

**The Annual Review of
Interdisciplinary Justice Research
Volume 7, 2018**

**Edited by
Steven Kohm, Kevin Walby, Kelly Gorkoff,
Michelle Bertrand and Bronwyn Dobchuk-Land
The University of Winnipeg
Centre for Interdisciplinary Justice Studies (CIJS)
ISSN 1925-2420**

Beyond Impact Factor Fetishism: Representing Justice in Criminal Justice and Criminology Journals

Kevin Walby and Steven Kohm
University of Winnipeg

Abstract:

This article explores how justice research is evaluated, measured, and communicated in the peer-reviewed social science journal industry. We examine issues of impact factor and journal prestige as measured using common citation indices. Engaging with literature on impact factors and their proliferation across the social sciences, we compare impact factor, subscription cost, and other indicators of journal prestige for 41 criminology, criminal justice, and socio-legal studies journals. Our findings suggest an upward trend in emphasis on impact factor and a concurrent upward trend in cost of journal subscriptions, which we claim illustrate trends in the corporatization of journal production, publication, and management. We reflect on other consequences of publishing industry corporatization, including the rise of predatory journal publishers as well as the outsourcing of journal production. In conclusion, we contrast the corporate journal publishing model with autonomous journal production (e.g., *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*), raising questions about what it means to represent justice in academic journal publications.

Keywords: criminology; criminal justice; impact factor; academic journals; corporatization; justice

Introduction

This article explores how justice research is evaluated, measured, and conveyed in the peer-reviewed social science journal industry. Archambault and Larivière (2009) note that since 1995 there has been a surge of journals and papers measured using impact factor. Fleck (2013) refers to this surge as impact factor fetishism. There is a broad literature on journal status and citation-based impact in the social sciences going back more than five decades (e.g., Christenson & Sigelman 1985; Garfield 1972). A specific literature on journal status

and citation-based impact in criminology and criminal justice studies exists too — including recent allegations of “corrupt practices” associated with one criminology periodical in particular (Baker 2015; Bartlett 2015). We examine issues of impact factor and journal prestige measured using common citation indices with focus on periodicals in criminology and criminal justice. We contend that such figures and measures should not simply be of interest to bibliometric- and informetric-oriented scholars. By examining impact and its effects in academia, criminologists and criminal justice scholars can learn something about the work that we do, the journals that are included and excluded by trends in publishing, as well as the corporations we inadvertently support with our research efforts and writings. Taking a broader view of the practice and business of academic publishing allows us to better understand how criminological and criminal justice research is represented to scholarly audiences as well as the limits and constraints on academic knowledge. As Cullen (2015) notes, critical analyses of criminological bibliometrics holds much potential to help us better comprehend the criminology and criminal justice fields and ourselves as scholars.

Engaging with literature on impact factors and their proliferation across the social sciences, we compare impact factor, journal subscription cost, and other indicators of journal prestige for 41 criminology, criminal justice, and some socio-legal and justice studies journals. Our findings, which we refer to as the costs of impact, suggest an upward trend in emphasis on impact factor and a concurrent upward trend in the cost of journal subscriptions, both of which we claim are illustrative of a tendency toward corporatized journal production, publication, and management. Corporatization is defined as making organizations or processes more business-like in their operations or more bottom-line and profit oriented (McDonald 2014). We contend that the focus on impact has intensified as this corporate structure of the publishing industry has expanded. We reflect on other consequences of publishing industry corporatization,

including the rise of predatory journal publishers as well as the outsourcing of journal editing, typesetting, and proofing. We assert that the corporatization of academic publishing undermines the aims of critical scholarship in justice studies and militates against certain approaches and subjects of research. The ascendancy of impact factor in academic publishing is therefore analyzed here as an indicator of the corporatization process. We do not argue that academics should stop trying to publish in journals owned and operated by major corporations, but to be aware of the practical and ethical implications of the publishing industry corporatization for our work as academics (Larivière et al. 2015).

We contrast the corporate journal publishing model with autonomous, independent journal production (e.g., *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*), raising questions about what it means to represent justice in journal publications. We argue that independent and open-access publishing in criminology and criminal justice studies better reflects our commitment to the advancement of knowledge and the pursuit of justice that lies at the heart of our scholarly discipline (Crank 2003).

Note on Method

We use three primary sources of information — a sample of 41 criminology, criminal justice, and socio-legal journals, survey data from a sample (N=6) of journal editors, and our own experiences in the publishing industry as editors and authors. Journal editors were asked to reflect on the themes in the literature on impact factors and discuss their experiences as editors, including their interactions with publishers. In the sample of 41 journals, we examined impact factor, subscription cost, and other indicators of journal prestige (see Appendix). We included Canadian, Australian, and European journals to broaden the analysis, since the literature on journal impact in criminology and criminal justice is very U.S.-centric. As Stack (1987: 476–477) noted, a journal can be called a criminology journal if criminologists publish in it, cite it, and define it as a criminology or

criminal justice journal. Nadeau et al. (2018) note that criminology and criminal justice studies have become more multidisciplinary over time. We thus have operated with a generous notion of criminology and criminal justice journals with our sample. We have included some socio-legal journals and some justice studies journals as well because the boundaries between these and criminology and criminal justice journals are not as totalizing as the literature on impact in criminology and criminal justice journals suggests. We have not only included the standard measure of impact, but also the Scimago Journal Ranking (SJR). We are not claiming to offer sophisticated bibliometric- and informetric-oriented analyses. Nor are we interested in coming up with some replacement indicator of impact. Instead, we are interested in assessing some overlooked dimensions behind these figures.

