

THE MOST CITED SCHOLARS IN FIVE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINOLOGY JOURNALS, 2006–10

ELLEN G. COHN* and AMAIA IRATZOQUI

The current article examines three elements of scholarly influence comparing five major international criminology journals (BJC – British Journal of Criminology, CRIM – Criminology, ANZ – Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, CJC – Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, EJC – European Journal of Criminology) from 2006 to 2010. David Garland (BJC), Robert J. Sampson (CRIM and ANZ), Julian V. Roberts (CJC) and David P. Farrington (EJC) had the most overall influence, with Sampson the most cited over the five journals. Influence was both specialized, with some scholars having one or two highly cited seminal works, and versatile, with others having many different works cited several times each. The most cited works of the most cited authors were on developmental and life-course criminology and criminal careers.

Keywords: scholarly influence, citations, criminology, international

Introduction

The publication of *Evaluating Criminology* (Wolfgang *et al.* 1978) generated considerable interest in the use of publication and citation analysis within criminology and criminal justice (CCJ). Publication productivity research uses the number of faculty publications in academic journals and textbooks to evaluate the quality of CCJ programs (Sorensen and Pilgrim 2002; Steiner and Schwartz 2006; Oliver *et al.* 2009; Davis and Sorensen 2010; Kleck and Barnes 2011; Fabianic 2012). Citation analysis has been used to distinguish ‘academic stars’ in CCJ and sociology graduate programs who went on to publish frequently in the field (Rice *et al.* 2005; Shutt and Barnes 2008; Long *et al.* 2011) and to examine the nature of scholarly collaboration (Rice *et al.* 2011). Citation analysis has also been used as a quantitative means of examining ‘scholarly influence’, identifying the most influential scholars and topics during a particular time period via raw citation counts and rankings (Cohn *et al.* 2013).

Research into scholarly influence in CCJ may focus solely on American comparisons or consider a broader international focus. Cohn, Farrington and their colleagues have conducted a considerable amount of research examining citations in British, American, Canadian and Australasian journals (see e.g. Cohn and Farrington 1994b). Their most recent works, examining citations in a variety of journals between 2006 and 2010, have found that the most cited scholars tend to be American (e.g. Robert J. Sampson) and British (e.g. David P. Farrington), versatile (i.e. with a large number of different cited works) and frequently publishing in the areas of developmental and life-course criminology and criminal careers (Cohn and Farrington 2012; Cohn *et al.* 2013). However, there has been no research exploring citations in general European

*Ellen G. Cohn, Department of Criminal Justice, Florida International University, PCA 261A, Miami, FL 33199, USA; Ellen.Cohn@fiu.edu; Amaia Iratzoqui, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 311 McCord Hall, University of Memphis Memphis, TN 38152-3530, USA.

journals or comparing citations in European journals to citations in other international journals. The current study builds upon this earlier research by examining three components of scholarly influence in five international criminology journals, the *British Journal of Criminology* (BJC), *Criminology* (CRIM), *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* (ANZ), *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (CJC) and the *European Journal of Criminology* (EJC), from 2006 to 2010 to determine whether these patterns of scholarly influence remain consistent.

Measuring Scholarly Influence

Identifying the most cited scholars and works in a discipline is one method of measuring prestige and influence (see, e.g., Cohn and Farrington 2012 for a detailed review of the literature). Early work on scholar influence focused on citation patterns of particular works within scholarly publications, finding that a small number of works were highly cited while most received few or no citations (Wolfgang *et al.* 1978). Similarly, like ‘chronic offenders’, a small number of scholars tend to account for a disproportionate fraction of all citations (Cohn *et al.* 1998; Orrick and Weir 2011).

Research using citation analysis as a measure of scholarly influence can generally be organized under three interconnected themes: the overall influence of scholars, measured by raw citation counts; the reliability of measures of scholarly influence, measured by the concordance between the top CCJ journals and the nature of scholarly influence, visible in scholars’ versatility or specialization.

Overall influence

Overall influence is determined by examining a scholar’s raw (or weighted) number of citations in an individual journal and across multiple journals. Some of the earliest CCJ research was conducted by Cohn and Farrington (1994a; 1994b), who measured scholarly influence by counting the number of citations of a particular scholar, excluding self-citations, as well as works by that scholar, in a small number of prestigious CCJ journals.

