

THIS IS A MANS WORLD ... OR LEAST THATS HOW IT LOOKS IN THE JOURNALS

SUSAN F. SHARP

*Department of Sociology, University of Oklahoma, 780 Van Vleet Oval, KH 331,
Norman, OK, 73019, USA
E-mail: ssharp@ou.edu*

KRISTEN HEFLEY

*Criminal Justice Department–PAC 384, University of Illinois at Springfield,
One University Plaza, Springfield, IL 62703-5407, USA
E-mail: khefl2@uis.edu*

Abstract. Mainstream criminology still tends to focus on gender as a control variable, ignoring the different pathways to crime followed by males and females. This leaves us with knowledge that we already have—males commit more criminal and delinquent acts than do females, but little information about the similarities and differences between men and women who commit crimes. On the other hand, feminist approaches tend to do one of two things: deal with girls and women only or deal with women and men separately to illuminate the differences. In this paper, we examine articles in three major journals, *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, and *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, to explore the ways that gender is treated in mainstream criminology journals. Then, we will discuss the implications this has for feminist criminology.

Introduction

Scholars agree that women are far less likely than men to engage in crime (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996). However, there is considerable disagreement as to how we should approach this difference. Mainstream criminology has considered women to be only marginally relevant because of their lesser rates of offending. Gender, if addressed at all, has often been a control variable in analyses, telling us that women offend less than men but little about their offending or non-offending. Certainly, these types of analyses do not tell us about women and girls' pathways to offending nor do they tell us whether the dominant mainstream theories predict equally well for women and men (Chesney-Lind 1989).

In contrast, feminist criminologists have argued that much of the field of criminology is based on the faulty premise that the study of male criminality is the study of crime. That approach assumes that what explains male crime will also explain female crime, a method criticized by feminist criminologists (cf., Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988; Daly 1995). Feminists argue that this masks the truth about female criminality as well as the responses to girls' and women's crimes (Belknap 2001; Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988; Katz 2000). Overgeneralization of findings leads to an assumption that we have knowledge about crime, while in reality we have knowledge about *male* crime (Hannon and Dufour 1998). Additionally, it is important to understand why one group (females) is less likely than the other group (males) to commit more serious crimes despite similar demographics and experiences (Hannon and Dufour 1998).

Furthermore, scholarship builds on existing scholarship. A focus on androcentric criminological theories to the exclusion of feminist approaches leads to a continued bias in favor of male-oriented criminology and to ignoring the contributions of feminist criminology (Chesney-Lind and Pasko 2004; Flavin 2001; Goodstein 1992; Heidensohn 1987; Wilson 1991). This translates to a dearth of feminist theory and research in criminology and criminal justice courses, ensuring that the production of new scholars is still based on research that has primarily been done by and about men (Goodstein, 1992; Heidensohn 1987; Renzetti 1993). Indeed, the disciplines of criminology and criminal justice have lagged far behind many other fields in their acceptance of feminist scholarship and integration of its products into the base of knowledge of the disciplines (Britton 2000; Renzetti 1993). The perpetuation of this exclusion of feminist criminological research and theory into the mainstream is furthered by the "cultural literacy" argument (Thornberry 1990). Thornberry identified a core literature with which he argued that any expert in criminology should be familiar. Not surprisingly, feminist work was woefully underrepresented, leading to the ongoing devaluation of the contributions of feminist scholarship in the education of new generations of scholars (Renzetti 1993).

To correct this bias, feminist scholars do not argue for discarding the dominant theories. Instead, they advocate supplementing what we know about crime and the criminal justice system, not by excluding men but by also studying women. Additionally, they point out that neither studying only men nor presenting theories in a gender-neutral way will help increase our understanding of female crime (Flavin 2001).