Social Science Journal Publishing and Impact Factors

Much of the literature on journal impact factors and scholarly citation indices assesses what citation indices measure, how impact factors have changed over time, why journals move up and down ranking scales, which scholars are the most highly cited (e.g., Cohn & Farrington 2007), and whose individual scholarly impact is greatest (Copes et al. 2012; Khey et al. 2011). An early debate between Shichor et al. (1983) and Poole and Regoli (1981) jested over approaches to measurement but suggested there was broad consensus about which journals in U.S. criminology had the highest impact. One of the earliest papers to rank criminology journals using the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) was written by Stack (1987). However, since Stack's paper, the calculation of impact factors has evolved, with the rise of Scimago Journal Rank, among others. All of these measures assess journal impact in slightly different ways. Impact factor according to the SSCI, the most widely used score and technique for measuring impact, is defined as the number of citations (in any peer-reviewed journal article) of peer-reviewed articles published by the journal in the two previous years, divided by the total number of peer-reviewed articles published by the journal in

those two years. Google Scholar and Scopus can be used to generate lists of citations for those without access to the Thomson Reuters database that is home to the SSCI. There are also discussions about how to refine and extend these measures (Nisonger 1994). Perhaps more notably, the awareness of impact factors by journal editors and scholars has become heightened, with numerous effects we explore below.

Barranco et al. (2016) refer to the big three journals in our field as *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, and *Justice Quarterly*. In a study of criminology and criminal justice journals, their impact factors, and associated ranking, Jennings et al. (2009) note there is a good deal of stability in which journals are ranked most highly, defined as journals ranked in the top 20 journals. Yet there is also variability. For example, between 1998 and 2007, the *British Journal of Criminology* was in the top 5 for some years but fell out of the top 20 other years (Jennings et al. 2009: 165). It all depends on the number of citations and the number of highly cited articles that fall within the two-year window used to measure impact. Relatedly, Campbell et al. (2006) examine ranking of legal journals in the United Kingdom, finding similar stability in journal rankings. This article provides a rare contribution from law to bibliometric- and informetric-oriented literature from outside the United States.

Jennings et al. (2009) also explore some implications of these forms of assessment. First, they argue myopic focus on disciplinary impact may lose sight of cross-disciplinary impact. Second, they note there is variation in how impact factors are calculated, notably the window of time used to calculate the impact. Third, Jennings et al. (2009) argue journals that allow review articles may artificially inflate their impact since review articles are cited more frequently. Fourth, special issues that end up publishing “string citations” (Jennings et al. 2009: 170) or multiple citations on a single topic (e.g., a particular concept or theme) from a single paper in a single issue may inflate impact.¹

¹ Some scholars have also raised critical questions about the standard peer review process, including the fact that peer review can involve low interrater reliability, low prognostic quality,

Fifth, some journals are not listed, so their impact is overlooked, a theme we return to below. Sorensen (2009) suggests non-criminology journals and niche journals are not well reflected in these now standardized measures for impact factor. He also notes self-citation can artificially boost the impact factor for journals. For example, the editorship of *The Journal of Criminal Justice* was taken over by biosocial criminologist Matt DeLisi, who promptly set about making sure that his own papers and papers previously published in *The Journal of Criminal Justice* (many by fellow biosocial criminologists) were heavily cited, especially in his opening editorials. Controversially, DeLisi authored or co-authored 26 papers in *The Journal of Criminal Justice* since assuming editorship in 2010 (Baker 2015). DeLisi's frequent self-citations no doubt boosted the scholar citation scores for DeLisi and his co-authors and also boosted the impact factor of the journal (see Baker 2015; Bartlett 2015). Bartlett refers to this case as the journal that could not stop citing itself.² This is just one of the ways that editors can boost or inflate the impact factor of their journal, an issue we return to below.

There is also literature that gauges scholars' perceptions and beliefs in an effort to verify the impact factor assessments. For example, Sorensen et al. (2006) conducted a survey with U.S. scholars at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) and American Society of Criminology (ASC) about their perception of journal prestige. They exclude Canadian and Australian journals. As perhaps Canadian scholars might expect given the venue and sample, the authors found that *Criminology* and *Justice Quarterly* were top journals in the opinion of these scholars. As Sorensen et al. (2006: 319) put it, there is a high degree of concordance between calculation

low consistency, confirmation bias, and poor editorial choices (Osterloh & Kieser 2015; Osterloh and Frey 2015).

² Journals can be banned for such practices, but it is primarily predatory journals that are being banned by Thomson Reuters at this time. However, Bursik (2015: 11) notes that Thomson Reuters removed several non-criminology journals for excessive self-citation, including *The Scientific World Journal*, referring to it as a "citation cartel."

of impact factor and opinions of U.S. scholars at ACJS and ASC about their perception of journal prestige. Sorensen (2009: 508) similarly suggests the top journals tend “to be quite consistent across the measures.”

It could be referred to as a concordance as Sorensen et al. (2006) put it; however, we suggest it is more like a herd mentality and self-fulfilling prophecy that is in concordance with the corporatization of academic journal publishing. The fetishization of impact can create a misleading valorization of journals that become propped up as disciplinary watermarks. As Archambault and Larivière (2009: 639) argue, impact factors are also “widely open to manipulation by journal editors and misuse by uncritical parties.” As one journal editor told us: “The standard Impact Factor as used by Thomson Reuters is actually pretty simple, but it’s both easy to get slightly wrong and, more seriously, is easy to manipulate if no-one actually checks the claims made.” The editor continued: “Where it’s easy to go wrong is that one can easily miscount the citations, by including those for all years instead of just the one year, or misinterpreting a source as peer-reviewed when it’s not. So you have to be careful. You can also make these mistakes deliberately...” Another way that this can happen involves coercion. As one journal editor noted, inflation of impact can happen

when an editor encourages (sometimes insists) that an author reference articles that have been published in his/her journal, thereby increasing the citation count for the journal. I have seen a version of this in practice, where an editor essentially said “cite some of my work.” He was a theorist, and the article bore no relationship to anything that the author had written about, but the professor I was helping at the time (I was a PhD student) just told me “find something of his I can quote.”

