

Jonathan Z. Shapiro,¹ Ph.D. and Sanford A. Angelos,² M.S.

An Evaluation of Criminalists' Attitudes Toward the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*

REFERENCE: Shapiro, J. Z. and Angelos, S. A., "An Evaluation of Criminalists' Attitudes Toward the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*," *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, JFSCA, Vol. 30, No. 1, Jan. 1985, pp. 269-278.

ABSTRACT: The Ad Hoc Publication Committee of the Criminalistics Section of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences was charged with determining the need for a journal devoted to criminalistics. Based on a survey of Criminalistics Section members, the committee reported its findings and recommendations at the 1983 section meeting. This paper presents the results of that survey as well as the committee's recommendations concerning a new journal. Statistical results are reported on attitudes towards the quality of *The Journal of Forensic Sciences*, the utility of regional journals, and the need for a new journal. Differences within the sample are then analyzed, controlling for professional affiliations and the rate of attendance and presentation at AAFS annual meetings.

KEYWORDS: criminalistics, surveys, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*

An Ad Hoc Publication Committee was formed at the 1982 Criminalistics Section business meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS). *Editor's Comment: The members of the Ad Hoc Publication Committee were: Douglas M. Lucas (Chairman), Sanford A. Angelos, and John D. DeHaan.* The purpose of the committee was to study the issue of whether or not the Criminalistics Section should sponsor a journal. To explore the issue, it was decided to survey the section members ($N = 549$) concerning their attitudes. The committee's report was presented at the section's 1983 business meeting and included the results of a questionnaire mailed to all members of the Criminalistics Section.

The committee was to explore several interrelated issues. The questionnaire was designed to address the following major areas of concern: (1) Is there dissatisfaction with the existing forensic science journals, especially with the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*? What is the nature and extent of this dissatisfaction? (2) Is there anything the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* can do to correct misperceptions or dissatisfaction? (3) Is there interest and support for a new journal in criminalistics? This paper presents a statistical summary of the results of the questionnaire in order to analyze attitudes towards the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*.

General Information

Of the 549 questionnaires mailed, 203 were returned, which represents a 36.9% return rate. Of the 203 respondents, 103 (51%) do not hold membership in the American Chemical Society, possibly because the American Chemical Society has no division (except perhaps Analytical) that would be of interest to forensic scientists. Of the total sample, 163 (80%) hold

Received for publication 17 Feb. 1984; revised manuscript received 21 May 1984; accepted for publication 23 May 1984.

¹Associate professor, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

²Forensic chemist, U.S. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, North Central Laboratory, Chicago, IL.

membership in at least one of the regional forensic science groups (see Table 1), and 107 (53%) responded that they hold membership in other forensic science societies. The society most often identified ($N = 25$) is the Forensic Science Society (British). The Canadian Society of Forensic Science was fourth, with five people indicating membership. Of the sample, 105 people (55%) have attended 1 or 2 AAFS meetings, while 36 persons (19%) have not attended any meetings in the past 5 years. Twenty-five percent have presented a paper or two.

The questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix A, with the survey variables listed in Appendix B. Although some of the survey items are individually interesting, the major focus of the analysis was on attitude scales and subscales composed of the individual items. Appendix C indicates the items that were combined to create subscales of various attitudes of criminalists to the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* and the scales created by combining related subscales.

Item Analysis

This survey contained additive scales developed from sets of interrelated questions. These scales were used to evaluate group attitudes. When appropriate, individual items were also examined and analyzed. These items (11 to 40) are scored from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = no opinion, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree). Appendix A summarizes the item responses.

Item 11 stated that the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* was better than other forensic science journals. Of the 200 responses, the mean is 3.5, indicating a moderately positive attitude toward the journal. However, the results reflect a polarized view: 41.5% agreed and 23% disagreed with the question.

Item 14 asserted that regional journals (newsletters) are more useful than the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. Of the 198 responses, the mean was 2.5, indicating that the respondents disagreed somewhat with the statement.