However, it is important to note that feminist criminology is not a theory but rather a perspective or epistemology (Burgess-Proctor 2006; Daly 1997; Flavin 2001). By putting the focus on women, feminist criminology seeks to shed light on how the gendered nature of society is reflected in crime and in the criminal justice system's response to crime. Indeed, a feminist approach can add to our understanding of not only female crime but also male crime. Furthermore, it can sensitize us to how multiple social placements impact the pathways to crime and victimization as well as responses to crime (Burgess-Proctor 2006; Potter, 2006; Wonders 1991). Chesney-Lind and Pasko (2004) argue that feminist criminology has "profound implications for mainstream criminology" (p. vii).

Feminist criminology has emerged and grown over the last three decades (Goodstein 1992). As a result of the women's movement of the 1960s and second wave feminism, works on women and crime began to be more frequently published. First, a special issue of *Issues in Criminology* focusing on women and crime (Klein and Kress 1973) was published (Flavin 2001; Simpson 1989). Then, Simon (1975) and Adler (1975) set forth theories arguing that women's liberation would lead to more female crime. While these two books brought the study of female offending into the spotlight, their approaches are not always considered to be feminist (Wright, 2000). Perhaps the birth of feminist criminology is more easily marked with the publication of Smart's (1976) book, *Women Crime and Criminology* (Britton, 2000).

These early studies of women and crime have been followed by a wealth of feminist work (Belknap 1996; Brownmiller 1975; Burgess-Proctor 2006; Chesney-Lind 1989, 2006; Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988; DeKeseredy 1999; Morris 1987; Morris and Gelsthorpe 1991; Owen and Bloom 1995; Pollock 2002; Ritchie 2000; Russell 1982; Schwendinger and Schwendinger 1983; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997; Simpson 1989; Stanko 1990; Steffensmeier and Allan 1996; Young 1986; Wilson 1991; Wonders 1991). However, much of this body of work has been relegated to specialty journals (e.g. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *Violence Against Women*, *Sex Roles*, *Feminist Criminology*), special issues of other journals, or book-length treatments (Flavin 2001). Feminist criminology has continued to grow, but in many areas it has continued to be marginalized.

The production of feminist criminological scholarship has increased both in quantity and scope since the liberation argument was introduced. Feminist work on the female offender, however, has continued to be somewhat marginalized. Indeed, one study argues that despite similar

backgrounds, there are “both subtle and profound differences in female and male offending patterns” (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996, p. 466), bringing into question the suitability of mainstream criminology to explain female offending. By the early 1980s, the Division on Women and Crime (DWC) of the American Society of Criminology was founded (Rafter 2000) as well as a section on minorities and women in the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (Goodstein 1992). Then, two journals were created to increase the visibility of feminist criminological research. *Women & Criminal Justice* was launched in 1989, followed by *Violence Against Women* in 1995. Recently, the DWC launched its own journal, *Feminist Criminology*. These journals have definitely increased the visibility of feminist criminological work. However, overall, mainstream criminological journals still appear to place minimal importance on feminist approaches to the study of crime and the criminal justice system.

In the current study, we evaluate three major criminology journals, *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, *Justice Quarterly* and *Criminology*, to determine the degree to which the field has remained male-focused. We examine how gender is used in analyses to determine whether or not criminology is still “a man’s world.” We chose the journals for their stature in the field. *Criminology* is the official journal of the American Society of Criminology. According to the website of the American Society of Criminology, “the most recent journal rankings from the Institute for Scientific Information identifies *Criminology* as the leading professional journal in the field of criminology (first out of 22), sixth of 96 in the field of sociology, and 29th of 101 in the field of law” (American Society of Criminology 2005). *Justice Quarterly* is the official journal of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the other national association of criminologists and criminal justice professionals, and as such should be included in this analysis. Finally, *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* is ranked as the second most influential criminological journal for the 2000–2004 time-frame by the ISIS Essential Science Indicators (In-Cites 2005).