None of the editors we spoke with said they directly laboured to increase the impact factor of their journal. However, most confirmed

that impact factor is frequently discussed among the editorial board and in conversations with publishers. One editor described the way impact factor is discussed at the editorial board level:

While impact factor is rarely a direct concern, it does come up whenever the board meets...For instance, the board often strategizes about how citations might be increased due to simply citing the work in the journal more often...or citing our own work (gaming the system a bit). We also follow carefully which articles achieve the most citations and think through why.

The impact of highly ranked journals is not typically called into question, and neither is the fetishization of certain publication venues. Because measures of journal impact can be manipulated and abused, it is important to take a critical view of these practices rather than reify such scores and practices.

Findings: The Costs of Impact

Several items stand out in our examination of 41 journals reviewed (see the Appendix for full figures). First, there is incredible variation from year to year within one approach (e.g., SSCI) to measuring impact (also see Waltman 2016). These variations correspond with the above-mentioned criticisms of impact factor, notably that the window of measurement is too short and the decisions can be manipulated (Haustein & Larivière 2015). The two-year window is far too short for the social sciences as it may take several years for a paper to be recognized as significant (Fleck 2013: 338). As Lozano et al. (2012) note, letters and commentaries might be counted, which is problematic since these are not reviewed contributions. Moreover, there are slight differences in the techniques of counting citations (Waltman 2016) hidden in these numbers.

Second, there is incredible variation between approaches to measuring impact (also see Waltman 2016). The SJR is a size-

independent prestige indicator that ranks journals by their ‘average prestige per article.’ It is based on the idea that ‘all citations are not created equal.’ SJR is a measure of scientific influence of journals that accounts for both the number of citations received by a journal and the importance or prestige of the journals where such citations come from. It measures the influence of the average article in a journal, and it expresses how central an average article of the journal is to the global scientific discussion. Thus, there is not necessarily concordance between measures of impact in the way one might expect. There is also variation from country to country in terms of how national bodies of scholars and associations view top journals and interpret the rankings and scores. For example, using a combination of measures, writing from an Australian context and representing the Australia & New Zealand Society of Criminology, Brown and Daly (2008) ranked *British Journal of Criminology*, *Law and Society Review*, *Punishment and Society*, and *Theoretical Criminology* as the top criminology journals in the world. Outside of University of Toronto and Simon Fraser University (and universities in Quebec where scholars fetishize Anglophone journals), we assume that the opinions of most Canadian scholars in criminology and criminal justice would be similar. Yet in the United States, *British Journal of Criminology*, *Law and Society Review*, *Punishment and Society*, and *Theoretical Criminology* do not ever seem to match up with what Barranco et al. (2016) call the big three in criminology and criminal justice (CCJ): *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, and *Justice Quarterly*. There is variation in the scores, and notably in the interpretation of the scores, and the variation may strongly overlap with national cultures of publication and research.

Third, most notably related to corporatization, the costs are high. Of the 41 journals we examined, 25 have an individual subscription cost over \$100. Similarly, 21 of the 41 journals have an institutional subscription cost over \$700. Not surprisingly, the journals owned by major corporate publishers tend to be those with an institutional subscription cost over \$700. Whether it is the U.S.-centric literature

that uses conventional measures of impact (Barranco et al. 2016) and views *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, and *Justice Quarterly* as the best journals, or Australian accounts (Brown & Daly 2008) that have different approaches and view *British Journal of Criminology*, *Law and Society Review*, *Punishment and Society*, and *Theoretical Criminology* as the top journals, all the so-called top journals are among the most expensive. More unexpectedly, several journals with institutional costs over \$700 purport to be critical, social justice-oriented publication venues. This raises practical and philosophical questions related to the purpose of critical scholarship in criminology and criminal justice studies. Can we advocate for accessibility in the justice system while simultaneously supporting a profit-oriented, corporatized academic publishing regime?

There are two broader, related findings from these data. First, impact is everywhere for the majority of these criminology and criminal justice journals. It is displayed prominently on their pages and communications. As Fleck (2013) puts it, authors and journal editors fetishize impact for marketing, promotion, and impression management purposes. It has become an obsession. Second, the costs of these journals are substantial, and have gone up as the focus on impact has been amplified. For example, *Crime, Law and Social Change* charged \$1,186 USD for an institutional subscription in 2005, and \$1,894 in 2015.³ Moreover, the costs have increased in the past decade, yet the products have not changed significantly if at all. There has been no value added to these journal publications despite the massive increases in cost (Larivière et al. 2015: 12). As Larivière et al. (2015) note, five major corporate publishing companies more or less own the journal publishing industry. Moreover, journals in the social sciences exhibit the highest degree of corporate concentration;

³ Not all journal subscription prices went up. For example, *Social Justice Research* charged \$654 USD for an institutional subscription in 2005, but only \$184 in 2015 (although, the print copy was eliminated as the journal moved to a strictly online format).

Elsevier, Wiley-Blackwell, Springer, and Taylor & Francis own more than 70 percent of the journals in the social sciences (Larivière et al. 2015: 1). The profits that these companies reap are significant. Elsevier harvests an annual revenue of approximately \$5 billion (STM Report 2015). These companies are also buying up more independent journals every quarter. The managing editor of an independent journal we spoke with reported being approached by one of the colossal corporate journal publishers with a buyout offer, including rights to all back issues. This journal remains independent for the time being, but corporate players are poised to take over as the journal continues to struggle to find the funds to operate. Meanwhile, university libraries are struggling to purchase new material and maintain subscriptions. It would seem that our data on criminology and criminal justice journals support the claims of Larivière et al. (2015) about journal industry overcharging. As Larivière et al. (2015: 11) put it, “due to the publisher’s oligopoly, libraries are more or less helpless, for in scholarly publishing each product represents a unique value and cannot be replaced.” Corporate publishers have libraries over a barrel. Libraries across Canada pay \$7 million or more in institutional subscriptions per year (Larivière et al. 2015). A paradox of journal publishing in the online open access era is that access to these publications is becoming more restricted due to corporate-driven cost increases.

