode Island).

Midwestern Criminal Justice Association

Chicago, Illinois
Thursday, September 22nd – Friday, September 23rd, 2016

MCJA

39th Annual Meeting

The Changing Nature of Crime, Criminals, and Criminal Justice

CALL FOR PRESENTATIONS
Abstract Submission Deadline: August 1, 2016
Submit online at http://www.mcja.org/abstract-submission.html

President
Joseph Ferrandino, Ph.D.
Indiana University Northwest
joferran@iun.edu

Program Chair & 1st Vice President
Jennifer H. Peck, Ph.D.
University of Central Florida
Jennifer.Peck@ucf.edu

Conference Hotel
Hilton Garden Inn Chicago
Downtown/Magnificent Mile
10 E. Grand Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
Just minutes away from the Magnificent Mile!

KEYNOTE SPEAKER
Former MCJA President and Longtime Member Professor William Wakefield of the University of Nebraska-Omaha will deliver the keynote address this year.

Online Hotel Reservations: http://www.mcja.org/annual-meeting.html
(312) 595-0000 (must mention MCJA when booking through telephone)
Reservations must be made by August 22, 2016 to confirm conference rate

For more information on the annual meeting, abstract submission, hotel reservations, sponsorship, STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION, and other ways you can participate in the annual conference, visit us at:

www.mcja.org

The Academic Game: To Play or Not to Play? That is the Question

John Paul Wright* **Kevin Beaver****

Published in 1970 by renowned professor Pierre van den Berghe, *Academic Gamesmanship* remains a humorous, sarcastic, yet prescient "how-to manual" for academics interested in maximizing the rewards they receive over their career. The academic game, van den Berghe told us more than four decades ago, rests on several "protective myths" about academic life—myths embraced by academics for rather selfish reasons. These myths, which include the idea that all academics are of superior intelligence, that the rewards for academic life are meager, and that academic life is dull, shield scholars and universities from public accountability. To an unsuspecting public, to uninitiated freshmen students, or to loyal graduate students, these myths help create a mystique of intellectual credibility that surrounds the academic. Knowing this, van den Berghe tells us, academics are loath to puncture those protective myths because doing so may reveal to the world that not all scholars are competent, that rewards in time and treasure are often substantial, and that worldwide travel, craft beers, and status are enjoyed by an expansive number of professors.

But the game is more than perpetuating self-serving myths. The academic game involves a series of interrelated utilitarian decisions that have, at their core, the goal of advancing one's career, reputation, and fame. These decisions cover a broad swath of academic life, influencing what scholars study, what they teach, what they say in public, and, more important, what they don't study, teach, or say in public. This is because the academic game, like any other game, requires participants to recognize certain risks and pitfalls and to negotiate those risks in a way that increases the chances of enjoying the spoils. To be certain, the analogy of scholarship as an academic game is unsettling, in part because it confers an uncomfortable awareness that at least part—maybe a large part—of our collective work is produced through motives that are adulterated, and in part because we can all point to those who play the game better than us.

Notice that the goals of academic gamesmanship—namely, increased disciplinary status, increased financial rewards, and lower teaching loads—overlap only partially, and sometimes not at all, with the scientific goals of a field. At least in principle, for example, many still hold to the notion that scientists should vigorously pursue the truth and that scholars should be willing to "speak truth to power." Playing the academic game, however, sometimes causes scholars to avoid pursuing truth and, more often than we like to admit, to avoid even

speaking it. Gamesmanship can thus sideline legitimate research, as it did with biological research, and it can restrict scholarly debate. Listen, for example, to the wall of criminological silence surrounding the stark claims made by Black Lives Matter or to the void of scholarly voices willing to confront, to correct, or to contextualize public discussions on police shootings of black men. There are no disciplinary incentives for such efforts. Indeed, there are only risks.

Academic gamesmanship also requires at least a wink and a nod to certain themes, even if those themes are unimportant to the issue at hand. Discussions of race and sex differences, for example, have to be couched in the language of oppression, historical mistreatment, or discrimination and never in the language of individual or biological differences or personal responsibility. On the rare occasion genetic influences on behavior are discussed, the typical caveats about Nazism and eugenics have to be inserted. And on matters related to incarceration and incapacitation effects, the usual rhetoric about mass incarceration and racism must be invoked. Caveats, disclaimers, and sometimes intentional obfuscation enter the criminological dialogue because they give individual scholars intellectual cover by signaling to others that they, too, are playing the game.

Gamesmanship kicks in when scholars recognize that holding certain viewpoints, engaging in certain research methods, and generating certain findings will propel their careers upwards. When this happens, scientific objectivity takes a backseat to other, less scientific interests. P-hacking, inappropriate data manipulation, and interpretations of statistical results that are highly slanted occur because the formal and informal rewards of the field incentivize certain findings. Unfortunately, the choice some scholars face comes down to not being able to publish research findings that are true or being able to publish research findings that are, at best, concocted. When taken to the extreme, some criminological research takes on the façade of objectivity, wherein scientific jargon, statistical manipulation, and crafty arguments are used to present the illusion of scientific fact. As research in other fields, namely psychology, is now showing us, illusion can build a career but makes for poor science.

Does this mean that criminologists treat the truth as unimportant? That is not our view. Many criminologists are highly conscientious scholars who conduct meticulous research. Still, under certain conditions, even some of those scholars will respond to the incentive structure of the discipline. Moreover, we should recognize that a relatively large number of criminologists appear to care little about scientific veracity and have, instead, elected to prioritize their favorite political views or closely related scholarly paradigms. The point is, even competent scholars sometimes play the academic game, and many more elect to abide by the rules, mores, and governing policies of their academic clique.

There are many ways to game the system, and they appear to be increasing. Harkening back to van den Berghe (2016), he stated in 1970 that "publishing has become a compulsion. The average academic author does not write because he has something to say, because he hopes to contribute to knowledge, or because he has fun doing it; rather, he writes and publishes in order to improve his *vita* . . . . Scholarly publication is thus an extremely elaborate and patient exercise in *vita* construction."

It is safe to say that since 1970, many scholars have seen publishing as a key pathway to academic success and recognition. Today's criminologists publish at levels never before seen, and it is no longer uncommon for newly minted PhDs to enter the job market with double-digit publications. But publication counts, or "vita construction," are now being connected to citation counts and other alleged metrics of influence. Where increasing publication records have undoubtedly led to an increase in the number of marginal articles entering our journals, the games now being played with citations, including massive self-citations, strategically citing friends and others, requesting to be cited when reviewing manuscripts, and even publishing your own vita, are striking. It's the new obsession.

Sometimes, however, it's not the numbers that matter. By any measure our journals are packed with papers confirming research hypotheses. Either we have reached a point as a discipline where we are omniscient or, more likely, scholars now understand that the absence of a statistically significant result means their paper won't get published. Moreover, the sheer number of ways that variables get operationalized, sometimes within the same dataset, and the infinite number of statistical iterations that can be rapidly calculated, has likely opened the door to research processes that inordinately, if not always, confirm initial expectations. Technology has enabled scholars to search easily for the results they desire or for those that will lead to publication. This is the standard operating mechanism employed by those who value gamesmanship.