Rationale for the study

Twelve years ago, the *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* published a special issue devoted to the integration of women’s issues into criminal justice and criminology courses. According to Goodstein (1992), criminology had been slower than many disciplines to incorporate feminist perspectives. She cited Heindensohn (1987), Daly and Chesney-Lind (1989) and Simpson (1989), all of whom observed that mainstream

criminology had been affected only slightly by the vast amount of feminist criminological scholarship. Furthermore, universities were slow to adopt feminist literature into their curricula (Goodstein 1992), ensuring that mainstream criminology would continue as it had, with little impact made by feminist work. In the same special issue, Eigenberg and Baro (1992) examined gender in five criminal justice journals, noting that women published less often in these journals than men. They also found that the gender composition of the editorial staff of the journals was strongly related to the gender of the authors. Specifically, the journal with the highest proportion of female editors and associate editors also had the greatest number of publications authored by females, while the journal with no female editors had the fewest number of papers authored by women.

Nor has the problem been limited to journals. Introductory text books in criminology and criminal justice also suffer from this bias. For example, Baro and Eigenberg (1993) criticized the treatment of women in criminology and criminal justice textbooks, focusing on pictorial representations. More broadly, textbooks have been criticized for ignoring critical perspectives on crime, including critical feminism (DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1996; Wright 2000). When included, feminist approaches are often limited to an examination of more mainstream approaches such as those of Adler (1975) and Simon (1975), according to one analysis (Wright 2000). Indeed, this study found that the mean page coverage of critical feminism, while higher than for other types of critical theorizing, was only 3.23 pages per text, covered in slightly less than three-fourths of the texts surveyed (Wright 2000, p. 111).

As Renzetti (1993) has pointed out, the fields of criminology and criminal justice have been especially slow to recognize that gender affects all areas of social life, including crime and responses to crime. Indeed, feminist approaches to the study of crime and responses to crime were often published in “woman-specific” journals such as *Women & Criminal Justice* or in texts and edited volumes devoted to the study of women and crime. Most articles in the dominant journals in these two related fields still published research that rarely acknowledged different paths and responses to crime by gender. Renzetti went on to describe articles by Thornberry (1990) as well as Siegel and Zalman (1991) in which they describe the works they believed should be considered the “core literature” in criminology, with less than three percent addressing women and gender issues (Renzetti 1993, p. 223). While she agreed with the importance of the works they cited, she advocated broadening the list to incorporate feminist approaches as well.

One recent study examined the representation of females in the criminological literature from 1895 to 1997. The findings confirmed that females are traditionally underrepresented in research published in sociological and criminological journals. Additionally, the author suggested that the numerical dominance of male researchers in the field of criminology might be part of the problem (Hughes 2005). However, she also concluded that female researchers, like their male counterparts, were more likely to focus on males than on females (Hughes 2005, p. 19). What is missing from her analyses, however, is a critical examination of *how* gender is used rather than whether or not women are included.

Another fairly recent study examined the androcentric nature of the criminological literature, focusing on whether females were included in the research at all. Hannon and Dufour (1998) conducted a study of how gender was utilized in articles published in four criminology journals over two time periods (1974–1978 and 1992–1996). Their study examined whether research included both sexes or only one sex. They then went on to examine the degree to which the articles over-generalized, noting whether or not the titles specified that only one sex was sampled. While they did acknowledge that the latter period produced more research that included women, they concluded that later research still paid scant attention to gender differences (Hannon and Dufour 1998).

The studies by Hughes (2005) and Hannon and Dufour (1998) confirmed that criminology at the end of the twentieth century was “still just the study of men and crime” (Hannon and Dufour 1998.) What is lacking in both studies, however, is a critical analysis of how gender is actually handled in the mainstream criminological literature. In other words, despite the greater number of studies utilizing both sexes, the question arises whether the resulting analyses are truly gendered. Likewise, do examinations of the criminal justice system’s responses to crime take a gendered approach, or are they limited to telling us that men get longer sentences? The current study seeks to begin answering these questions.