Studies of overall influence also frequently examine citations in textbooks or compare citations in journals and textbooks (Wright 2000; 2002). Although they tend to favour established scholars (Allen 1983; Green 1997; but see Wright 2002), textbooks are an alternative measure of influence since they tend to reach an audience largely unfamiliar with the wider body of literature (Shichor 1982). Comprehensive examination reading lists also have been used as a measure of scholarly influence (Giblin and Schafer 2008). Results tend to reveal patterns similar to those within the major CCJ journals.

The use of citations as a valid measure of scholarly influence is based on the assumption that highly cited works are important to the scholars who cite these works (Meadows 1974). If individual scholars independently working in the same field cite the same work, that work is clearly important to these researchers. Citations imply influence, so the most highly cited scholars may be considered the most influential in the field.

The number of citations is related to the outlet in which they are referenced. Cohn and Farrington (1994a) define influential scholars as those who are most cited in major

CCJ journals, arguing that articles in more prestigious journals are likely to be more widely read, so citations in those articles are more likely to influence other scholars. Accordingly, overall scholarly influence includes not only the raw number of citations, but also the number of citations within major outlets. The most cited scholars and works also are a means of identifying trends towards certain topics (Cohn *et al.* 2013).

Reliability of measures of scholarly influence

Prior research on scholarly influence has also considered the similarity among top CCJ journals in identifying the most cited scholars, because some findings may be specific to the journals used in the analyses. For example, studies of 'mainstream' American journals tend to favour American scholars; research examining more international, less mainstream journals identifies more international and/or specialized scholars (Cohn and Farrington 1999). Content analyses of presentations at American Society of Criminology (ASC) annual meetings reveal that criminological research is largely based in and focused on the United States (Barberet 2007). If the most cited scholars identified are contingent on the outlet examined, the reliability of the results may be questioned.

Some scholars have encouraged the inclusion of sociology journals (Wright *et al.* 1999) and as well as publications in more specialized areas, such as police studies (Wright and Miller 1998) and critical criminology (Wright and Friedrichs 1998) to address the potential for bias. These studies find little similarity between the most cited scholars in more specialized areas compared to those in mainstream criminology, suggesting that specialized scholars may be overlooked when only mainstream journals are chosen for analysis.

Research incorporating international journals also addresses the issue of reliability, identifying more influential international and specialized scholars than studies using only American journals (Cohn and Farrington 2007). A recent study considering the concordance of scholarly influence between four international journals (CRIM, BJC, CJC and ANZ) over five time periods between 1986 and 2010 found the most concordance between ANZ and CRIM, and between BJC and CJC, and the least concordance between BJC and CRIM, and between CJC and CRIM (Cohn *et al.* 2013). These findings point to the necessity of examining other journals to determine how the scope of comparison affects the identification of the most influential scholars and works.

Nature of scholarly influence

The nature of scholarly influence can be considered in two ways. The first focuses on citations of a particular scholar. Using concepts developed in criminal career research, Cohn and Farrington (1996; 2012) distinguished between the prevalence and frequency of citations. A large number of citations may occur if a scholar is cited in many different articles (a high prevalence) or cited many times in a few articles (a high frequency). They suggested that a high prevalence may be a better measure of the scholar's influence on a large number of other scholars than a high frequency, which may reflect influence on only a few other scholars.

The second component considers a scholar's individual works, drawing a distinction between specialization and versatility. Specialized scholars have one or two highly cited works, often books and often presenting a major theory, while versatile authors have many different works cited, with no single work standing out as particularly highly cited. Versatile authors tend to have written many articles rather than a single seminal work, although some specialized authors may also have many different works cited. Logically, a high frequency of citation must be associated with versatility, while a high prevalence may be associated with specialization.

Examining the nature of scholarly influence is important to citation analysis because it illustrates the patterns of the most cited works of the most cited scholars, identifying whether the most cited scholars tend to be known for one or two significant pieces or are influential because of their body of work. Current research suggests that the majority of scholars tend to be versatile (Cohn and Farrington 2012).

Sources of Citation Data

There are various potential sources of citation data. The three most relevant are the *Social Sciences Citation Index* (SSCI), online scientific archives such as Google Scholar (GS) and Elsevier's Scopus and manual examinations of reference lists of academic publications.