The academic game can also be played by ass-kissing those in the field who are at or near the top of the status hierarchy and by telling people what they want to hear—both of which are strategies for gaining access to desirable networks. These strategies are clearly manipulative, but they are rationally manipulative. Access to networks helps to assure long-term career survival by keeping open scholarly opportunities. For many, being invited to participate on a panel, to contribute a chapter in a book, or to collaborate on an article signifies career advancement and status recognition and thus represents being invited into the club. As with any profession, these are powerful motivators, and those equally adept at selling themselves and at ass-kissing are more likely to be invited to join.

Gaming relationships to gain access to networks of status and opportunity is rational, albeit a bit unseemly. Even so, once embraced by the network, few wish to jeopardize their status within that network. Alliances form, bonds develop, and rewards flow to those loyal to the group. These dynamics are so strong that scholarly cliques often create a language and vocabulary that is impenetrable to anyone outside the group. Critical criminologists, for example, invent words wholesale while sociologists develop a seemingly endless array of abstract concepts and jargon—often to describe the same idea. Learning and using the language of the in-group, however, does more than allow scholars of similar minds to speak to each other. The most important part of uttering words like "neoliberal," or "patriarchy," or "collective efficacy," is that it signals to others to which intellectual camp one belongs.

Playing the game successfully requires gaining admission to the club, learning the new language, and, above all, being loyal. Loyalty comes in two flavors. First, scholars can be loyal to the group through publishing research that supports favored narratives or by echoing in

seminars, on panels, or to the press, those narratives. Second, when someone attacks those narratives or, worse yet, commits an act of apostasy, the loyal will circle wagons and punish the deviant. Nothing, after all, solidifies a group more than an outside attack or traitorous actions. In each case, scholars belonging to the in-group will jettison science and any pretense of professionalism to make sure others remain loyal. To those who play the academic game, these occasions represent a wonderful opportunity to solidify their in-group status, even if it comes at the expense of someone else's career or reputation.

Gamesmanship is about moving up the hierarchy, racking up rewards and honors, and being recognized as one of the elites in the field. The game can be played to earn tenure and promotion, which are appropriate if not temporary concerns. Nowhere does the academic game run deeper, however, than in our broader professional organizations. It is, after all, our professional organizations that divvy out disciplinary awards and accolades and where mere membership on boards can be highly selective and influential.

There are, of course, many who do the tedious and unrecognized work of our professional organizations so that the organizations may flourish. Having served on boards, we intend no slight. Nonetheless, for other scholars, our organizations have become conduits through which their intellectual values and their friends are prioritized and rewarded. Often they have worked to position themselves on boards and committees, knowing that access is influence and that access opens the door for others in their group to enter. We are reminded of a cab ride with a then-to-be president when she stated openly, "Now that we control _____, we can make it respect our values." We may dismiss such bluster as excitement, but there was a certain degree of truth to the statement.

A quick perusal of the American Society of Criminology's (ASC) website, for example, shows a marked lack of diversity in viewpoints, in intellectual backgrounds, and in areas of expertise when it comes to its board members, its fellows, and others who consistently receive highly prestigious awards. They overwhelmingly come from (or are directly descended from) a background that includes sociology, and they pursue research interests that focus largely on sociological causes of crime.

To see just how much playing the academic game is linked to honors and awards, take a look at the list of ASC fellows. Even an untrained eye can see the networks of influence. You can trace the pedigree from advisor to student to fellow or from friend to colleague to fellow. The overlapping social networks that exist in the list of fellows is remarkable. To be clear, we are not saying outright or implying that ASC fellows are not worthy of the honors bestowed on them. Some of our friends are on that list. Even so, it is fair to ask whether becoming a fellow is, at least partially, the result of access to social networks or disciplinary biases—networks and biases that privilege some but not others. Noticeably absent, after all, are researchers who have made their careers by focusing on areas considered out of bounds in the academic game, such as psychopathy (e.g., Robert Hare), neurocriminology (e.g., Adrian Raine), biosocial criminology (e.g. Anthony Walsh), or a conservative political agenda (e.g., James Q. Wilson). Indeed, James Q. Wilson was treated so poorly by criminologists that he refused to attend our yearly meetings. Few, however, can doubt his accomplishments: He coauthored one of the most comprehensive and most-cited books on the causes of crime, he

received an honorary doctorate degree from Harvard, and he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Fortunately, Wilson didn't play the academic game in our discipline.

Better yet, take a look at the list of winners for the ASC's Outstanding Article Award and scan for the diversity in topics and viewpoints on this list. About half came from a sociological journal (five in total from *American Journal of Sociology* and *American Sociological Review*), and the other half have themes that are common to the academic game, like focusing on socio-environmental causes of crime or underscoring the unfounded belief that traits and behaviors are infinitely malleable. What about studies that focus on the continuity of antisocial behavior from infancy to adulthood, the crime-reducing effects of mass incarceration, or the role of personality and intelligence in criminal involvement? What about a paper that was published in a psychology journal, a neuroscience journal, or even an economics journal—journals that have significantly higher impact than any criminology or sociology journal? Again, the point is that the discipline rewards certain viewpoints and certain types of research and that these rewards act as inducements that are sometimes subtle and sometimes not. What would happen if the ASC or the ACJS broadened the incentive structure to reflect the truly multidisciplinary approach of our discipline and no longer privileged sociology?

What Can Be Done?

The issues raised previously can be dealt with if there is a real and concerted effort to do so. While admittedly speculative, we offer a thumbnail sketch that hopefully will lead to more discussions of what might be implemented to help deal with the potential problems. First, data need to be collected and analyzed to determine the extent of the problems that we have outlined. In the current age of social media, there has been a rapid development of applications that can be used to help identify network structures that exist in public Twitter feeds and other forms of social media. These approaches could be used to map the overlapping networks within the ASC and the ACJS. For example, does having a colleague, a friend, or a former student on the board make a difference in the odds of winning an award? Do alumni get treated more favorably when compared to others? Are decisions to accept manuscripts for publication more (or less) likely to occur if an editor is a colleague, if he or she is a former (or current) dissertation advisor, or is at a rival department? In short, are all of these decisions based on merit or do subjective biases and appraisals creep into decisions? These are empirical questions, but they are questions that are critically important to answer in order to maintain the integrity of any organization or society that proclaims to reward contributions based on a meritocracy.

Second, and somewhat relatedly, our organizations should make a concerted effort to include a wider variety of criminologists on their nominating and electing committees. Very often the people who vote on fellows and other awards are known quite well by those who are being nominated (and sometimes are their intellectual descendants). If this does not represent a conflict of interest, what does? This could easily be solved by bringing in more scholars from diverse educational backgrounds and places of employment, such as community colleges and directional campuses.