Item 23 stated that sectional "mini" journals would be preferred to the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. For 200 responses the mean was 2.3, indicating significant disagreement with the statement. However, a related item, No. 38, stated that each section should have its own journal, reviewers, and editor. For 197 responses, the mean was 2.9, a neutral response that was symmetrically distributed.

Item 34 states that the proceedings of the meeting should be published separately. For 197 responses, the mean is 3.2, with 70% of the responses being "neutral" or "somewhat agree."

Item 29 stated that a new journal on criminalistics is needed. For the 200 responses, the mean was 2.9, with the distribution being bimodal at "disagree" and "agree"; the respondents were thus equally divided for and against. However, Item 39 stated that sufficient material for the new journal exists. For the 200 responses the mean was 3.2, with 128 responses (or 64%) reporting "neutral" or "agree." Thus some of the people opposed to a new journal believe that there is a sufficient amount of material to support a new journal.

TABLE 1—Membership in regional association.

Association	<i>N</i>	Percent	Responses, %
Mid-Atlantic	19	11.6	10.5
Northeastern	15	9.2	8.3
Southern	27	16.6	14.9
Midwestern	49	30.1	27.1
Southwestern	12	7.4	6.6
Northwestern	17	10.4	9.4
California	24	14.7	13.3
Total	163	100.0	...

Attitude Scale Analysis

The following four scales were developed: format, submissions, new journal, and feelings. Appendix C is a summary of the scales and the items used in their formation. The Format (coded FORMAT) scale was developed to indicate the attitude of the respondents toward the format of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. This general scale was composed of several subscales. Quality (QUAL) of the *Journal* was the first subscale, and interest in a separate journal (SEPJOU) was the next. The concept of publishing regional papers (PUBREG) from their respective meetings was the third subscale. The fourth subscale, labeled relevant format (RELFOR), examined general attitudes and was developed to ensure that all questions involving the format of the *Journal* were included.

The second scale was Submissions (SUBS); its subscales included criteria (CRIT), caseload (CASE), and relevant submission (RELSUB). The new journal (NEWJOU) scale comprised the subscales publishing problems (PUBLISH), quality of papers (PAPER), and relevant new journal items (NEWREL). The final scale, feelings (FEEL), was composed of individual questions from the survey; there were no subscales. The central tendency and dispersion of each of the scales and subscales are reported in Table 2.

Within-Sample Attitude Differences

Within-sample differences in attitudes were examined by controlling for regional association membership, the number of AAFS meetings attended, and the number of presentations at the academy meetings in the last five years. Table 3 presents the scale attitudes by regional association. The subscale QUAL, quality of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, had a range from 3 to 15. The most positive response, 6.83, was from the Northwestern Association, while the most negative, 5.68, was recorded by the California Association. This subscale was scored in reverse order; for the rest of the scales, the greater the score, the greater the dissatisfaction with the current situation. For SEPJOU, concerning the need for separate journals within the academy, the range was from 2 to 10. The minimum score was from the Mid-Atlantic Association, 4.53, and the maximum was the Southwestern Association, at 6.58. For the subscale PUBREG, concerning whether the *Journal* should publish regional papers, the range is 3 to 15. The Midwestern Association disagreed most strongly, at 7.49; the Southwestern association was most supportive, at 8.25.

TABLE 2—Statistical descriptions of scales and subscales.

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
QUAL	6.36	1.97
SEPJOU	5.17	1.92
PUBREG	7.86	1.64
RELFOR	7.09	1.60
FORMAT	32.57	4.17
CRIT	11.50	2.56
CASE	6.94	1.57
RELSUB	18.11	4.04
SUBS	43.02	6.81
FEEL	11.20	2.57
PUBLISH	10.54	3.32
PAPER	12.69	2.12
NEWREL	8.05	1.56
NEWJOU	40.07	6.58

TABLE 3—Attitudes by regional association membership.