Related Indicators of Corporatization

Other indicators of corporatization of journal publishing include the rise of predatory publishing, paid peer reviews, and changes in the journal production labour process. First, a slate of predatory publishing companies that print dissertations and theses now prey on unsuspecting graduate students and junior scholars, hoping to print their works and sell them to libraries purely for profit. For example, Lambert Academic Publishing for emails students who have just finished their graduate degree and attempts to entice them into publishing the thesis as a book without any (credible) peer review. Likewise, there are many dubious predatory journals that operate in a similar fashion. According to Bohannon (2013), scholars in the

developing world are often exploited by pay-for-play journals because they have fewer academic opportunities and institutional supports. Scholars in Canadian universities are also being duped by predatory academic outlets that promise to publish and promote academic research for monetary fees that range into the thousands. A notorious example is a digital newsletter and website that has operated under several names including Adjacent Government, Adjacent Open Access, and Adjacent Digital Politics. Using high pressure boiler room sales tactics, academics are telephoned by salespersons peddling the opportunity to have their work featured in the digital newsletter. University administrators relay to us that they have had to intervene in cases where academics received demands for payments of thousands of dollars with the threat of legal action.

Second, as Bohannon (2013) has shown, pay-for-play journals will publish almost anything, and the standards for peer review are much lower. Bohannon (2013) accuses these journals of accepting for publication articles that contain basic errors in science.⁴ It is noteworthy that some of the journals identified in Bohannon's study were owned by major corporate academic publishers including Elsevier, Wolters Kluwer, and Sage (Bohannon 2013: 65). A related issue is the emergence of paid reviews for these pay-for-play journals. For example, a website called Scholar Town invites reviews of pay-for-play journals, and pays for the reviews. The first author went down to Scholar Town to take a look.⁵ The website pays between \$40 and \$60 for single paper reviews for journals owned by mostly predatory publishing companies. It is also worth noting that traditional academic publishers such as Oxford now routinely pay reviewers for their peer-reviewed anthologies and encyclopaedias.

⁴ It would seem that the issue of predatory journal publishing has entered the mainstream. Recently, CTV News reported that predatory journals "...which operate on a for-profit basis, are often publishing poorly researched and illegitimate science that could endanger scientific credibility and patients" (Gajewski 2017).

⁵ We use the expression "went down to Scholar Town" in jest. The first author simply emailed the website and asked how the process worked and how much he would be paid for peer reviews.

Thus, the practice of scholarly peer review as a time-honoured and voluntary tradition in academia is becoming coopted by the corporate imperative of efficiency. Anecdotal experience with paid peer review suggests that efficiency — that is, turning around positive manuscript reviews quickly — is often rewarded with yet more paid reviews, thus ensuring a mutually rewarding relationship between the corporate publisher and the enterprising academic.⁶

A third indicator of corporatization is the outsourcing of copy-editing and formatting processes to India and other South Asian countries. Many journals with the corporate journal publishers, and many of the major corporate book publishers, have begun to outsource copy-editing and formatting processes. The labour is cheaper, but the workers induce many errors in these writings that must be corrected (Selwyn 2016). According to Sallaz (2013), “should your next paper be accepted by a journal that utilizes this outsourcing model, it will pass across the desktop computers of between 40 and 50 front-line employees in the global South, each of whom are paid about 0.50 USD per hour to do various things to it.” In the recent experience of the first author, with a journal enjoying a high impact factor, a copy editor in the Philippines induced numerous errors in the text including changing coordinator to voordinator, chief to vchief, and southern to douthern. The journal then tweeted out an alert about this version containing numerous induced errors, and posted the paper online first on the journal website. The error-ridden article was not taken down for over two weeks. There can also be poor communication between procuring and managing editors stationed in England and the copy editors and typesetters based primarily in India. This can create frustration for scholars, delays, and errors in the final

⁶ By invoking the term “enterprising academic” we are highlighting a propensity for some scholars to seek to commercialize or profit from aspects of their work that might have previously been performed without charge — notably, providing peer review of journal manuscripts. While the term “enterprising” could also be applied to scholars who work to create their own publishing venues outside of profit-driven, corporate publishing structures, we do not use the term in that way in this article.

published works. At the same time, this shift in labour process generates staggering profits for publishing companies.

Additional indicators of corporatization on scholars or by scholars include duplicate publication, when there is considerable overlap between publications. Duplicate publication can exaggerate the significance of findings and chew up valuable publication spaces that might be occupied by other papers (Griffiths 2008). This approach can be used to artificially inflate a scholar's citation scores, which are used in the United Kingdom and elsewhere for annual evaluations and to determine workload. These pressures are real for scholars in the United Kingdom, Australia, and elsewhere, hence the greater frequency of duplicate publications. Relatedly, these tools are also now used to measure the research capacity and output of universities, which in true New Public Management form (Lorenz 2012) have an impact on levels of funding.