Social Sciences Citation Index

The SSCI, part of Thomson Reuters' Web of Science (WoS), provides extremely wide coverage, including a large number of social science journals in a variety of disciplines. However, it also presents some significant limitations for citation research. WoS includes self-citations, which must be excluded in research tracking a scholar's influence on others in the field. Additionally, errors in a journal's reference lists (e.g. spelling mistakes, incorrect initials) are reproduced in the WoS. If the journal permits the use of 'et al.' in the reference list, those additional authors will not be included in the WoS. Other issues include the ever-shifting list of journals used by the WoS, which makes longitudinal research virtually impossible; the overrepresentation of journals from North America and Western Europe and the general exclusion of citations from book and book chapters (Cohn and Farrington 1994b; Gabbidon and Collins 2012). Lastly, since many journal reference styles only include the last names and first initials of the authors, the WoS may merge the citations of multiple scholars with the same surname and first initials.

Online scientific archives

Online scientific archives also provide citation data. GS, a free source, searches full-text academic journals and bibliographic databases in multiple languages and includes citations not only from journal articles and books but also conference proceedings, technical reports, legal opinions, theses and 'scholarly' web pages. GS tends to produce more citations than the WoS (Bauer and Bakkalbasi 2005; Meho and Yang 2007). However,

information on the coverage of GS, such as which journals are included, which databases are searched, which time periods are covered or how often GS is updated is not provided, making it impossible to conduct longitudinal research (Cohn and Farrington 2012). Additionally, like the WoS, GS also includes self-citations.

Scopus is a large paid database operated by Elsevier. Citation data are only available from 1996 onwards, greatly limiting citation tracking and longitudinal research. Many records in the database are missing information and the number of records identified by a search may vary depending on the order in which search terms are entered, especially if the 'search within' function is used (Dess 2006). Scopus also primarily focuses on the natural and 'hard' sciences, and coverage of the social sciences is limited.

Manual counting

Citation data may also be obtained directly from the reference lists of journals and books in a given field by manually counting the number of citations of a given scholar, work or journal. While this method is significantly more time-consuming, it avoids many of the problems associated with online sources, such as the inclusion of self-citations, the coverage of citations from multiple media forms, the scholar name confusion and the vulnerability to search-term phrasing. This method was developed and used successfully by Cohn and Farrington (e.g. Cohn and Farrington 1990; 1994a; 1994b).

Cohn and Farrington (1990) first applied citation analysis to British criminology, examining citations in CRIM and BJC between 1984 and 1988 to investigate the differences between British and American criminology. They expanded their research to Canada, Australia and New Zealand, adding two additional journals, the *Canadian Journal of Criminology* and *Criminal Justice* (CJC), formerly the *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, and the ANZ and examining citations in those four journals during the five-year period 1986–90 (Cohn and Farrington 1994a). They have continued to collect data in five-year increments (1991–95, 1996–2000, 2001–05 and 2006–10) to study changes in scholarly influence over time (see Cohn *et al.* 1998; Cohn and Farrington 2012; Cohn *et al.* 2013). The current study employs the manual counting approach pioneered by Cohn and Farrington.

Current Study

Relevant journals

The current study considers five major English-language criminology journals: BJC, CRIM, ANZ, CJC and EJC. Following the precedent regarding Cohn and Farrington's international comparison (see, e.g., Cohn and Farrington 2007), the main four journals (BJC, CRIM, ANZ and CJC) were selected for their prestige and wide dissemination. In comparison, EJC, the official journal of the European Society of Criminology, is a relatively new journal, originating in 2004. Extending the analysis to including EJC will reveal whether EJC is more similar to other European journals (e.g. BJC) or whether it in fact holds more widespread international influence (e.g. by evidencing similarities with non-European international journals such as CRIM, ANZ and CJC).

The present article examines six hypotheses related to scholarly influence within these major international journals during the five-year period 2006–10. First, the most highly cited scholars are predicted to be predominantly American, as identified by their affiliation. Second, the most cited scholars will be versatile rather than specialized. Third, the most highly cited works primarily will be within the areas of developmental and life-course criminology and criminal careers. Fourth, there will be greater concordance between ANZ and CRIM, and between BJC and CJC, than among other pairs of journals. Fifth, BJC and EJC will display the greatest similarities, as both journals are European. Sixth, there will be significant discordance between EJC and the other international journals, since these comparisons spans continental borders.