Methods

In the current study, we examined articles from the three most highly ranked criminology journals in the United States, *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, and *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* for the years 2000–2004 for a total of 20 issues of each journal. The total number of

articles, commentaries and research notes was 412. Our analyses were based on how gender was approached in the articles. We utilized the following categories in our coding scheme:

- Gender was not applicable: the analyses did not include individuals as a unit of analysis. These included meta-analyses and analyses at higher units of analysis, including county, state, and nation.
- Gender was ignored as a variable. (The research did not specify which gender or genders were included in the analyses.)
- Gender was used as a control variable only.
- The data included both males and females, but no attempt was made to examine the effects of gender.
- The analyses were limited to males only.
- The analyses were limited to females only.
- The analyses were conducted separately for males and females.
- Gender was used as a moderating variable.

In some cases, the analyses were conducted in more than one way. For this paper, we elected to code the data to reflect the most feminist approach used in the article. For example, if the article included analyses using gender as a control variable as well as separate analyses by gender, we coded the article as separate analyses by gender. In the subsequent analyses, we eliminated all articles in which gender was not applicable, resulting in a final sample size of 317 articles.¹ We created a variable, “female-sensitive,” that incorporated those types of analyses that would provide a lot of information about women. Only three of the categories (“females only,” “separate analysis by gender,” and “gender as a moderating variable”) are likely to be “female-sensitive.” For the purposes of this study, we agree with Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988), that a feminist analysis would place women at the center. Thus, the use of gender as a control variable would not meet our definition. Only by paying particular attention to the ways in which gender organizes social life and institutions can we add to our understanding of the gendered nature of crime and criminal justice. We use the term “female-sensitive” to indicate that females are treated as central to the analyses.

Whether or not the articles were devoted to criminal justice research was also examined. The former variable included analyses related to arrests, sentencing and incarceration. Seventy-four (23.3%) of the 317 articles were related to criminal justice issues. We next examined the theoretical approach to the analyses. Seventy-five of the articles (23.7%) were atheoretical, thirty-nine (12.3%) used some version of control or self-control theory, eighteen (5.7%) used social disorganization theory,²

four (1.3%) used differential association or social learning theory, sixteen (5.0%) used some version of strain theory, ten (3.2%) used routine activities or opportunity theory, nine (2.8%) used deterrence theory, fourteen (4.4%) used conflict theory, forty-three (13.6%) used more than one theory, and eighty-nine (28.1%) used some other theoretical approach, including feminist theories. We created a dichotomous variable measuring whether or not the analyses utilized feminist theories. Forty-five articles (14.2%) used overtly feminist theories, accounting for roughly half of the “other” theoretical approaches.

Results

We first conducted frequency distributions on the operationalization of gender. The results are reported in Table 1. By far, the majority of cases fall into the category “gender as a control variable,” accounting for 52.4% of the articles ($n = 166$). In 11.0% of additional articles ($n = 35$), gender was ignored completely, and in 6.9% ($n = 22$), the article explicitly stated that the sample included both males and females but analyses did not incorporate gender.

Turning to gender-specific analyses, a total of 63 articles focused on only one sex. Seventeen articles (5.4%) analyzed females only compared to forty-six articles (14.5%) that used a male-only sample. Thirty (9.5%) incorporated separate analyses by gender, and one used gender as a moderating variable (0.5%).

We then collapsed the coding categories into two categories: “female-sensitive” coded 1 and “not female-sensitive” coded 0. The categories “females only,” “separate analysis by gender,” and “gender as a

Table 1. Operationalization of gender in the articles

Operationalization of gender	<i>N</i>	%
Gender was ignored	35	11.0
Gender was a control variable	166	52.4
Included both males and females together	22	6.9
Males only	46	14.5
Females only	17	5.4
Separate analysis by gender	30	9.5
Gender was a moderating variable	1	0.3
Total	317	

moderating variable” were coded as “female-sensitive.” All others were coded “not female-sensitive.”³ By this definition, only 48 articles (approximately 15.2%) were female-sensitive. The other nearly 85% utilized the more traditional approaches of focusing only on men, ignoring gender, or controlling for the effects of gender.