Discussion and Conclusion: Alternatives to and Reflections on the Costs of Impact

From Christenson and Sigelman (1985) to Copes et al. (2012), there is recognition in the literature on impact that citation-based scores for individual scholars and for journals should be taken with a big grain of salt. There is some consistency and substance to these scores, but scores and rankings can also be manipulated and miss a lot of significant, meaningful scholarly work. Notably, these approaches to scoring individual scholarly work and journal performance are not able to measure the contributions of works that do not participate in the corporate-dominated journal publishing world. Archambault and Larivière (2009) note that these measures of impact factor may marginalize non-English work and scholars, and amplify the sense of prestige among U.S. scholars and journals, since the measures focus heavily on English-language sources in the United States. And as one journal editor told us:

The other thing is that the Impact Factor is a pretty useless measure of impact. For example, it doesn't include citations of your peer-reviewed articles in books, however prestigious, influential or widely read. It doesn't measure if any newspapers or magazines take up the findings, or whether university teachers are including them on reading lists and so on. It also doesn't include the impact of non-peer reviewed material, even if it is cited in peer-reviewed publications — and some editorials and opinion pieces are very highly cited. It's also very time-limited and doesn't measure long-term impact and pieces that become influential several years after publication or are rediscovered, don't feature. The Google h5 index is a bit better for this, covering citations over a 5-year period.

Measures for different types of scores (for example, h-index, e-index, g-index, and so on) are now being used to create a sub-literature on “academic stars” (see Khey et al. 2011) that further exalts publication in the journals that impact factor scoring favours. However, as Lopez-Cozar et al. (2014) point out, the Google Scholar scoring system is subject to abuse because false papers, duplicate papers, and book reviews can be indexed.

There are alternatives. *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research* and *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* are two Canadian publications that by design evade or avoid some of the problems with corporate journal publishing. Both journals are independent financially. *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research* is funded by internal grants and the occasional external grant. *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* is funded primarily through subscriptions. Both strive to be affordable. Both journals are independent when it comes to the editorial process. Both use blind peer review and extensive editorial boards to review submitted works. Both strive to be as inclusive as possible. And both journals provide venues for exploring different, open definitions of and viewpoints on justice that are not typically accepted in some highly

ranked journals such as what Barranco et al. (2016) call the big three in CCJ: *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, and *Justice Quarterly*. Through their outreach and publishing, both *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research* and *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* make an impact in criminology and criminal justice studies, but they do not calculate impact factors and do not intend to configure one in the future either. *Radical Criminology* is a journal that likely fits into this group, as well as *Champ Penal*.

Yet individual authors may not feel they can submit their work to these non-traditional journals because their prospects for tenure and promotion rely on demonstrating a journal's rank in the discipline as measured by traditional impact factor metrics. The same pressures that have driven the shift from "deeper intellectual, methodological, and temporal commitments" in criminology to "mainstream article sociology" (Ferrell, Hayward and Young 2008: 163) tend to support the growth of corporatized academic publishing. We do not blame our academic colleagues for choosing their publication outlets in ways that will ensure they can advance in their careers. Nor are we arguing established scholars and graduate students should stop trying to publish in journals owned and operated by major corporations. Obviously that would be detrimental to scholarly careers given the institutionalized recognition of certain journals as leading venues (Gabbidon et al. 2011). There are institutionalized incentives to publish in corporate journals, but the action of doing so "reinforces the control of commercial publishers [over] the scientific community" (Larivière et al. 2015: 13). Valuable and socially useful work in criminology and interdisciplinary criminal justice research may not be published at all if scholars tailor their topics, methods, and research questions to fit the strictures of so-called high impact journals. Nevertheless, alternatives beyond corporate journals such as *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research* and *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* represent a way forward that opens the door to different topics, research questions, and methodologies

that are not always featured in mainstream criminology and criminal justice journals. Choosing to publish our work in an independent forum may come with a cost to our academic career, but it is a tangible act of resistance to the corporatization of scholarly publishing.

The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research, *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* and similar venues may seem like fringe droplets in a bigger corporate bucket of journal publishing. They are. Beyond autonomous, independent journal management, Beverungen, Bohm and Land (2012) argue that a resurgence of university presses and a fair trade model of publication management are other approaches that could help to counter the corporatization of journal publishing. The challenges that need to be overcome are immense. Perhaps a first crucial step is naming the problem, and noting that our publishing efforts advance corporate profit and even global inequality in ways that it would be difficult to suggest meet any definition or standard of justice. To represent justice in our published works, we must give concerted thought not only to what we are saying, but also to the processes and corporate structures that facilitate and underpin the dissemination of our research.