Third, the incentive structure for awards and honors should be recalibrated. Incentives should be realigned to reward those who make

contributions that push the field forward—that is, that make substantive contributions to the existing knowledge base. Let us also add that a premium should be placed on studies that disconfirm broadly held scholarly views, that replicate over time, or that address in a direct and scholarly way meaningful social issues. Our point is that realigning the rewards structures in the discipline will alter the gamesmanship that occurs. If greater weight is given to studies that focus on null results, that challenge the status quo, or that actually falsify a theory, then scholars will react and will pursue publication of those studies.

Fourth, there must be more transparent protocols in place for all awards, honors, and other recognitions. Anecdotally, we are reminded of a scholar we nominated for an award but whom the committee turned down. The scholar has a remarkable publication record, has made several substantive contributions to our field and to others, and has never been recognized. When pressed, the committee told us our nominee was viewed as being "too far out there." Translation: He wasn't viewed as one of us, so his work wasn't valued. Situations like this could be prevented if a listing of all nominated scholars for each award was published along with reasons why one candidate was selected over another. Make everything public and open for review. After all, isn't sunlight the best disinfectant?

Conclusion

Should you play the academic game? We are of two minds: The utilitarian in us says yes, without a doubt. Playing the game, to include carefully managing your public reputation, publishing a lot of safe research, remaining loyal to your intellectual clique, and being appropriately deferential to elites, is one of the best ways to climb the academic ladder. Publishing a lot of safe research will likely earn you tenure and promotion and it might even result in your name being placed on a plaque. To be certain, there is nothing at all wrong with pursuing a course of action that assures you a long and rewarding career.

Still, there is merit to not playing the game or to walking away from it altogether. Gamesmanship involves constant compromise of principles and an understanding of how every interaction potentially affects one's status. Not playing the game liberates scholars from these concerns, freeing them to pursue questions independent of the expectations of others. Not playing the game allows for the development of meaningful and sustained relationships buttressed by respect, collegiality, and friendship. And not playing the game frees scholars from the inaccuracies, errors, narratives, and paradigms that define our discipline and simultaneously limit our curiosity. Gamesmanship requires an allegiance to the discipline and to all that defines our field. Not playing the game only requires that you pursue the truth and do not expect anything in return. The choice is yours, but from our point of view, the game robs us of the best part of being an academic: the freedom to think independently.

References

van den Bergh, P. (1970). *Academic gamesmanship: How to make a Ph.D. pay*. London: Abelard-Schuman.

van den Bergh, P. (2016). *Publishing: How to do it.* http://www.thebestschools.org/academic-gamesmanship/chapter-7-publishing/

***John Paul Wright** is a Professor and Graduate Director at the University of Cincinnati. He has published numerous articles and books and consults regularly with various criminal justice agencies. His work can be found in leading criminal justice, genetic, and psychological, and psychiatric journals. His most recent book is Life-Course Criminality: Criminals in the Making. Wright's focus is on the development of criminal violence across the life-course, especially biological and genetic factors related to behavioral maladaptation. His work also seeks to integrate findings from a number of disciplines, including human behavioral genetics, psychology, and biology.*

***Kevin M. Beaver** is a Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida State University. Beaver has published more than 150 articles and more than 25 book chapters and is the author/editor of 10 books. He has employed behavioral genetic and molecular genetic methodologies to unpack the gene environmental basis to a range of criminal and delinquent outcomes. He is the past recipient of the American Society of Criminology Ruth Shonle Cavan Young Scholar Award and the National Institute of Justice's graduate research fellowship. His research has appeared in journals as diverse as American Journal of Public Health, Biological Psychiatry, Criminology, Developmental Psychology, and Sexual Abuse.*

It's A Wide Sky of Academic Stars: Lessons Learned From 12 Outstanding Female Scholars in Criminology and Criminal Justice

Terra Richardson, Lamar University*
Robert M. Worley, Lamar University**
Eric F. Bronson, Lamar University***

Although there are numerous studies that explore publication productivity and rankings within criminology and criminal justice (Cohen & Farrington, 2012, 2014; Frost, Phillips, & Clear, 2007; Jennings, Schreck, Sturtz, & Mahoney, 2008; Long, Boggess, & Jennings, 2011; Jennings, Higgins, & Khey, 2009; Orrick & Weir, 2011), only a handful of researchers have examined the role that female scholars specifically have had in shaping the discipline (see Khey, Jennings, Higgins, Schoepfer, & Langton, 2011; Rice, Terry, Miller, & Ackerman, 2007; Weir & Orrick, 2013). Recently, Crow and Smykla (2015) found that female scholars are more likely than males to be lead authors in regional journals, are more likely to co-author papers with other female scholars, and are more likely to employ mixed-methods research designs than male scholars. Carlan, Thompson, and Cheeseman (2013), in their analysis of criminology and criminal justice (CCJ) doctoral programs, reported that females comprised 35.9% of faculty members, and nearly half of the faculty in doctoral programs who had received their PhDs between 2000 and 2012 were women. Female scholars are also publishing at a higher rate than ever before. In a recent study, Eigenberg and Whalley (2015) discovered that women authored 34% of publications in mainstream CCJ journals, and this figure is even higher when one includes journals that emphasize gender issues. Female CCJ faculty members who believe their articles are instrumental in advancing the discipline are also more likely to publish than their male counterparts (Potter, Higgins, & Gabbidon, 2011).

Currently, an estimated 42% of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) members are female, the highest percentage in the 53-year history of the organization (Campbell & Stohr, 2015); ACJS has a female executive director (Mary Stohr) and executive director emeritus (Mittie Sutherland). As well, the three most recent presidents of the American Society of Criminology are women (Ruth Peterson, Candace Kruttschnitt, and Joanne Belknap). The current and previous editors of *Justice Quarterly* are women (Megan Kurlychek, Cassia Spohn), as is the previous editor of *Criminology* (Denise Gottfredson). The topic of women's scholarly productivity seems timely in light of the tremendous strides that female scholars are making within the discipline of CCJ.

For the purposes of this investigation, we wanted to go beyond the numbers and attempt to get an idea as to who female academic stars are and what contributes to

their success. We specifically wanted to interview respondents who have published in the most elite CCJ journals, such as *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Crime and Delinquency,* and the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, as well as those who have significant executive service within the American Society of Criminology and ACJS. We relied heavily upon a study conducted by Weir and Orrick (2013), which listed female scholars who have published the most in elite journals. We also employed a variation of a strategy used by Jennings, Gibson, Ward, and Beaver (2008) and examined faculty vitas on various departmental websites. E-mail invitations were sent to 15 female academic stars, and 12 respondents (89%) agreed to participate in an interview.

In order to gather the most descriptive data on the subjects, we developed questions designed to measure each respondent's motivation levels, work habits, and attitudes toward research, among other areas. Variations of these questions were used by the second author in a similar investigation in which he interviewed both male and female academic stars (see Worley, 2011). All interviews were recorded with the subjects' permission and later transcribed. We adhered to principles of analytic induction throughout multiple readings to code the data and analyze it for themes (Charmaz, 1983, 2006).