Scale	Association						
	Mid-Atlantic	New England	North-western	California	Southern	Mid-western	South-western
QUAL	6.61	6.67	6.83	5.68	6.41	6.32	6.58
SEPJOU	4.53	5.80	5.28	4.96	5.24	5.14	5.83
PUBREG	7.95	7.73	8.22	7.83	8.27	7.49	8.25
RELFOR	5.95	7.62	7.22	6.84	7.56	7.20	8.00
FORMAT	30.83	34.15	33.61	31.83	33.36	32.16	34.90
CRIT	10.00	11.00	11.78	11.32	11.28	11.96	13.20
CASE	6.05	7.57	7.06	6.28	7.56	7.02	8.00
RELSUB	17.00	17.38	18.50	17.39	19.38	17.80	21.50
SUBS	39.86	42.25	43.78	42.00	44.40	43.15	49.28
FEEL	11.72	11.47	11.41	10.88	11.42	10.98	11.91
PUBLSH	9.79	11.69	10.44	10.08	10.56	10.61	12.82
PAPER	11.33	13.17	12.45	12.61	13.42	12.73	14.41
NEWREL	8.00	8.13	8.44	7.88	8.00	7.70	8.73
NEWJOU	37.33	41.50	40.72	38.74	40.82	39.82	46.50

The subscale RELFOR, dissatisfaction with the format of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, ranged from 2 to 10. The maximum, 8.00, was recorded by the Southwestern Association, while the Mid-Atlantic, at 5.95, was the most satisfied. The overall scale FORMAT, consisting of the four subscales discussed above, ranged from 12 to 60. Most regional scores were in the low 30s. The maximum (negative) score, 3.49, was recorded by the Southwestern Association. The minimum score, 30.83, was from the Mid-Atlantic Association.

The subscale CRIT, pertaining to the criteria for acceptance in the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, ranged from 4 to 20. The maximum score was 13.2, from the Southwestern Association. The minimum score, 10.0, was recorded for the Mid-Atlantic Association. The subscale CASE, concerning whether the respondent's caseload precludes submissions to the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, ranged from 2 to 10. The association with the least available time was the Southwestern, with a 10.0. The one with the most opportunity to submit manuscripts was the Mid-Atlantic Association, with a score of 6.05. The subscale RELSUB, which concerned the *Journal's* willingness to take criminalistics papers, ranged from 5 to 25. The maximum score was recorded for the Southwestern Association, at 21.5; the minimum for the Mid-Atlantic, at 17.0. SUBS, the general scale concerning attitudes toward *Journal of Forensic Sciences* submissions, ranged from 13 to 65. The maximum (negative) score, 49.28, was recorded for the Southwestern Association. The minimum score, 39.86, was from the Mid-Atlantic.

The scale FEEL, concerning general feelings about the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, ranged from 5 to 25. The most negative feelings were from the Southwestern Association, at 11.91; the most positive from California, at 10.98. The subscale PUBLSH concerned problems with having papers published in *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. It ranged from 4 to 20, with Mid-Atlantic Association at 9.79 having perceived the least problem with publishing in the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. The Southwestern Association, at 12.82, perceived the greatest problems. The subscale PAPER concerned the quality of papers in the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* and ranged from 4 to 20. The Mid-Atlantic Association, at 11.33, revealed the most positive attitude toward the papers in the *Journal*. The Southwestern, at 14.41, was the least positive. The subscale NEWREL concerns the perceived need for a new criminalistics journal. The Midwestern Association, at 7.88, was least in favor of a new journal. The Southwestern Association, at 8.73, was the most inclined in that direction.

Finally, the general scale NEWJOU contained the subscales PUBLSH, PAPER, and NEWREL, as well as other items. The scale, which ranged from 14 to 70, reflected the overall

TABLE 4—Correlations of attitudes and attendance rate.