We also divided the articles into a variable measuring whether they were criminal-justice related or not criminal justice-related due to the recent amount of scholarship on incarcerated women. Seventy-four articles (23.3%) were related to the criminal justice system. In Table 2, we cross-tabulated this variable with the female-sensitive variable to determine whether the apparent gender bias was more dominant in criminal justice articles. While a slightly higher percentage of non-criminal justice articles were female-sensitive, this difference was not significant ($\chi^2 = .67, 1 \text{ df}$).

We next cross-tabulated the female-sensitive variable with the year of publication to explore whether articles were becoming more female-sensitive. The results are reported in Table 3. Here, we found an interesting pattern. Approximately 17–19% of the articles were female-sensitive during three of the years. In 2000, 18.4% met our definition of female-sensitive, 19.3% met the definition in 2003, and 16.9% met the definition in 2004. However, in 2001, only 13.6% were female-sensitive, and only 5.5% were female-sensitive in 2002. We conducted chi-square analyses on the different pairs of years and found that 2002 was significantly different from 2000 ($\chi^2 = 4.75, 1 \text{ df}, p = .029$), 2003 ($\chi^2 = 5.03, 1 \text{ df}, p = .025$) and 2004 ($\chi^2 = 3.80, 1 \text{ df}, p = .05$). No other two years differed significantly. At first glance, it would appear that this could be an artifact of 9/11. However, the two-year trend began in 2001. The delay in getting an article into print precludes a response to 9/11 as the explanation of why fewer articles with a female-sensitive approach were included in these years. It is probably far more likely that editorial decisions or the

Table 2. Cross-tabulation of “female-sensitive” operationalization by criminal justice

	Criminal justice		Subtotals
	Yes	No	
<i>Female-sensitive</i>			
Yes	9 (12.2%)	39 (16.1%)	48
No	65 (87.8%)	204 (83.9%)	269
Subtotal	74	243	317

Table 3. Cross-tabulation of “female-sensitive” operationalization by year of publication

	Year of publication				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Female-sensitive</i>					
Yes	14 (18.4%)	8 (13.6%)	3 (5.5%)	12 (19.3%)	11 (16.9%)
No	62 (81.6%)	51 (86.4%)	52 (94.5%)	50 (80.7%)	54 (83.1%)

focus of funding sources may have dictated the reduction in female-sensitive articles during 2001 and 2002. Changes in the editor of each journal could also have had an effect on the decisions of what type of research to publish. For example, the editor of *Journal of Research in Crime in Delinquency* changed in 2003. Perhaps not coincidentally, in 2004 we found twice as many articles that incorporated female-sensitive analyses than in any other year. On the other hand, *Criminology* changed editors in 2004. For the years 2000–2003, there were nine, three, three and six female-sensitive analyses per year. However, with the advent of the new editor in 2004, only two articles included female-sensitive analyses. It is slightly more difficult to interpret the effects of changes in editorship for *Justice Quarterly*. In 2000 and 2001, under one editor, there were three female-sensitive articles per year. With the advent of a new editor in 2002, there were no female-sensitive articles for one year. Then, this new editor produced volumes in 2003 and 2004 with five articles per year containing female-sensitive analyses.