The female academic stars who graciously took time away from their research agenda to answer our questions were Joanne Belknap (University of Colorado), Robin Engel (University of Cincinnati), Bonnie Fisher (University of Cincinnati), Kristy Holtfreter (Arizona State University), Candace Kruttschnitt (University of Toronto), Jodi Lane (University of Florida), Janet Lauritsen (University of Missouri–St. Louis), Jean McGloin (University of Maryland), the late Nicole Rafter (Northeastern University), Mary Stohr (Washington State University), Barbara Warner (Georgia State University), and Pamela Wilcox (University of Cincinnati).

Solving Puzzles for a Living

We asked respondents how they managed such a prolific level of publication, and many replied that it was due to their sheer love of the work. Bonnie Fisher told us that she enjoyed her job so much that she did not view what she did as work. Jean McGloin expressed herself in a similar manner, stating that she was fortunate to "solve puzzles for a living." Besides having a strong affinity for her work, Joanne Belknap also explained that because she often collects her own data, she has an obligation to the individuals who took part in her research to "get their information out." Candace Kruttschnitt may have been influenced by the Sociology Department at the University of Minnesota, where she taught and later became chairperson prior to relocating to the University of Toronto:

> There were a number of highly productive people, and so it is like being the little fish in the big pond. You are swimming as fast as you can…to keep up with the bigger fish and make tenure. So I knew what the expectations were for tenure…so I set out about doing that.

Jean McGloin told us that after she was promoted to associate professor with tenure at the University of Maryland, she became much more concerned with placing her work in top-tier journals, rather than publishing in a lot of journals. When asked to elaborate, she said,

> Maryland has a clear sort of cultural value…they are much more interested in where you publish than how much you publish. So, I think if you look at my record, the amount has gone down a bit because I have really tried to pay attention to where everything is going.

We asked our respondents when they find themselves to be the most productive. Robin Engel informed us that she spends so much time in the field working with police officers, she does not have the luxury of blocking off time to write. Instead, she prefers to use the summers to work from home. When Janet Lauritsen was asked whether she had a specific time she preferred to engage in scholarship, she expressed herself if the following manner:

> The thing about productivity when you are a senior faculty versus a young faculty member or a graduate student is that you have so many of these other responsibilities, but you just try to coordinate those so that you can get blocks of time, whenever you can get them, so you can get the writing done.

Mary Stohr, who publishes with both her graduate and undergraduate students, told us that lately she has been motivated to work more than ever because she feels as though her students need the experience and benefits that come with being involved in research. Stohr informed us that she often juggles about 16 different research projects at any given time.

Respondents were asked to identify what, in their opinions, constitutes a successful research year and whether or not they set specific productivity goals in terms of quality and quantity. Jean McGloin was emphatic that scholars should not define their success by the number of publications:

> You can have articles accepted that are not published for two or three years. So is it a good year because it got accepted? Or is it a good year when it comes out in print? I think at this point, after you get tenure, your focus has to be the long game. Are you making the contributions you want to make? Are you getting the data you want to get? Are you writing the papers you want to get? Are you making the sort of substantive contribution to the discipline; and if you can say at some part of the year you have done that, then you are doing your job.

Robin Engel, Jodi Lane, and Pamela Wilcox provided more of a numeric response when describing what constituted a successful year for them. For example, Robin Engel stated:

> I try to at least bring in two to three new contracts a year. I

> also try to write two articles, and I like to get published in top-tier places. And, I like to get a couple out in practitioner-based outlets, magazines or journals that are geared toward the field.

However, like other respondents, Engel explained that it really depends on where one is published rather than how many articles one publishes. Jodi Lane told us that publishing four articles would constitute a successful year. She also explained that she uses her university standards to assist her in assessing her own productivity. Lane stated that because she knows what the university values, she measures herself against this expectation in order to do her best work.

Bonnie Fisher told us that if she created new knowledge or made a contribution to the field, then she considered herself successful. Fisher reported that she did not have any goals in terms of quantity; rather, she emphasized being a critical, skeptical, and logical thinker. When asked to elaborate, Fisher stated:

> I was never socialized to focus on the numbers, and it was always about the quality of the work and the contribution to a body of knowledge. It was always about the big science and knowing what you were doing.

We wanted to assess the respondents' level of competitiveness by asking whether or not they felt a sense of friendly competition among their colleagues. No one stood out as being overly competitive; in fact, Bonnie Fisher explained to us that she viewed research as a form of collaboration rather than a competition. Jean McGloin also stated that she did not feel the need to compete with others:

> The goal is intellectual advancement and sort of growing ideas, and maybe the day that I get into counting how many articles I have versus how many someone else has, then I have completely lost what the purpose of my job is.

Joanne Belknap acknowledged that while competition exists, especially among junior scholars who may feel they have not yet proven themselves, she did not feel the need to compete with others. As she told us:

> I am reasonably smart and I am successful because I am passionate about what I do. I think justice is incredibly important and the lack of it is disturbing. I think I have a high enough self-esteem, for the most part, and I feel like once I got to be in my thirties, I really didn't care what people thought about me. I really feel proud of my record.

Respondents were also asked how they handled the pressure of being such prolific writers. We assumed that as leaders in the CCJ discipline, the respondents deal with myriad invitations to contribute to various works as well as being solicited as mentors by graduate students and junior faculty. The purpose of this question was to determine how each subject handled such pressure. Several of the subjects said that they have had to learn how to say

"no" to some invitations. Candace Kruttschnitt emphasized that she used to say "yes" to everything: "I think women feel more sympathy, and I hate to generalize—stereotype—but I think women feel more obligated to do service, for whatever reason, but you really have to be careful, and you really have to pick and choose."

Nicole Rafter's reported her policy is to decline most invitations to contribute to someone else's work. She told us that she tends to say "no" to everything, unless it is a dear friend who is asking or one of her graduate students. Rafter also mentioned that she will agree to do tenure reviews, even though they are time consuming and sometimes difficult. Rafter told us that she developed a rule of thumb for herself: for a long time, she would only do one a year and only for women. When asked why, Rafter explained, "I did this because for a certain period, the field was so sexist that it was nearly impossible for women to get a fair shake at the tenure stage."

Kristy Holtfreter told us that it is important to prioritize and make time for one's own research first. She stated that if she does not have time for a particular research project, she tries to suggest someone else who might be interested. Robin Engel, who is known for conducting applied research with criminal justice practitioners, indicated that while the demand for her time is high, she has improved over the years in understanding when she really needs to attend a meeting or when one of her doctoral students can go in her place.

Joanne Belknap told us that she manages her time by meeting with her graduate students weekly as a group. She usually requires that they have taken one of her classes, but sometimes she will make exceptions. The purpose of her weekly meeting is to allow them to give her an update on their progress. Belknap explains how she holds them accountable to a standard of progress; if students are not getting what she feels is an acceptable amount of work done, and they know this going into the group, then they are dropped from the group for a semester. Some may feel that this technique is harsh, but it gives unmotivated or underprepared students one semester to get it together. When reflecting on junior faculty collaboration, Belknap stated:

> I really want to work with faculty of color because I just think the discipline is so horribly underrepresented in terms of race more than gender, so I am just more likely to do that; but I also see my interests seem to be more consistent with scholars of color, even though my record seems to say that I am a "gender" person. I have always been concerned about race as well [as gender] and increasingly came to the realization that white people need to "do" race better, which includes recruiting more people of color into academia.