Representing Justice in Criminal Justice and Criminology Journals

Appendix

Journal Title	Publisher	2015 Cost		Year	Impact Factor	Scimago Journal Ranking (SJR)	Cited Items	% International Collaboration
		Individual	Institutional					
Policing and Society	Routledge	\$494 (print)	\$1,684 (online)	2015	1.732	0.89	62	4.6
				2014	0.966	0.409	45	7.41
				2013	1.213	1.004	52	3.23
				2012	0.704	0.641	35	12.5
				2011	1.044	0.575	25	19.35
Crime, Law and Social Change	Kluwer Academic Publishers	\$99 (online)	\$1,894 (online)	2015	0.718	0.366	74	17.14
				2014	0.982	0.46	89	18.18
				2013	0.928	0.51	76	17.14
				2012	0.673	0.338	77	10.91
				2011	0.782	0.341	72	6.56
Police Quarterly	Sage	\$135 (print)	\$762 (online)	2015	1.243	1.109	33	5.56
				2014	1.525	0.978	38	5.88
				2013	0.744	0.705	32	5
				2012	0.865	1.264	36	25
				2011	1.5	0.861	43	0
Critical Criminology	American Society of Criminology	\$99 (online)	\$686 (online)	2015	0.803	0.419	48	19.23
				2014	0.621	0.274	27	21.43
				2013	0.571	0.603	27	10.53
				2012	0.475	0.179	22	6.9
				2011	0.722	0.244	22	0
Feminist Criminology	Sage	\$171 (print)	\$749 (online)	2015	1.063	0.622	32	5.88
				2014	1.161	0.741	30	5.26
				2013	1.567	1.183	31	6.67
				2012	0.857	0.874	25	5.56
				2011	1.323	0.591	23	0
Criminology and Criminal Justice	Sage	\$120 (print)	\$1,007 (online)	2015	1.477	0.718	69	13.79
				2014	1.15	0.785	56	13.51
				2013	2.276	1.316	57	9.68
				2012	1.863	1.118	52	6.25
				2011	1.913	0.787	47	7.14
Journal of Criminal Justice	Pergamon Press Ltd.	\$317 (print)	\$2,013 (online)	2015	2.936	2.006	142	20
				2014	3.505	2.659	153	27.87
				2013	2.973	2.12	205	22.81
				2012	1.795	1.087	190	21.82
				2011	1.809	0.934	209	4.69
Criminology	American Society of Criminology	Not Available	\$358 (online)	2015	5.549	5.142	79	22.58
				2014	3.902	4.138	88	7.41
				2013	4.164	4.767	96	20.69
				2012	4.507	4.009	109	6.06
				2011	3.342	5.197	100	13.51
British Journal of Criminology	Oxford University Press	\$212 (print)	\$957 (online)	2015	2.252	1.373	129	17.24
				2014	1.956	1.242	125	12.77
				2013	2.514	2.109	136	12.28
				2012	2.617	1.5	121	0
				2011	3.354	1.984	111	3.85

The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research – Volume 7

Punishment & Society	Sage	\$124 (print)	\$1,184 (online)	2015	1.146	0.594	37	8
				2014	1.523	1.122	52	18.52
				2013	2.038	1.552	63	4.35
				2012	1.608	1.2	54	13.64
				2011	2.333	1.508	45	12.5
Crime & Delinquency	Sage	\$211 (print)	\$2,185 (online)	2015	1.24	1.327	97	3.57
				2014	1.489	1.458	84	3.77
				2013	1.241	1.035	67	3.92
				2012	1.569	1.341	69	7.69
				2011	2.208	1.856	56	8.16
Criminal Justice and Behavior	Sage	\$115 (print)	\$1,152 (online)	2015	1.55	1.193	181	11.27
				2014	1.926	1.392	167	17.57
				2013	2.27	1.632	172	11.69
				2012	2.212	1.506	159	20.45
				2011	2.374	1.374	186	12.31
Crime & Justice	University of Chicago Press	\$65 (online)	\$270 (online)	2015	5.222	1.267	12	23.81
				2014	1.294	0.62	13	0
				2013	0.684	0.845	13	0
				2012	2.15	1.759	23	0
				2011	2.563	3.755	22	25
Justice Quarterly	Academy of Criminal Justice Science	\$314 (online)	\$1,257 (online)	2015	2.233	2.366	89	6.56
				2014	2.284	2.025	79	8.93
				2013	2.269	2.613	79	8.7
				2012	2.464	2.108	76	3.13
				2011	2.662	2.775	73	2.78
Law and Social Inquiry	University of Chicago Press	\$60 (print+online)	\$313 (online)	2015	0.723	0.57	61	6.52
				2014	0.773	0.467	51	9.3
				2013	0.871	0.523	49	2.27
				2012	0.873	0.528	51	5.26
				2011	1.155	0.621	44	5.71
Law and Society Review	Blackwell Publishing Inc.	\$133 (online)	\$532 (online)	2015	1.18	0.82	46	9.68
				2014	1.836	1.446	71	4.17
				2013	1.879	1.843	63	14.29
				2012	2.103	1.565	62	7.41
				2011	1.811	1.118	59	9.68
Journal of Law and Society	Blackwell Publishing Inc.	\$86 (print+online)	\$1,339 (online)	2015	0.724	0.265	45	11.54
				2014	1.154	0.264	41	6.67
				2013	1.271	0.398	50	0
				2012	2.45	0.307	52	4
				2011	1.897	0.33	51	12.5
Crime, Media, Culture	Sage	\$93 (print)	\$765 (online)	2015	0.788	0.753	28	5.26
				2014	0.769	0.482	29	13.33
				2013	1.308	0.508	35	10.53
				2012	0.765	0.426	24	0
				2011	0.719	1.005	24	5
Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies &	Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.	Not Available	Not Available	2015	0.761	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
				2014	0.725			
				2013	0.410			
				2012	0.534			

Representing Justice in Criminal Justice and Criminology Journals

Management				2011	0.547				
Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice	Canadian Criminal Justice Association	\$100 (print)	\$175 (online)	2015	0.583	0.34	27	25	
				2014	0.688	0.456	24	9.52	
				2013	0.636	0.343	31	9.68	
				2012	0.588	0.326	26	14.29	
				2011	1.068	0.926	35	3.57	
Canadian Journal of Law and Society	Cambridge University Press	Not Available	\$198 (online)	2015	0.677	0.247	23	0	
				2014	0.5	0.176	19	5.26	
				2013	0.354	0.174	16	0	
				2012	0.091	0.178	11	0	
				2011	0.704	0.34	11	2.86	
Howard Journal of Criminal Justice	Basil Blackwell	\$210 (print+online)	\$1,319 (online)	2015	0.678	0.357	44	7.14	
				2014	0.686	0.353	31	3.85	
				2013	0.667	0.444	14	2.56	
				2012	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	
				2011	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	
The Prison Journal	Sage	\$137 (print)	\$863 (online)	2015	0.449	0.43	33	8.7	
				2014	0.354	0.694	39	12.5	
				2013	0.977	1.137	48	8	
				2012	1.444	0.818	51	8.7	
				2011	0.4	0.586	40	6.25	
Contemporary Justice Review	Routledge	\$152 (print)	\$481 (online)	2015	0.373	0.148	15	2.86	
				2014	0.286	0.231	22	0	
				2013	0.509	0.28	30	3.13	
				2012	0.585	0.171	21	0	
				2011	0.259	0.165	7	6.45	
Criminal Justice Studies	Routledge	\$170 (print)	\$490 (online)	2015	0.362	0.236	17	21.43	
				2014	0.364	0.273	22	3.57	
				2013	0.315	0.22	20	6.45	
				2012	0.333	0.171	16	6.25	
				2011	0.404	0.393	23	3.23	
Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research	University of Winnipeg	Open Access	Open Access	2015					
				2014					
				2013					
				2012					
				2011					
Journal of Prisoners on Prisons	University of Ottawa	\$15 (print)	\$60 (online)	2015					
				2014					
				2013					
				2012					
				2011					
Law, Culture and the Humanities	Sage	\$157 (print+online)	\$706 (online)	2015	0.647	0.131	17	0	
				2014	0.372	0.16	19	0	
				2013	0.98	0.291	25	0	
				2012	0.404	0.143	17	0	
				2011	0.422	0.169	20	3.45	