Finally, we used logistic regression to determine which of our variables predicted a female-sensitive approach to articles. The results are reported in Table 4. The analyses included the year of publication, whether or not the article had a criminal justice orientation, and whether or not the article used feminist theory. Additionally, we created dummy variables for the three journals and omitted *Justice Quarterly* as the reference category for the analysis. As expected, year of publication had no effect on whether or not the article was female-sensitive, although as noted above, 2002 was an anomaly that bears further investigation. Having a criminal justice orientation approached significance ($b = -.912$, $p = .062$) and was negatively related to being female-sensitive. A criminal justice article being female sensitive was only .402 as likely as with a non-criminal justice oriented article. Not surprisingly, the use of feminist theory was the best predictor ($b = 3.474$, $p \leq .05$), and the odds were that

Table 4. Logistic regression of female-sensitive on year of publication, criminal justice focus, feminist theory, and journal

	<i>B</i>	SE	Odds ratio
Constant	-68.084	250.780	
Year of publication	.032	.125	1.033
Criminal justice orientation	-.912 [†]	.501	.402
Feminist theory	3.474***	.472	32.264
<i>JRCD</i>	.810	.581	2.249
<i>Criminology</i>	1.203**	.484	3.330
Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ²	.355		

[†] $p \leq .10$, * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$.

articles using feminist theory were 32.264 times more likely than other articles to present female-sensitive analyses. Interestingly, being published in *Criminology* as opposed to *Justice Quarterly* had a significant effect on the likelihood of an article being female-sensitive ($b = 1.203$, $p < .01$). In fact, articles in *Criminology* were more than three times more likely to be female-sensitive.

Discussion

Gender is still included as a control variable in the majority of journal articles of *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, and *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*. Thus, critical questions about female offending and females in the criminal justice system are not being addressed. Our analyses demonstrate that a slight majority (52.4%) of the articles persist in using gender in a way that reinforces what we already know. Gender control variable analyses are essentially the “add women and stir” approach (Chesney-Lind 1986, p. 81) that simply tells us that males are more likely to commit crime (or to receive longer sentences than females in the case of criminal justice articles). Because the authors do not undertake separate analyses by gender or examine gender in interaction with other variables or as a moderating variable, they make fundamental assumptions about how the theories used in the studies explain gendered behavior. This assumption is that models developed on male subjects are “gender-neutral.” In other words, there is a tacit belief that males are normal and that females who commit crime must be like men who commit crimes.

Different but related assumptions appear to characterize other operationalizations of gender. These assumptions are based upon the norm of male offending: another almost 18% of the articles tell us nothing about women at all, either because they ignore gender as a variable or analyze males and females together without controlling for gender.

Ultimately, out of five years and 317 total articles, only 48 provide readers with real insight into female offenders and how they may differ from males. However, many of these employed what Flavin (2001) refers to as the most advanced approach to understanding female offenders by using theory to examine how a variety of factors interact with gender to affect criminality (Burgess-Proctor 2006; Potter, 2006; Wonders 1991). Arguably, in three decades of effort feminist criminologists have expanded both by pointing out the limitations of theories of men's criminality and by advancing theories of their own (Flavin 2001). However, widely disseminated research in the field of criminology as a whole has changed little. Because of this and the fact that feminist research in criminology is still largely contained in specialty journals or less prestigious ones, knowledge brought to the table by feminist criminologists remains marginalized. "Malestream" (Renzetti 1993) criminology still fails to benefit from the insights offered by feminist work in the field. More disturbingly, the accepted core literature of the field (Thornberry 1990) is still dominated by research that fails to take into account the gendered nature of crime and the justice system.

The fact that males do commit more crime than females may be used as justification for the lack of substantial inclusion of female-sensitive articles. However, two important problems result from disregarding the rich pool of knowledge being generated by feminist criminology. First, women are affected by the criminal justice system's policies. However, these policies are still enacted based on male needs and male behaviors (Flavin 2001). The number of women involved in the criminal justice system, however, is growing. In 2004, the incarceration rate for women increased twice as fast as the rate for men (Harrison and Beck 2005), but women are being incarcerated in a system that is based on a different type of offender.