Method

For the present analyses, citation data were obtained from the reference lists of every article in all issues of each journal during 2006–10. ‘Articles’ included research notes, comments and rejoinders but excluded book reviews, book review articles, editorials, letters and obituaries. All individual authors were counted, excluding institutional authors (e.g. Home Office). Unpublished reports and conference papers were included if cited. Self-citations were identified and excluded, although co-author citations were included (Cohn and Farrington 1996). Co-author citations occur when the author of an article cites one of his/her own multi-authored works. For example, if Jacqueline Cohen publishes an article in which she cites an article co-authored with Alfred Blumstein, Blumstein would be counted as a co-author citation Cohen would not, because of the exclusion of self-citations.

For each journal, the reference pages were downloaded from online full-text copies of journals. When a reference had multiple authors, duplicate listings were made of the reference, with each co-author listed first, for counting purposes. Extensive checking was conducted to ensure that no references were omitted, to minimize the possibility of typographical errors and to detect and, if possible, correct mistakes in reference lists. Where references specified ‘et al.’ rather than listing all authors, the names of all co-authors were obtained whenever possible.

A large number and variety of errors in the reference lists, including misspelled names and incorrect or missing initials, were checked and corrected. This required a detailed knowledge of CCJ scholars to maximize data accuracy. While it is unlikely that every error in the reference lists was corrected, it is likely the vast majority of them were corrected, especially those involving the most cited authors in each journal.

The complete list of references for all five years of a journal was then sorted alphabetically and examined to determine the number of times that name occurred. Self-citations were not included in a scholar’s total citation count. Citations to scholars with multiple names were amalgamated where known.

A record of the ‘nationality’ of all authors of each article in the five journals was also kept, determined by the author’s institutional or organizational affiliation, as stated in the article, rather than by citizenship. Therefore, a scholar who is an American citizen but is employed at a British university would be considered to be British rather than American.

In total, 48,921 authors (excluding self-citations) were cited in the five journals in this five-year period. These are not all different persons; the same person may be counted more than once if s/he was cited several times. Another researcher may not replicate the present results exactly, because of errors in reference lists that may not have been detected (or that other researchers may not detect), difficulties in distinguishing between individuals with the same initial and surname, possible inconsistencies in what is defined as an 'article,' or minor and infrequent clerical errors in the computerization of such a large number of citations. However, despite this potential for error, the main conclusions are likely to hold up with only marginal changes in any replication.

Results

Overall scholarly influence

Overall scholarly influence was measured by the raw number of citations each scholar received in each journal. In BJC in 2006–10, 240 articles were published by 417 individual authors, 50 per cent of whom (205) were from the United Kingdom, with the remaining from the United States (74), Australia (31), Canada (27) and the Netherlands (23). These articles contained a total of 20,256 total cited authors, including 1,189 self-citations and 619 co-author citations. This produced a total of 19,067 eligible cited authors, an average of 79 cited authors per article.

Table 1 shows the 51 most cited scholars in BJC in 2006–10 (all those ranked up to 50). The most cited scholar, David Garland, was cited 122 times. He was considered a versatile author, with 26 different works cited in 70 different articles, 29 per cent of all articles published in BJC. His most cited work, *The Culture of Control* (Garland 2001), was cited 46 times. The second most cited author, J. Michael Hough, was cited 69 times. The highest ranked female scholars in BJC were Barbara Hudson (ranked 24.5) and Lucia Zedner (ranked 30.5).

In CRIM in 2006–10, 168 articles were published by 413 individual authors, 90 per cent of whom (373) were American, and the remaining from Canada (11), the Netherlands (9) and the United Kingdom (7). These articles contained a total of 21,969 cited authors, of which 1,110 were self-citations and 996 were co-author citations, resulting in 20,859 eligible citations and an average of 124 cited authors per article.