Scale	Correlation with Attendance	Significance
QUAL	-0.15	0.03
SEPJOU	-0.26	0.0004
PUBREG	0.076	0.29
RELFOR	0.0057	0.93
FORMAT	-0.17	0.02
CRIT	-0.18	0.01
CASE	-0.105	0.14
PAPER	0.064	0.37
RELSUB	-0.369	0.0001
SUBS	-0.360	0.0001

perceived need for a new journal. The Southwestern Association saw the greatest need, at 46.5; the Mid-Atlantic Association saw the least, at 37.33. Perhaps the most obvious pattern emerging in the regional attitudes toward the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* was the consistently negative responses from members of the Southwestern Association. This result may perhaps be explained by the fact that this regional association has been sensitized by previous questionnaires on this topic.

Attitudes toward the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* were also examined by controlling for attendance and paper presentation rates at the last five AAFS meetings. The logic behind this analysis was that those members most active in the academy and, consequently, most likely to be affected by changes in the *Journal* or by a new criminalistics journal, should be distinguished from the general constituency. However, rather than inspecting each conditional mean, in effect treating attendance as a nominal variable, correlations of scale attitudes by attendance rate were examined to search for linear relationships between the variables. As indicated in Table 4, a fairly explicit linear relationship can be observed.

Among the nine scales, six were significantly correlated with attendance at meetings. In general, the more active the member, the less criticism of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* was expressed. The linear relationship was strongest for the subscales CRIT and RELSUB of the general scale SUBS. The negative correlation for SUBS of 0.36 indicated that active members are more critical of the criteria for acceptance in the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* than are less active members. A similar pattern was evident for the subscales QUAL and SEPJOU for the major scale FORMAT. The negative correlation of 0.17 indicated that the active members were somewhat less critical of the current format than less active members.

A similar pattern of within-sample attitude differences existed for the variable publication rate. Table 5 reports the correlation between the scale attitudes and the presentation rate; a pattern similar to that identified for attendance rate was evident. The strongest linear relationship existed for the subscales CRIT, CASE, and RELSUB of the major scale submissions (SUBS). In terms of presentation, the more active members of the section were significantly less critical of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* acceptance standards than less active members. However, there was less difference between active and less active presenters on the format of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, since a significant correlation was only found in the subscale SEPJOU. Nonetheless, it was inferred that within the sample, the criticism of and dissatisfaction with the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* came from those less active in the meetings; consequently, the overall attitudes concerning the *Journal* and the need for a new criminalistics journal were more neutral among those most likely to be affected by major changes in the current situation. Our inclination is to interpret the criticism at a reduced level because of the patterns uncovered by the attendance and presentation rate variables.

TABLE 5—Correlations of attitudes and paper presentation rate.

Scale	Correlation with Presentation	Significance
QUAL	-0.006	0.94
SEPJOU	-0.20	0.01
PUBREG	0.14	0.09
RELFOR	-0.20	0.01
FORMAT	-0.138	0.09
CRIT	-0.269	0.0005
CASE	-0.284	0.0002
PAPER	0.04	0.42
RELSUB	-0.338	0.0002
SUBS	-0.34	0.0002

Recommendations

The Ad Hoc Publication Committee made seven recommendations based on their evaluation of the responses:

1. The Criminalistics Section of AAFS should not encourage or sponsor a new journal.
2. The section should encourage all criminalists to exert the additional effort and the discipline required to prepare and submit for publication in an appropriate journal or newsletter any information they believe would be helpful to others.
3. The section should request the editor and Editorial Board of *Journal of Forensic Sciences* to prepare and publish a style manual including descriptions (and examples) of the different types of articles, formats for each, and detailed instructions for authors and reviewers.
4. The section should request the editor of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* to consider including a separate contents page with articles grouped by academy section.
5. The section should request the Executive Committee of the academy to publish the annual report of the editor of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* in the Academy Newsletter.
6. The section should request the Executive Committee to study the implications and practicality of publishing the proceedings of the annual scientific meeting either in total or by sections within a reasonable time of the meeting.
7. The section should request the Executive Committee to consider making the book of abstracts of papers presented at the scientific sessions available for a fee to nonregistrant members and others.