Second, the omission of information about female offenders is detrimental to the field in another, equally important, way. Because gender is the variable that can best predict involvement in crime (Hannon and Dufour 1998; Steffensmeier and Allan 1996), there is value in considering how a gendered social structure contributes to different gendered outcomes (Flavin 2001; Naffine 1996). An authentic consideration of

gendered criminal trajectories requires going beyond the obvious and typical treatment of gender in research that simply demonstrates that males and females have differing rates of offending. Feminist criminology has led the way to more critical examinations of how the lives of both women and men are related to their offending as well as their non-offending, yet it appears that this is still only marginally accepted.

The current article has certain limitations that point to the need for more research on this topic. First, current feminist criminology advocates an approach that takes into account the intersection of multiple systems of oppression (cf. Burgess-Proctor 2006; Wonders 1991). In the current study, while we acknowledge the importance of intersectionality, we have focused only on how females are dealt with in the three journals. Clearly, more research is needed to explore not only the treatment of race and class but the degree to which articles take an intersectionality approach.

Additionally, further research should examine how gender is examined in second-tier and third-tier journals to understand if change has been continuing to occur that has not yet manifested itself in the journals examined in the current study (Eigenberg and Baro 1992). It may be the case that feminist methods and female-sensitive articles are more welcomed in journals that do not have to maintain themselves as the flagship journals of the field. However, this approach ultimately perpetuates the problem (Goodstein 1992; Renzetti 1993). Because the two highest-ranked journals and the official journal of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences all continue to be insensitive to gender differences in crime, the “core literature” remains androcentric (Thornberry 1990; Siegel and Zalman 1991). Graduate programs continue to produce a large number of Ph.D.s with only limited knowledge about the gendered nature of crime. Due to this, everyone loses out on the wealth of knowledge that gender-sensitive research can contribute. Clearly, insight into both male and female offending could be advanced through a more detailed examination of gender in published articles. The field, however, remains stagnant as long as it continues to ignore feminist epistemology and its methods for incorporating women into research.

Notes

1. Examples of article in which gender was not relevant include meta-analyses, comparisons of nations or other entities, and so forth.

2. Although there were more articles using this theory, only 15 incorporated analyses at the individual level.
3. While we acknowledge that occasionally use of gender as a control variable may provide information about females, this most often occurs when gender is not significant. We argue that to take a feminist approach, women must be placed in the center of analysis.

References

- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in Crime*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- American Society of Criminology (2005). Publications. Retrieved July 31, 2005 from <http://www.asc41.com/publications.html>.
- Baro, A. and Eigenberg, H. (1993). Images of gender: A content analysis of photographs in introductory criminology and criminal justice textbooks. *Women & Criminal Justice* 5(1), 3–36.
- Belknap, J. (1996). *The Invisible Woman*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Belknap, J. (2001). *The Invisible Woman*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Britton, D.M. (2000). Feminism in criminology: Engendering the outlaw. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571, 57–76.
- Brownmiller, J. (1975). *Against our will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of race, class, gender, and crime: Future directions for feminist criminology. *Feminist Criminology* 1, 27–47.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls' crime and woman's place: Towards a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency* 35, 5–29.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1986). Women and crime: The female offender. *Signs* 12, 78–101.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime, and justice: Feminist criminology in an Era of Backlash. *Feminist Criminology* 1, 6–26.
- Chesney Lind, M. and Pasko, L. (2004). Introduction. In M. Chesney-Lind and L. Pasko (eds.), *Girls, Women and Crime: Selected Readings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. vii–vii.
- Daly, K. (1995). Looking back, looking forward: The promise of feminist transformation. In B.R. Price and N.J. Sokoloff (eds.), *The Criminal Justice System and Women*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 443–457.
- Daly, K. (1997). Different ways of conceptualizing sex/gender in feminist theory and their implications for criminology. *Theoretical Criminology* 1, 25–51.
- Daly, K.M. and Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly* 5, 497–538.
- DeKeseredy, W.S. (1999). *Women, Crime and the Canadian Criminal Justice System*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- DeKeseredy, W.S. and Schwartz, M.D. (1996). *Contemporary Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Eigenberg, H. and Baro, A. (1992). Women and the publication process: A content analysis of criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 3, 293–314.