The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research – Volume 7

Police Practice & Research	Harwood Academic Publishers	\$194 (print)	\$743 (online)	2015	0.704	0.503	49	6.56
				2014	0.557	0.332	42	7.41
				2013	0.681	0.258	51	14.29
				2012	0.553	0.405	41	4.35
				2011	0.25	0.259	13	8.89
Criminology, Criminal Justice, Law & Society (formerly Western Criminology Review)	CA State University — San Bernardino	Open Access	Open Access	2015	0.379	0.217	11	0
				2014	0.289	0.337	18	40
				2013	0.419	0.326	19	11.54
				2012	0.355	0.223	13	0
				2011	0.235	0.301	8	0
Theoretical Criminology	Sage	\$111 (print)	\$1,165 (online)	2015	1.696	1.217	63	20
				2014	2.157	1.189	57	9.38
				2013	3.077	2.389	61	10
				2012	2.054	1.399	48	11.54
				2011	1.275	1.264	48	10.71
Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology	Australian Academic Press Pty Ltd.	\$186 (print)	\$622 (online)	2015	0.609	0.352	33	17.24
				2014	0.837	0.778	38	3.85
				2013	1.568	0.687	50	9.09
				2012	1.12	0.877	45	12
				2011	1.021	0.634	37	3.7
Canadian Journal of Women and the Law	University of Toronto Press	\$39 (print)	\$82 (online)	2015	0.5	0.158	11	4.55
				2014	0.294	0.3	23	0
				2013	0.846	0.261	19	0
				2012	0.5	0.218	21	0
				2011	0.188	0.148	5	0
Criminal Justice Ethics	Institute for Criminal Justice Ethics	\$69 (print)	\$300 (online)	2015	0.308	0.181	11	11.11
				2014	0.188	0.202	10	6.67
				2013	0.054	0.122	8	7.14
				2012	0.088	0.12	6	0
				2011	0.767	0.352	13	0
The Criminal Law Quarterly	Not Available	Not Available	\$162 (print)	2015	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
				2014	0.05			
				2013	0.05			
				2012	0.07			
				2011	0.07			
European Journal of Criminology	Sage	\$107 (print)	\$1,237 (online)	2015	1.408	0.909	95	24.44
				2014	1.424	1.12	90	17.07
				2013	1.671	1.598	72	12.82
				2012	1.762	0.806	66	19.61
				2011	1.88	2.213	51	22.5
Social Justice Research	Springer	Not Available	\$184 (online)	2015	0.98	0.692	43	25
				2014	1.38	0.761	40	24
				2013	1.205	0.425	39	15.38
				2012	1.265	0.857	36	11.54
				2011	1.314	0.917	38	30
International Criminal	Sage	\$47 (print)	\$379 (online)	2015	0.4	0.243	21	33.33
				2014	0.667	0.466	25	13.64

Representing Justice in Criminal Justice and Criminology Journals

Justice Review				2013	0.78	0.848	30	21.05
				2012	0.476	0.306	21	19.05
				2011	0.744	0.416	23	4.76
Social & Legal Studies	Sage	\$122 (print)	\$1,249 (online)	2015	1.184	0.457	44	6.06
				2014	1.264	0.556	46	8
				2013	1.186	0.782	48	12
				2012	0.927	0.582	49	3.57
				2011	0.863	0.398	31	9.38
International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice	Taylor & Francis	\$83 (print)	\$282 (online)	2015				
				2014				
				2013				
				2012				
				2011				
Journal of Criminal Justice Education	Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences	\$178 (print)	\$715 (online)	2015	0.483	0.261	30	3.33
				2014	0.429	0.485	35	3.57
				2013	1.056	0.849	45	3.13
				2012	1.379	0.793	49	0
				2011	0.955	0.735	37	3.23

References

- Archambault, E. and V. Larivière. 2009. History of the Journal Impact Factor: Contingencies and Consequences. *Scientometrics* 79/3: 635–649.
- Baker, T. 2015. An Evaluation of Journal Impact Factors: A Case Study of the Top Three Journals Ranked in Criminology and Penology. *The Criminologist* 40/5: 5–10.
- Barranco, R., W. Jennings, D. May and M. Wells. 2016. What Journals are the Most Cited Journals in Criminology and Criminal Justice’s Big Three Journals? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 27/1: 19–34.
- Bartlett, T. 2015. The Journal that Couldn’t Stop Citing Itself. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 62/5: 14.
- Beverungen, A., S. Bohm and C. Land. 2012. The Poverty of Journal Publishing. *Organization* 19/6: 929–938.
- Bohannon, J. 2013. Who’s Afraid of Peer Review? *Science* 342: 60–65.