The recommendations made are supported by the data and there is no reason to disagree with them. However, there are several aspects that should be pointed out.

The discussion on the formation of a new journal of criminalistics indicated that the results are bimodal. This means that the Criminalistic Section is divided in its opinion—one is either for the journal or against it. The division is based on the dissatisfaction with the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* and the belief in some quarters that a second U.S. journal of criminalistics would be a benefit to the profession. Others are satisfied with the *Journal* and believe that a new journal would not be able to survive, as there would be a lack of papers to publish.

A second study should be made in a year or two after the recommendations are implemented to determine if the attitudes have changed. The implementation of the recommendations should reduce the detected dissatisfaction and increase the number of respondents who would oppose a second journal.

It should also be noted that this study was only for the Criminalistics Section. Although this is the largest section within the academy, there are none other sections, comprising approximately 70% of the membership, that were not polled. Additionally, there are seven regional associations in the United States whose memberships are not predominantly members of the

Academy. This point is particularly important; the Southwestern and Mid-Atlantic Associations of Forensic Sciences have both conducted similar surveys, and the results showed overwhelming support for the formation of a new journal. Therefore, any new surveys should include both the entire membership and the regional associations in order to obtain the information from as many forensic scientists as possible. Finally, as suggested by an anonymous reviewer, future surveys should include questions concerning the age and educational attainment of the respondents.

Summary and Conclusion

The results of the survey and the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Publication Committee are accurate, statistically based interpretations of the results. However, the results and recommendations can be generalized only to the population of those who are members of the Criminalistics Section of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, not the entire academy nor the entire population of forensic scientists. The recommendations should be implemented and a second survey including both the membership of the academy and the regional associations should be taken within a year or two. The results of the second survey should be generalized to the entire population of forensic scientists; recommendations based on the results would be decisive.

Editor's comment: The report cited by the authors in this article is entitled, "Report of the Criminalistics Section Ad Hoc Publications Committee." Those interested in a copy of the committee's final report may contact the Executive Director, American Academy of Forensic Sciences, 225 S. Academy Blvd., Colorado Springs, CO 80910.

Address requests for reprints or additional information to
Jonathan Z. Shapiro
College of Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

APPENDIX A

The Survey Questionnaire (Including Percentage Response Rates)

Background Information

1. Are you a member of:

a. The American Chemical Society	Yes 32	No 68
b. A regional forensic society	Yes 89	No 11
c. Any other forensic society	Yes 65	No 35
2. If you are a member of:

a. The ACS	Which division? <i>Analytical (12)</i>
b. A regional group	Which one(s)? <i>(See Table 1)</i>
c. Other forensic society	Which one(s)? <i>Forensic Science Society (19)</i>
3. In the last five years (1978-1982) how many meetings have you attended?

a. AAFS	<i>One or more (81)</i>
b. ACS	<i>One or more (14)</i>
c. Regional forensic society list	<i>One or more (92)</i>
d. Other list	<i>One or more (63)</i>
4. In the last five years, how many papers have you had accepted for presentation?

a. AAFS	<i>One or more (36)</i>
b. ACS	<i>One or more (9)</i>
c. Regional forensic society list	<i>One or more (49)</i>
d. Other list	<i>One or more (33)</i>

5. In the last five years, how many papers have you published?
 - a. *Journal of Forensic Sciences* One or more (25)
 - b. *Forensic Science Society Journal* One or more (1)
 - c. *Forensic Science International* One or more (3)
 - d. Other journals (which ones?) One or more (33)
6. In the last five years, what percentage of your papers accepted for presentation at AAFS meetings were submitted to *JOFS*? One or more (25)
7. In the last five years, how many of the papers you had accepted for presentation at an AAFS meeting were published in the *JOFS*? One or more (18)
8. If there were some presented papers you did not submit to the *JOFS*, what were the reasons? _____
9. Do you do case work? Yes 85 No 15
10. Are you an administrator/supervisor? Yes 58 No 42