Toward the end of each interview, several respondents had advice for burgeoning young scholars. For example, Janet Lauritsen, who is married to

Richard Rosenfeld, suggested that female scholars who are involved, married to, or domestically partnered with someone who is in the field should try to refrain from publishing with them for a long time. Lauritsen advised scholars to carve out their own identities in the field and suggested that this can be achieved by publishing sole-authored work as well as a number of articles that are embedded with a consistent theme. Candace Kruttschnitt stated that young scholars must attend professional meetings in order to present papers, "get their faces known," and network. Bonnie Fisher suggested that it is important to work with people in other disciplines because everything in CCJ is so interrelated, and if one can collaborate with others, it will always be a rewarding experience. Fisher also warned junior faculty scholars, especially females, not to take on every service obligation that comes along. "Just focus on what is important for getting ahead, which are your publication records. Especially before you have tenure, focus on your publications. That is it." McGloin also advised junior scholars not to overextend themselves by volunteering for service that may not necessarily be beneficial to their careers. She suggested that it is important to assertively carve out time to write and research and rigorously guard that time.

Barbara Warner advised PhD students to take advantage of their doctoral education and learn as much as they can to jump start their academic careers prior to accepting their first position as an assistant professor. Kristy Holtfreter reiterated this and also advised scholars to find a good mentor who could be a role model for their careers. She also recommended that doctoral students should get involved with the American Society of Criminology's Division on Women and Crime. Jodi Lane told us that is important for junior scholars, even doctoral students, to project an image of professionalism because one misstep (even in graduate school) could be long remembered and possibly even stain one's entire career.

Robin Engel discussed family and work balance throughout her interview, and she praised her family-friendly department and her department chair, Edward Latessa, who reminded her many years ago that there is no need to stress out about publishing because everyone has the same 24 hours. Engel cautioned young scholars, particularly those interested in having a family, to be very selective when choosing a department. As she told us, there are some departments that are family friendly and friendly toward women, but then there are places that are not, and this can make a really big difference in one's overall quality of life. Joanne Belknap also provided advice on balancing one's quality of life and appreciating the field. She said, "One of the things my graduate students and I talk about a lot is balance. Balance the quality of life with your work because the work is never done. You have to figure out how to do the work, especially if you are trying to finish your dissertation and trying to get tenure."

Lessons Learned From Twelve Outstanding Female Academic Stars

Research studies that assessed the productivity of female scholars have relied primarily on quantitative approaches that provide

numerical data, including the tracking of publications, grants, and co-authorships, without truly providing insights into the scholars themselves. For the purpose of this investigation, we identified a sample of outstanding female scholars to ascertain what makes them so successful. By way of conclusion, we would like to offer three lessons that we uncovered from interviewing our respondents.

1. **Quality matters most.** Of all the topics that were discussed, respondents emphasized more than anything else that it is better to publish fewer articles in high-quality scholarly outlets than to publish a larger quantity of articles in lower-tier journals. Young scholars should be mindful of this as they begin their academic careers and decide where to submit their important work.

2. **Be selfish on your own behalf.** Respondents emphasized that junior faculty members should schedule time for research and protect it. Rather than taking on too many service obligations, they should focus upon their research, which is ultimately the most valued commodity in the academic workplace.

3. **Winners forget they're in a race; they just love to run.** Respondents discouraged young scholars from being overly competitive and comparing themselves to others. No matter how much one publishes, there will always be someone who is able to publish more. Scholars are advised to avoid spending unnecessary energy obsessing about where they stand in the academic universe.

The respondents in this investigation have shown us the path toward being a productive researcher. We sincerely hope both male and female scholars who are reading this will heed the advice of our respondents as they conduct scholarly examinations of their own, hopefully culminating in a career of happiness, fulfillment, and balance. Westward Ho!

References

Campbell, C., & Stohr, M. K. (2015). Demographics of ACJS members, 2012–2014. *ACJS Today, 40,* 43–54.

Carlan, P. E., Thompson, R. A., & Cheeseman, K. A. (2013). Criminology and criminal justice doctoral programs in 2012–2013: Transformation of a male-dominated arena. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 24,* 576–593.

Charmaz, K. (1983). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In R. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field research* (pp. 109–126). Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: SAGE.

Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Scholarly influence in criminology and criminal justice journals in 1990–2005. *Criminal Justice Review, 37,* 360–383.

Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2014). Publication productivity of criminologists. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 25,* 275–303.

Crow, M. S., & Smykla, J. O. (2015). An examination of author characteristics in national and regional criminology and criminal justice journals, 2008–2010: Are female scholars changing the nature of publishing in criminology and criminal justice? *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 40,* 441–455.

Jennings, W. G., Gibson, C. L., Ward, J. T., & Beaver, K. M. (2008). Which group are you in? A preliminary investigation of group based publication trajectories of criminology and criminal justice scholars. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 19,* 227–250.

Jennings, W. G., Higgins, G. E., & Khey, D. N. (2009). Exploring the stability and variability of impact factors and associated rankings in criminology and criminal justice journals 1998–2007. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 20,* 157–172.

Jennings, W. G., Schreck, C. J., Sturtz, M., & Mahoney, M. (2008). Exploring the scholarly output of academic organization leadership in criminology and criminal justice: A research note on publication productivity. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 19,* 404–416.

Khey, D. N., Jennings, W. G., Higgins, G. E., Schoepfer, A., & Langton, L. (2011). Re-ranking the top female academic "stars" in criminology and criminal justice using an alternative method: A research note. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22,* 118–129.

Long, H., Boggess, L. N., & Jennings, W. G. (2011). Re-assessing publication productivity among academic "stars" in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22,* 102–117.

Orrick, E. A., & Weir, H. (2011). The most prolific sole and lead authors in elite criminology and criminal justice journals 2000–2009. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22,* 24–42.

Potter, H., Higgins, G. E., & Gabbidon, S. L. (2011). The influence of gender, race/ethnicity, and faculty perceptions on scholarly productivity in criminology/criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22,* 84–101.

Rice, S. K., Terry, K. J., Miller, H. V., & Ackerman, A. R. (2007). Research trajectories of female scholars in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18,* 360–384.

Weir, H., & Orrick E. (2013). The most prolific female scholars in elite criminology and criminal justice journals 2000–2010. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 24,* 273–289.

Worley, R. M. (2011). What makes them tick: Lessons on high productivity from leading twenty-first century academic stars. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22*, 130–149.