- Brown, M. and K. Daly. 2008. Report on Criminology Bibliometrics Development. Adelaide: Australia & New Zealand Society of Criminology.
- Bursik R. 2015. Comments: An Evaluation of Journal Impact Factors: A Case Study of the Top Three Journals Ranking in Criminology and Penology. *The Criminologist* 40/5: 11.
- Campbell, K., A. Goodacre and G. Little. 2006. Ranking of United Kingdom Law Journals: An Analysis of the Research Assessment Exercise 2001 Submissions and Results. *Journal of Law and Society* 33/3: 335–363.
- Cohn, E. and D. Farrington. 2007. Changes in Scholarly Influence in Major International Criminology Journals. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 40/3: 335–359.
- Copes, H., S. Cardwell, and J. Sloan. 2012. H-Index and m-Quotient Benchmarks of Scholarly Impact in Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 23/4: 441–461.
- Christenson, J. and L. Sigelman. 1985. Accrediting Knowledge: Journal Stature and Citation Impact in Social Science. *Social Science Quarterly* 66/4: 964–975.
- Crank, J. 2003. *Imagining Justice*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Cullen, F. 2015. Observations on Criminological Bibliometrics. *The Criminologist* 40/5: 11–13.
- Ferrell, J., K. Hayworth and J. Young. 2008. *Cultural Criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fleck, C. 2013. The Impact Factor Fetishism. *European Journal of Sociology*, LIV/2: 327–356.

- Gabbidon, S., G. Higgins and F. Martin. 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.
- Gajewski, Misha. 2017. Predatory Publishing a Growing Problem, Warn Scientists. CTV News, Saturday, October 7, 2017.
- Garfield, E. 1972. Citation Analysis as a Tool in Journal Evaluation. *Science Citation Index* 178: 471–479.
- Griffiths, P. 2008. Duplicate Publication and ‘Salami Slicing’: Ethical Issues and Practical Solutions. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 45/9: 1257–1260.
- Haustein, S., and Larivière, V. 2015. The Use of Bibliometrics for Assessing Research: Possibilities, Limitations and Adverse Effects. In Welpel, I. M., Wollersheim, J., Ringelhan, S., & Osterloh, M. (Eds.) *Incentives and Performance: Governance of Knowledge-intensive Organizations*. Cham: Springer. pp. 121–139.
- Jennings, W., G. Higgins and D. Khey. 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* 20/2: 157–172.
- Khey, D., W. Jennings, G. Higgins, A. Schoepfer, and L. Langton. 2011. Re-ranking the Top Female Academic ‘Stars’ in Criminology and Criminal Justice Using an Alternative Methods. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 22/1: 118–129.
- Larivière, V., S. Haustein, and P. Mongeon. 2015. The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era. *PloS ONE* 10/6: 1–15.

- Lopez-Cozar, E, N. Robinson-Garcia, and D. Torres-Salinas. 2014. The Google Scholar Experiment: How to Index False Papers and Manipulate Bibliometric Indicators. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65/3: 446–454.
- Lorenz, C. 2012. If You're so Smart, Why are you Under Surveillance? Universities, Neoliberalism, and New Public Management. *Critical Inquiry* 38/3: 599–629.
- Lozano, George A., Vincent Larivière, and Yves Gingras. 2012. The Weakening Relationship between the Impact Factor and Papers' Citations in the Digital Age. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 63/11: 2140–2145.
- McDonald, D.A. 2014. Public Ambiguity and the Multiple Meanings of Corporatization. In D. McDonald (Ed). *Corporatization and Public Services in the Global South*. New York, NY: Zed Books. pp. 1–30.
- Nadeau, F., P. Mongeon, and V. Larivière. 2018. Les influences disciplinaires de la criminology anglo-americaine: une etude bibliometrique. Forthcoming with *Criminologie*
- Nisonger, T. 1994. A Methodological Issue concerning the Use of Social Sciences Citation Index Journal Citation Reports Impact Factor Data for Journal Ranking. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 18/4: 447–458.
- Osterloh, M. and A. Kieser. 2015. Double-Blind Peer Review: How to Slaughter a Sacred Cow. In Welpel, I. M., Wollersheim, J., Ringelhan, S., & Osterloh, M. (Eds.) *Incentives and Performance: Governance of Knowledge-intensive Organizations*. Cham: Springer. pp. 307–321.
- Osterloh, M. and B. Frey. 2015. Ranking Games. *Evaluation Review* 39/1: 102–129.

- Poole, E. and R. Regoli. 1981. Periodical Prestige in Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Criminology* 19/3: 470–478.
- Sallaz, J. 2013. Your Paper Has Just Been Outsourced. *Global Dialogue: Newsletter for the International Sociological Association*. 3/4. <http://isa-global-dialogue.net/your-paper-has-just-been-outsourced/>
- Selwyn, N. 2016. Academic Work in the Digital Age. Talk given at the Disrupting Higher Education Dialogues conference, Deakin University.
- Shichor, D., R. O'Brien and D. Decker. 1983. Periodical Prestige in Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Criminology* 21/3: 457–461.
- Sorensen, J. 2009. An Assessment of the Relative Impact of Criminal Justice and Criminology Journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 37/5: 505–511.
- Sorensen, J., C. Snell and J. Rodriguez. 2006. An Assessment of Criminal Justice and Criminology Journal Prestige. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 17/2: 297–322.
- Stack, S. 1987. Measuring the Relative Impacts of Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals. *Justice Quarterly* 4/3: 475–484.
- STM Report. 2015. International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers, Fourth Edition published March 2015. The Hague: International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers.
- Waltman, L. 2016. A Review of the Literature on Citation Impact Indicators. *Journal of Informetrics* 10/2: 365–391.