Opinion Poll

Please circle the best response:

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = No opinion
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. The <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences (JOFS)</i> is better than any other forensic journal. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>23</td><td>17</td><td>42</td><td>16</td></tr> </table> 12. The criminalistics papers in <i>JOFS</i> are not relevant to my work. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td>64</td><td>5</td><td>7</td><td>2</td></tr> </table> 13. To publish a paper in the <i>JOFS</i> is more difficult than other journals. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>19</td><td>54</td><td>20</td><td>4</td></tr> </table> 14. The papers in regional journals are more useful than papers in <i>JOFS</i>. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>49</td><td>25</td><td>13</td><td>3</td></tr> </table> 15. My caseload does not allow enough time to work on a paper for publication. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>21</td><td>11</td><td>39</td><td>23</td></tr> </table> 18. <i>JOFS</i> is more devoted to the other sections of the academy. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>45</td><td>18</td><td>25</td><td>6</td></tr> </table> 19. Criminalistics is not adequately represented in <i>JOFS</i>. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>48</td><td>12</td><td>23</td><td>7</td></tr> </table> 20. I can obtain valuable information in the <i>JOFS</i>. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>65</td><td>28</td></tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 23 | 17 | 42 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 23 | 64 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 19 | 54 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 49 | 25 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 11 | 39 | 23 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 45 | 18 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 48 | 12 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 65 | 28 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 21. The papers at regional meetings are not sufficiently complete to be published in the <i>JOFS</i>. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>31</td><td>26</td><td>36</td><td>4</td></tr> </table> 22. The forensic journals are too demanding in their criteria for acceptance of papers. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>36</td><td>39</td><td>14</td><td>1</td></tr> </table> 23. I would rather have separated sectional "mini" journals than the <i>JOFS</i>. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>51</td><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>4</td></tr> </table> 24. The regional association should print their own journals. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>39</td><td>15</td><td>20</td><td>5</td></tr> </table> 25. It is easier to write a paper for a regional meeting than for AAFS. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>10</td><td>28</td><td>43</td><td>17</td></tr> </table> 26. The <i>JOFS</i> should publish the papers presented at the regional associations. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>26</td><td>25</td><td>39</td><td>7</td></tr> </table> 27. The <i>JOFS</i> is not as good as any other forensic journal. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>29</td><td>52</td><td>14</td><td>5</td><td>2</td></tr> </table> 28. The time needed to write a paper for a regional meeting is less than that for the academy. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>16</td><td>29</td><td>46</td><td>8</td></tr> </table> 29. A new journal devoted exclusively to criminalistics is needed. <table border="0" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>29</td><td>17</td><td>28</td><td>12</td></tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 31 | 26 | 36 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 36 | 39 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 51 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 39 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 28 | 43 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 26 | 25 | 39 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 29 | 52 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 29 | 46 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 29 | 17 | 28 | 12 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 23 | 17 | 42 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | 64 | 5 | 7 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 19 | 54 | 20 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 49 | 25 | 13 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 21 | 11 | 39 | 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 45 | 18 | 25 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 48 | 12 | 23 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 5 | 2 | 65 | 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 31 | 26 | 36 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 36 | 39 | 14 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | 51 | 13 | 13 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | 39 | 15 | 20 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 10 | 28 | 43 | 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 26 | 25 | 39 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | 52 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 16 | 29 | 46 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 29 | 17 | 28 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