Table 2 shows the 51 most cited scholars in CRIM in 2006–10 (those with ranks up to 49.5). The most cited scholar, Robert J. Sampson, was cited 363 times. He was considered both a specialized and versatile author. His most cited work in CRIM was *Crime in the Making* (Sampson and Laub 1993), which was cited 33 times, but he also had 78 different works cited. In total, Sampson was cited in 105 different articles (63 per cent of all the articles in CRIM). The second most cited scholar was John H. Laub, with 147 citations. The highest ranked female scholars were Terrie E. Moffitt (ranked 8.5) and Cassia C. Spohn (ranked 37.5).

In ANZ in 2006–10, 101 articles were published by 212 authors, 62 per cent of whom were from Australia or New Zealand. The remaining authors were most commonly from the United States (48) and the United Kingdom (17). These articles contained a total of 9,576 cited authors, including self-citations (527) and co-author citations (437), for a total of 9,049 eligible citations, an average of 90 cited authors per article.

TABLE 1 *Most cited Scholars in the BJC*

Rank in 2006–10	Name	Cites
1	David Garland	122
2	J. Michael Hough	71
3	Michel Foucault	68
4	John Braithwaite	65
5	Robert J. Sampson	61
6	Patrick O'Malley	60
7.5	David P. Farrington	59
7.5	Nikolas Rose	59
9	Jonathan Simon	58
10	Richard V. Ericson	57
11	Ian Loader	51
12	Tom R. Tyler	50
13.5	Stephen Farrall	48
13.5	Tony Jefferson	48
15	J. Richard Sparks	47
17	Ronald V. Clarke	46
17	Clifford D. Shearing	46
17	Jock Young	46
19	Stanley Cohen	44
20	Richard T. Wright	42
21	Anthony E. Bottoms	40
22	Tim Newburn	39
23	Benjamin Bowling	38
24.5	Ulrich Beck	37
24.5	Barbara Hudson	37
26	Daniel S. Nagin	36
27.5	John H. Laub	35
27.5	Robert Reiner	35
30.5	Zygmunt Baumann	34
30.5	Emile Durkheim	34
30.5	Loic Wacquant	34
30.5	Lucia Zedner	34
34.5	Pierre Bourdieu	33
34.5	Julian V. Roberts	33
34.5	Lawrence W. Sherman	33
34.5	Stephen Tombs	33
37	Malcolm M. Feeley	31
38.5	Anthony Giddens	30
38.5	Michael Levi	30
40	Mark Warr	28
41.5	Bruce A. Jacobs	27
41.5	Shadd Maruna	27
45.5	David H. Bayley	26
45.5	Francis T. Cullen	26
45.5	Stuart Hall	26
45.5	Howard Parker	26
45.5	Alex R. Piquero	26
45.5	Wesley G. Skogan	26
50	Erving Goffman	25
50	Kieran McEvoy	25
50	Coretta Phillips	25

Table 3 displays the most cited scholars in ANZ in 2006–10 (52 scholars with ranks up to 48.5). As in CRIM, Robert J. Sampson was the most cited scholar, with 76 citations. Here, Sampson was a versatile scholar, with 41 different works cited in 26 different articles; he was cited in 26 per cent of all articles in ANZ. His most cited work,

TABLE 2 *Most cited Scholars in CRIM*

Rank in 2006–10	Name	Cites
1	Robert J. Sampson	363
2	John H. Laub	147
3	Stephen W. Raudenbush	131
4	Travis Hirschi	125
5	Francis T. Cullen	116
6	Daniel S. Nagin	111
7	Raymond Paternoster ^a	101
8.5	Terrie E. Moffitt	97
8.5	Alex R. Piquero	97
10	Michael R. Gottfredson	95
11	David P. Farrington	91
12	Darrell J. Steffensmeier	86
13	Robert J. Bursik ^b	85
14	Steven F. Messner	82
15	Alfred Blumstein	77
16.5	Harold G. Grasmick	73
16.5	Kenneth C. Land	73
18	John L. Hagan	70
19	D. Wayne Osgood ^c	67
20	Robert Brame	66
21.5	Shawn Bushway	64
21.5	Avshalom Caspi	64
23	William J. Wilson	62
24.5	Robert Agnew	61
24.5	Jeffrey D. Morenoff	61
26.5	Lawrence E. Cohen	58
26.5	Charles R. Tittle ^d	58
28	Richard Rosenfeld	57
29	Marcus Felson	56
31	Lawrence W. Sherman	55
31	Jeffrey T. Ulmer	55
31	Mark Warr	55
33.5	Allen E. Liska	53
33.5	Ralph B. Taylor	53
35.5	Ronald V. Clarke	51
35.5	Delbert S. Elliott	51
37.5	Ronald L. Akers	48
37.5	Cassia C. Spohn	48
40	John H. Kramer	47
40	Janet L. Lauritsen	47
40	David L. Weisburd	47
42.5	David Huizinga	46
42.5	Richard T. Wright	46
44	Anthony S. Bryk	44
45	Marvin D. Krohn	43
46.5	Elijah Anderson	42
46.5	Felton E. Earls	42
49.5	Celeste A. Albonetti	41
49.5	Theodore Chiricos	41
49.5	Ruth D. Peterson	41
49.5	Travis C. Pratt	41