***Terra Richardson** received her Master of Science degree in Criminal Justice from Lamar University. She is a former correctional officer and grievance investigator with the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and is currently a juvenile Probation officer with the Texas County Juvenile Probation Department in Austin, Texas.*

****Robert M. Worley** is an Associate Professor at Lamar University. He received his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Sam Houston State University in 2006 and has published articles in journals, such as, Deviant Behavior, Criminal Law Bulletin, Criminal Justice Review, Journal of Criminal Justice Education, and the American Journal of Criminal Justice, among others. He is currently Editor of ACJS Today and an Associate Editor of Deviant Behavior.*

*****Eric F. Bronson** is an Associate Professor and Director of Criminal Justice Programs at Lamar University. He received his Ph.D. in Sociology from Bowling Green University in 2002 and has published articles in journals, such as, Canadian Women Studies, Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture, Journal of Higher Education, Critical Issues in Justice and Politics, and Teaching Sociology, among others.*

In Memoriam: Marie Griffin

Dr. Marie Griffin

Marie Griffin, Marie (Professor at Arizona State University) of Scottsdale, lost her hard-fought battle against cancer on August 15, 2016. Marie was a very proud native of Pittsburgh, PA who moved to Scottsdale with her parents, Jack and Betty Griffin, in 1979, where she became an equally proud alumna of Chaparral High School and Santa Clara University. Upon completing a Ph.D. in justice studies at Arizona State University, she was honored to join the faculty of ASU's School of Criminology and Criminal Justice in 1996. As a professor, Marie was nationally recognized for the rigor and impact of her scholarly research and for her dedication to working closely with students to maximize their academic growth and development. Marie was a practicing feminist in both her academic life and her personal life. But Marie's greatest pleasure and joy derived from her time spent with family, friends, and colleagues. Marie is survived by her loving husband, John Hepburn, and their twins, Jack and Megan. Marie was able to change John only slightly, generally for the better, but her significant imprint on the character, the heart, and the quest to learn within her beautiful children, now age 14, is unmistakable. Jack and Megan truly are her legacy. Marie's father, Jack, passed away in 1991, but Marie is survived by her mother, Betty Shannon, and her stepfather, Ronald Shannon, of Scottsdale; her sisters Margie Griffin Bollinger of Gilbert, AZ and Martha Griffin Thornton of Kenner, LA; her brother Ed Griffin of Sarasota, FL; stepdaughters Erin Hepburn Wilkinson of Phoenix, AZ, and Kara Hepburn Boyce of Mesa, AZ; and 4 young grandchildren: Madeline, Shaylee, Emily, and Caitlin. Marie was exactly the kind of person that everyone wanted in a colleague, friend, and neighbor. She was a selfless woman of great warmth, compassion, love, integrity, and an engaging sense of humor that was 10 degrees away from normal. A visitation was held on Thursday, August 18, 2016 at Messinger Mortuary, Scottsdale, AZ. A funeral service was held on Friday, August 19, 2016 at the Messinger Mortuary.

Film Review

Frida Barkfors and Anne Koehncke (Producers) and Frida Barkfors, Lasse Barkfors (Directors). 2014. *Pervert Park*. Denmark/Sweden.

For many of us, our ideas about sex offenders have been influenced by many sources, one of which is the popular show *Dateline NBC: To Catch a Predator*. This show televised law enforcement agencies conducting sting operations in order to catch men who were seeking sex with underage children. As a result, it elevated the profile of people who have committed such crimes throughout mainstream America, which further labeled and stigmatized sex offenders as the "worst of the worst" among criminals. Prior to and since this show, there have been policies (i.e., sex offender registration and notification and residence restrictions) put into place in order to protect the public (especially children) from sex offenders. Such policies, however, have created numerous obstacles for sex offenders throughout their reentry efforts. For instance, sex offenders struggle with obtaining and maintaining housing (including homelessness) and employment due to their status. A large body of literature has emerged addressing the range of collateral consequences accompanying registration/notification, including loss of friends, family, educational opportunities, prosocial support systems, as well as various economic consequences and miscellaneous activity restrictions across communities.

With that said, the documentary *Pervert Park* challenges us to rethink our views of sex offenders and judge them not by their crime but rather as fellow human beings. In 2010, a married couple from Denmark (Frida and Lasse Barkfors) came across a newspaper article about a trailer park in St. Petersburg, Florida that houses approximately 120 sex offenders. Their idea was to document a community that operated "parallel" to the outside world. When they went to the trailer park, they found that it was not really a "parallel" community; rather, it was a community of sex offenders assisting one another in the reentry process. However, the film only focuses on 6 individuals' stories and not their reentry efforts or those of others in this community.

Yes, each one had compelling stories from his childhood, leading to sexual offending and life as a convicted sex offender. From their accounts, you could find yourself having empathy for them, especially after hearing about some of the verbal, physical, and sexual abuse that many of them endured. But, when the narrative changes to their sexual offense(s), the viewer is reminded why such individuals have been rejected by society. Thus, they are no longer viewed as people, but rather as monsters.

The film also captured other aspects of the trailer park, such as group therapy sessions, social gatherings, and a sense of community. As one offender explained, the park allows them to be "insulated" from the outside world, meaning that it is a supportive environment for their reentry efforts. To the novice viewer, this film may come across as a well-rounded documentary about registered sex offenders. But it failed to detail the community and the struggles they encounter as sex offenders. Additionally, the directors only chose to highlight individuals who embodied the stereotypical sex offender. That is, those interviewed were all child molesters, and a few were also repeat offenders. Sadly,

this is where the directors failed to demonstrate that sex offender stereotypes are misguided and incorrect. Research has shown that sex offenders are far from a homogeneous group; rather, they come from all walks of life and commit an array of sexual offenses against people of all ages.

This documentary was a courageous attempt to bring to light the struggles of being a sex offender. However, the film fell short in trying to humanize sex offenders to the general public. For instance, the regulations that sex offenders residing in Florida must follow were briefly stated, but it was never demonstrated how those regulations affected the residents outside of the trailer park. This would have enhanced the research that has highlighted the numerous collateral consequences that sex offenders face: lack of employment, loss of friends/family, and economic difficulties. Another example is the directors' belief that the public wants to hear about the individual struggles that led the offenders to sexually offend. Unfortunately, these sex offenders seemed to want to justify their actions due to their own troubled past, which may cause the viewer to believe that they have little to no remorse for their actions.

In sum, the film does not offer insight into the struggles that sex offenders face in their reentry efforts. The goal of the film was to humanize sex offenders; however, it may have only strengthened society's preconceived notions of sex offenders. Moving forward, if we truly want to humanize sex offenders, the focus should be on their struggles with housing, employment, prosocial support systems, and the effects on those who help and support them. After all, they are someone's relative, friend, and a member of society.

Shawn M. Rolfe, Doctoral Candidate
University of Louisville.

Choose Your Own Adventure—Planning for and Transitioning into Retirement

*G. Larry Mays**

Recently I was reading an issue of the *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* (Vol. 27, No. 2) and there was a very entertaining and thorough presentation dealing with how to begin and build an career in criminal justice. However, one topic was conspicuous by its absence (sorry, Craig): how to transition from a full-time faculty member into the world of retirement. This article is a modest effort to provide insights into some of the choices available for those who are considering retirement. By the way, before we start, don't look for any references in this piece because there aren't any—that's one of the advantages of retirement.