- Flavin, J. (2001). Feminism for the mainstream criminologist: An invitation. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 29, 271–285.
- Goodstein, L. (1992). Feminist perspectives and the criminal justice curriculum. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 3, 165–181.
- Hannon, L. and Dufour, L.R. (1998). Still just the study of men and crime? A content analysis. *Sex Roles* 38, 63–71.
- Harrison, P.M. and Beck, A.J. (2005) *Prisoners in 2004 (NCJ 210677)*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs.
- Heindensohn, F. (1987). Women and crime: Questions for criminology. In P. Carlen and A. Worrall (eds.), *Gender, Crime and Justice*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, pp. 16–17.
- Hughes, L.A. (2005). The representation of females in criminological research: A content analysis of American and British Journal Articles. *Women & Criminal Justice* 16, 1–28.
- In-Cites. Journals Ranked by Impact: Criminology and Penology. Retrieved July 31, 2005 from http://www.in-cites.com/research/2005/july_4_2005-2.html.
- Katz, R.S. (2000). Explaining girls' and women's crime and desistance in the context of their victimization experiences. *Violence Against Women* 6, 633–660.
- Klein, D. and Kress, J. (1973). Women, crime and criminology. *Issues in Criminology* 8, 1–12.
- Morris, A. (1987). *Women, Crime and Criminal Justice*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Morris, A. and Gelsthorpe, L. (1991). Feminist perspectives in criminology: Transforming and transgression. *Women & Criminal Justice* 2, 3–26.
- Naffine, N. (1996). *Feminism & Criminology*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Owen, B., & Bloom, B. (1995). *Modeling gender-specific services in Juvenile justice: Policy and program recommendations*. Final Report submitted to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning of the State of California.
- Pollock, J. (2002). *Women, Prison & Crime*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Potter, H. (2006). An argument for black feminist criminology: Understanding African American women's experiences with intimate partner abuse using an integrated approach. *Feminist Criminology* 1(21), 106–124.
- Ritchie, B.E. (2000). Exploring the links between violence against women and women's involvement in illegal activity. In *Research on women and girls in the justice system*, Research Forum (NCJ 180973). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Rafter, N.H. (ed.). (2000). *Encyclopedia of Women and Crime*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Renzetti, C.M. (1993). On the margins of the malestream (or, they still don't get it, do they?): Feminist analyses in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 4, 219–234.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1982). *Rape in Marriage*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schwartz, M.D. and DeKeseredy, W.S. (1997). *Sexual Assault on the College Campus: The Role of Male Peer Support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwendinger, J.R. and Schwendinger, H. (1983). *Rape and Inequality*. Sage: Newbury Park, CA.
- Siegel, L.J. and Zalman, M. (1991). 'Cultural literacy' in criminal justice: A preliminary assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 2, 15–44.
- Simon, R.J. (1975). *The Contemporary Woman and Crime*. Washington, DC: The National Institute on Mental Health.
- Simpson, S. (1989). Feminist theory, crime and justice. *Criminology* 27, 605–631.

- Smart, C. (1976). *Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Stanko, E. (1990). *Everyday Violence*. London: Pandora.
- Steffensmeier, D. and Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22, 459–487.
- Thornberry, T.P. (1990). Cultural literacy in criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 1, 33–49.
- Wilson, N.K. (1991). Feminist pedagogy in criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 2, 81–93.
- Wonders, N.A. (1991). Postmodern feminist criminology and social justice. In B. Arrigo (ed.), *Social Justice/Criminal Justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, pp. 111–128.
- Wright, R.A. (2000). Left out? The coverage of critical perspectives in introductory criminology textbooks, 1990–1999. *Critical Criminology* 9, 101–121.
- Young, V. (1986). Gender expectations and their impact on black female offenders and victims. *Justice Quarterly* 3, 305–327.