30. New, less strict criteria for publishing in <i>JOFS</i> are needed.	1 2 3 4 5 11 33 33 19 5	the <i>JOFS</i> are not adequately known.	1 2 3 4 5 1 32 30 29 7
31. The regional associations should jointly publish a journal.	1 2 3 4 5 10 31 24 27 9	36. The <i>JOFS</i> should be published more often.	1 2 3 4 5 4 24 31 34 7
32. Time from submission to publication in the <i>JOFS</i> is too long.	1 2 3 4 5 1 11 45 35 9	37. The reviewers for the <i>JOFS</i> are very strict.	1 2 3 4 5 3 12 56 25 4
33. A new journal devoted exclusively to pathology/toxicology is needed.	1 2 3 4 5 6 20 59 12 4	38. Each section should have its own journal, reviewers, and editor.	1 2 3 4 5 12 31 21 26 10
34. I would rather have a separate proceedings of the academy meetings published.	1 2 3 4 5 3 19 35 35 8	39. Sufficient material to support a criminalistics journal is available.	1 2 3 4 5 8 21 27 37 8
35. The requirements for papers submitted to		40. Criteria for publication in a newsletter should be different from publication in a refereed journal.	1 2 3 4 5 1 8 8 60 24

Use the back for any comments:

APPENDIX B

Variable Description

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Description</i>
V1	Membership American Chemical Society
V2	Membership regional forensic societies
V3	Membership other forensic societies
V4	Division of the American Chemical Society
V5	Name of regional forensic society
V6	Name of other forensic societies
V7	Attendance at American Academy of Forensic Sciences
V8	Attendance at American Chemical Society (national)
V9	Attendance at regional forensic societies
V10	Attendance at other forensic societies
V11	Presentation at American Academy of Forensic Sciences
V12	Presentation at American Chemical Society
V13	Presentation at regional forensic societies
V14	Presentation at other forensic societies
V15	Paper in <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i>
V16	Paper in <i>Forensic Science Journal</i> (British)
V17	Paper in <i>Forensic Science International</i>
V18	Paper in other newsletters/journals
V19	Presentation submitted to <i>JOFS</i>
V20	Accepted presentation published in <i>JOFS</i>
V21	Case work
V22	Administration/supervisor
V23	<i>JOFS</i> better than other forensic journals
V24	Papers in <i>JOFS</i> not relevant

- V25 Difficult to publish in *JOFS* than other journals
 V26 Regional journals more useful than *JOFS*
 V27 Caseload; not enough time to publish
 V28 *JOFS* devoted to other sections
 V29 Criminalistics not adequately represented in *JOFS*
 V30 Valuable information in *JOFS*
 V31 Regional papers not complete for *JOFS*
 V32 Forensic journals too demanding criteria
 V33 Sectional "mini" journal
 V34 Regional associations publish own journals
 V35 Regional papers easier to write than for AAFS
 V36 *JOFS* publish regional papers
 V37 *JOFS* worse than other forensic journals
 V38 Time writing for regional meeting less than AAFS
 V39 Need new criminalistic journal
 V40 Need less strict criteria for *JOFS*
 V41 Regional associations jointly publish a journal
 V42 *JOFS* time submission to publishing too long
 V43 Need new pathology/toxicology journal
 V44 Separate proceedings published
 V45 *JOFS* requirements not adequately known
 V46 *JOFS* published more often
 V47 *JOFS* reviewers too strict
 V48 Each section own journal and editor
 V49 Sufficient material for a new criminalistic journal
 V50 Different criteria for newsletter and journal

APPENDIX C

Scale and Subscale Composition

Scale	Variables	Description
QUAL	23, 30, 37	Quality of <i>JOFS</i>
SEPJOU	33, 48	Separate journals within AAFS
PUBREG	31, 36, 50	Publishing regional papers
RELFOR	35, 38	Relative to format
FORMAT	44, 46	Major scale composed of four subscales listed above
CRIT	25, 32, 40, 47	Criteria of <i>JOFS</i>
CASE	27, 38	Caseload
RELSUB	24, 26, 28, 29, 35	Relative submissions to <i>JOFS</i>
SUBS	42, 45	Major scale composed of three subsets listed above
FEEL	23, 24, 30, 37, 46	Feelings in general towards <i>JOFS</i> (major scale)
PUBLISH	33, 34, 41, 48	Publishing problems
PAPER	26, 31, 35, 38	Quality of papers
NEWREL	36, 44, 50	Need for new journal
NEWJOU	39, 43, 49	Major scale composed of three subscales listed above