In considering how to organize this article, I remembered a series of books that my son read in middle school. They were called *Choose Your Own Adventure,* and at key junctures in each book there was a choice that the reader faced about which direction to take in finishing the book (of course, my son would go back and read and reread the books until he had explored all of the "trails"). This presentation will provide some of the choices that faculty members might want to explore when they think about retiring.

No Retirement

One possibility is that you will choose not to retire at all. Some faculty members "die with their boots on" and never get to retirement or opt not to retire. In some states the retirement system will be eternally grateful for the extended careerist because those states may not be obligated to pay out any retirement benefits no matter how much has been paid in or for how long. For whatever reasons (uncertainty about the stock market and retirement savings, uncertainty about retirement activities, or the emotional investment in a long academic career), a few faculty members decide not to retire, and their institutions allow them to continue to work. If this is you, stop reading at this point; for the time being, you have chosen your adventure.

Before leaving this section, however, it is important to mention another adventure that may await some of you: "encouraged" retirement, when either you become too expensive or administrators feel that simply you are not pulling your weight. "Forced" retirement is a variant on this theme and brings into play all sorts of legal considerations. I will leave it to others to explore this topic. Suffice it to say, it is best to choose your own adventure as opposed to having someone else choose it for you.

Active Nonacademic Retirement

I've talked to any number of faculty members over the years who have said something to the effect that when they retire they no longer want to have anything to do with the world of academics. I characterize these people as having had all the fun they can stand. After retirement

they may want to travel, read more books, do the *New York Times* daily crossword puzzle, play in the World Series of Poker, quilt, learn to paint, write the great American novel, hunt or fish, spend more time with their children and grandchildren, farm or garden, or raise chickens (you know who you are). Some retired academics (along with many nonacademics) have used their retirement time to start blogs. Some of these are related to the world of the retiree's academic discipline or academics in general, but others merely provide the opportunity to comment on personal interests, such as those I've just outlined. The list of potential retirement activities is endless and it often is based on the hobbies and interests a person has developed over the years, or on the proverbial "bucket list." If you fit into this category, you can stop reading at this point because you, too, have chosen your adventure. However, if you decide to continue some involvement in academics—that is, you haven't had all the fun you can stand—go on to the next section.

Active Academic Retirement

I'm going to discuss three options here. They fit into the three traditional responsibilities of full-time faculty members: teaching, research, and service. They may be intertwined or they may be considered distinct and freestanding choices for retirement activities.

Teaching

For some people, the real joy of an academic career has come through teaching and interactions with undergraduate and graduate students. A number of my former students regularly stay in touch with me, and I often ask the successful ones if I can borrow money (for some reason, they always turn me down). In terms of teaching opportunities in retirement, there are many. First, if your academic department has not grown weary of you (see the previous discussion of "encouraged" or "forced" retirement), and vice versa, there may be courses that you can teach on a part-time basis. These activities may be on campus (day or night), at off-campus centers, or online. This practice may allow you to continue interactions with graduate students and to help direct their research (the next major topic). Second, there may be community colleges in your area that would welcome you as a teacher, particularly as someone who has taught at "the university." (Be advised that if you did teach at a senior college or university, you may not be welcome at a community college and you may not be qualified to teach criminal justice, if the state mandates certain prior in-service professional standards even for adjunct faculty.) Third, in many cities there are private schools (both nonprofit religious or secular schools, as well as for-profit institutions) that often are looking for part-time teachers, again, on campus or online.

Fourth, given the proliferation of online undergraduate and graduate programs, you can cobble together a practically full-time (or even more than full-time) teaching position, if online teaching is something with which you are comfortable. Fifth, you can combine travel with teaching. There are semester-at-sea programs, and you can exploit the professional contacts you've developed over the years to obtain one-semester or one-year term appointments at colleges and universities that are away from your normal base of operation. Schools often are looking for replacements for faculty members who are going on sabbatical, and this is a chance

to teach at a school you may have admired for some time, or one in a location with weather, scenery, or food that appeals to you. There is no central repository of information on sabbatical replacement positions, so you may have to ask around with your professional contacts. Sixth, you may be able to give guest lectures in conjunction with your regularly planned travels. In these situations, you need to check with your tax preparer as you may be able to claim part of the expenses as a tax deduction.

Finally, many institutions of higher education offer what are called "community education" programs. These may be on topics like painting, pottery, or wine tasting, but they can also include criminal justice topics that are in the news, like police misconduct or the death penalty. People often take these classes to broaden their horizons or to explore topics that they want to know more about. These classes typically depend on the potential instructor to propose the topic and decide what the appropriate fee will be. The fun part of most of these classes is that they are composed of adult learners (some of them retirees also) who have a variety of world experiences that they can share. However, you may decide that while you want to continue to be involved in academics in some way, you really don't want to continue teaching. If so, go on to the next section.

Research

For some of you, continued involvement in research is very appealing. You may have had an active (funded or not) research agenda and you would like to continue to pursue that in retirement. If you hold emeritus/a status at your institution, you probably will be allowed to serve on (and perhaps even direct) masters and doctoral committees. This activity crosses over from research to service (the next topic), and some departments are incredibly thankful to have extra help directing graduate research. Once again, you also may be able to exploit (positive use of the term here) the professional contacts you've developed over the years and be included on funded research projects that require multisite data collection. If you have a continuing institutional affiliation, you also may be able to write grant applications for that research project you always wanted to undertake but never had time to do before.

One of the difficulties that you may encounter in the area of research (and consulting, discussed in the next section) is that some universities cut off or substantially limit access to resources (office space, library privileges, etc.) for retired faculty members. This may not be the case for those who hold emeritus/a status, but it is still possible given the budgetary constraints under which many universities now operate. It may be worthwhile to continue to teach a class (see the previous section) in order to have ongoing access to university facilities and resources.

I also include writing books under the topic of research. You may want to pursue writing a scholarly monograph for a university press or another one of the companies that publishes such works. Retirement also gives you more time to write or rewrite textbooks. We could get into a long debate about whether textbooks qualify as research or not, since everyone seems to have an opinion on the topic. However, I include that activity here as it does require traditional library research in order to find the most recent data on a variety of criminal justice topics and involves the creative

process of organizing and summarizing sometimes complex concepts into material more easily grasped. In my own case, I've written or revised eight books since I retired in 2011. My wife often says I wasn't that busy when I was "working." The good news about doing research in retirement is that it is something you *get* to do (or want to do), not something you *have* to do (unless, of course, you have an editor and publisher). However, even that dimension doesn't make research in retirement appealing to many people. If that's the case with you, go to the next section (or back to an earlier one).

Service

During our full-time academic careers, service or service obligations can often appear to be burdensome. However, in retirement you get to pick and choose your areas of involvement. This may be especially appealing to those who worked at schools where "service" only counted if it was discipline related. Now it can be anything, and there are many community volunteer possibilities that can be fulfilling and even get you into concerts or sporting events for free.

I've already mentioned one potential service opportunity in retirement: serving on graduate committees. Nevertheless, there are quite a few other service opportunities, and I will mention some that most readily come to mind. First, publishers frequently are looking for manuscript reviewers, and the fact that you are retired may not make any difference to them as long as you are familiar with the subject matter. Related to this, I have found that journal editors are often looking for and appreciative of reviewers, especially in emergency situations when they need a review turned around in two or or three days. There are plenty of service opportunities in this area. Second, a number of departments that I'm familiar with regularly have faculty members going up for promotion and/or tenure and they often need outside reviewers. Once again, the fact that you are retired may not mean as much to them as the fact that you have had some reputation in the field and that you are willing to do the review in the specified time.

Third, departments may be mandated to engage in periodic program reviews (either as part of the ACJS program review process or separate from it). They need individuals who can review their self-study materials and who can come to campus for a couple of days to meet with faculty and administrators to discuss the department's strengths and weaknesses. I have been in a situation where one of the scheduled reviewers had a family emergency, and I was called to be a replacement on very short notice. Since I was already retired, I had the flexibility of schedule that I could accept the invitation. Fourth, organizations like ACJS and its regional associations frequently are in need of standing committee chairs and members, as well as session organizers, chairs, and discussants for the annual meetings. Your service here can be very helpful.

Finally, criminal justice agencies with which you've had contact may be in search of a consultant for a particular project (personnel training sessions, writing policies or certification exams, etc.). This is the way you can get money from your former students. Using the title "consultant" opens up a number of avenues (and covers a multitude of sins as well), and social network sites like LinkedIn can put you in contact or keep you in contact with people and

agencies that might desire your services. Once again, this is an area where, as a retiree, you can pick and choose how, when, and how often you want to get involved. If the three areas of teaching, research, and service don't sound appealing to you in retirement, go back to the section on nonacademic retirement.

Conclusion

When I got ready to retire, one of my retirement planners said, "Remember, in a short time you will go from who's who to who's he." If you've invested many years in building an academic career it may be difficult to think about retirement. All of us have a certain amount of psychological and emotional investment in our careers and our professional identities. Some faculty members get to the end of busy and productive careers and may feel like they want to write a new and totally different chapter to their lives, one that has nothing to do with universities, classrooms, and committee meetings. Others may want to continue some involvement, either for a transitional period of a year or two, or indefinitely. The good news about all of this is that the categories I've outlined are not necessarily mutually exclusive. You can buy a houseboat or RV with high-speed Internet access and sightsee and relax as well as teach online classes. You may "drop out" for a short time only to discover that you want to drop back in. You also might be involved in one aspect of the academic enterprise (for example, teaching) only to discover that you'd really rather be working on writing projects or providing service to the profession in some way. Whichever course of action you decide to take, you may be able to go back to one of the key junctures of the story and take a story and take a slightly different path. That way, you can choose your own adventure. I chose mine and the adventure continues.

Acknowledgments: I want to acknowledge the many helpful comments, suggestions, and corrections made by three people who are pursuing their own adventures in one form or another. They are, in alphabetical order, Philip Reichel, Frank P. Williams III, and L. Thomas Winfree, Jr.

***G. Larry Mays** holds a doctorate degree in political science from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He began his criminal justice adventure while serving for five years as a police officer in Knoxville, Tennessee. He taught at East Tennessee State University for four years, Appalachian State University for two years, and New Mexico State University for 30 years. Dr. Mays is author, editor, coauthor, or coeditor of 24 books, more than 70 articles in refereed journals, and 37 book chapters and encyclopedia entries, and he has presented more than 90 papers at regional, national, and international meetings.*

ACJS

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

ACJS Editor Position: *ACJS Today*

The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences is seeking applications for the position of **Editor** of ***ACJS Today***, the official online newsletter of ACJS.

The Editor of *ACJS Today* will be responsible for producing a high quality professional online newsletter for the membership of the Academy. The Editor will set editorial policy, solicit materials, consider unsolicited submissions for publication, develop features of interest to the membership, and manage the newsletter.

The Executive Board of the Academy will appoint the Editor for a three-year term. *ACJS Today* is published five times a year, with issues in January, March, May, September, and November. The Editor's first issue will be in September 2017 and will be determined by the date of appointment and in consultation with the current Editor, Robert Worley. There is a $1,500 summer stipend for the Editor.

Applicants must meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrated record of scholarly activity as measured by such indicators as publications in refereed journals, book publication, and research.
- Prior editorial experience as measured by such indicators as editorial responsibilities for other scholarly publications and past experience as a referee or associate/deputy editor of an academic journal, or other editorial experience demonstrating the applicant's ability to implement and maintain the integrity of blind review, to improve or maintain the quality of the publication, to communicate effectively, and to behave in a professional manner that is supportive of the mission and goals of the ACJS and consistent with the ACJS statement of ethics.
- Commitment to the ACJS Code of Ethics, particularly to Section III.C regarding research and publication.
- Earned Ph.D. or terminal degree in area of specialization.
- Formal declaration of support from host institution, including release time, space, and other support services the institution will commit to editorship.
- ACJS membership in good standing for three continuous years at the time of application.

Application materials are due no later than **November 1, 2016.** Please feel free to address questions to either Heather Pfeifer, Chair of the *ACJS Today* Editor Search Committee hpfeifer@ubalt.edu or the current Editor, Robert Worley rworley@lamar.edu

ACJS Today

Editor: **Robert M. Worley, Ph.D.**
Lamar University
Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 10026
Beaumont, Texas 77710
Phone: 409.880.7827
rworley@lamar.edu

Historian: Mitchel P. Roth, Ph.D.
Sam Houston State University
College of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 2296
Huntsville, TX 77341
Phone: 936.294.1649
icc_mpr@shsu.edu

ACJS National Office

Mary K. Stohr: Executive Director
execdir@acjs.org

Mittie D. Southerland: Executive Director Emeritus
mittie.southerland@gmail.com

Cathy L. Barth: Association Manager
manager@acjs.org

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
P. O. Box 960
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

Office Location:
7339 Hanover Parkway, Suite A
Greenbelt, MD 20768-0960
Tel.: (301) 446-6300; (800) 757-ACJS (2257)
Fax: (301) 446-2819
Website: http://www.acjs.org

ACJS Today Publication Dates

January
March
May
September
November

Submission Deadlines

December 15th
February 15th
April 15th
August 15th
October 15th

The editor will use his discretion to accept, reject or postpone manuscripts.

Article Guidelines

Articles may vary in writing style (i.e. tone) and length. Articles should be relevant to the field of criminal justice, criminology, law, sociology or related curriculum and interesting to our readership. Please include your name, affiliation and email address, which will be used as your biographical information. Submission of an article to *ACJS Today* implies that the article has not been published elsewhere nor is it currently under submission to another publication.
Photos: jpeg or gif
Text format: Microsoft Word, RTF, TXT, or ASCII
Citation Style: APA 5th Edition

ACJS 2016 – 2017 Executive Board

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
ACJS Today
P.O. Box 960
Greenbelt, Maryland 20768-0960