^aEditor, 2004–05.

^bEditor, 1998–03.

^cEditor, 2010–14.

^dEditor, 1992–97.

TABLE 3 *Most cited Scholars in the ANZ*

Rank in 2006–10	Name	Cites
1	Robert J. Sampson	76
2	David P. Farrington	63
3	John Braithwaite	39
4.5	Daniel S. Nagin	38
4.5	Raymond Paternoster	38
6.5	John H. Laub	34
6.5	Alex R. Piquero	34
8	Don Weatherburn	32
9	Chris Cunneen	30
10	Tom R. Tyler	27
12	Alfred Blumstein	25
12	Travis Hirschi	25
12	Ken Pease	25
14	Julian V. Roberts	24
15	Terrie E. Moffitt	23
16	Kathleen Daly	22
17	J. David Hawkins	21
19	Francis T. Cullen	20
19	David Indermauer	20
19	John Pratt ^a	20
22	Robert Brame	18
22	David Garland	18
22	Rolf Loeber	18
26	Ronald V. Clarke	17
26	Allison Morris	17
26	Clifford D. Shearing	17
26	Lawrence W. Sherman	17
26	Darrell J. Steffensmeier	17
30	Janet B. L. Chan	16
30	Michael R. Gottfredson	16
30	Gabrielle Maxwell	16
33	Marcus Felson	15
33	Arie Freiberg	15
33	Bronwyn Lind	15
39.5	Michael W. Arthur	14
39.5	Anthony E. Bottoms	14
39.5	Roderic G. Broadhurst	14
39.5	Richard F. Catalano	14
39.5	Jacqueline Cohen	14
39.5	J. Michael Hough	14
39.5	David Huizinga	14
39.5	Stephen W. Raudenbush	14
39.5	Richard E. Tremblay	14
39.5	Per-Olof Wikstrom	14
48.5	Patricia L. Brantingham	13
48.5	Paul J. Brantingham	13
48.5	Stanley Cohen	13
48.5	Anthony Giddens	13
48.5	Wayne Hall	13
48.5	L. John Horwood	13
48.5	Jody Miller	13
48.5	Tim Newburn	13

^aEditor, 1998–2005.

Crime in the Making, was cited only ten times. The second-most cited scholar was David P. Farrington, with 63 citations. The highest ranked female scholars were, again, Terrie Moffitt (ranked 15) and Kathleen Daly (ranked 16).

In CJC in 2006–10, 136 articles were published by 263 authors, 87 per cent of whom (230) were Canadian. The non-Canadian authors were most commonly from the United States (11) or the United Kingdom (9). These articles contained a total of 7,741 cited authors, including 452 self-citations and 366 co-author citations, resulting in 7,289 eligible citations, and an average of 54 cited authors per article.

Table 4 shows the most cited scholars in CJC in 2006–10 (47 scholars with ranks up to 42), most of whom were British. The most cited scholar was Julian V. Roberts, with 33 cites. Roberts was a versatile author, with 29 different works cited in 17 different articles. None of his works were highly cited; only four were cited more than once. They were *The Use of Victim Impact Statements in Sentencing* (Roberts 2002), ‘The incarceration of aboriginal offenders’ (Roberts and Melchers 2003), ‘Empty promises’ (Stenning and Roberts 2001) and ‘Public opinion, crime, and criminal justice’ (Roberts 1992). The second most cited scholar was Anthony N. Doob, with 32 citations. The highest ranked female scholars were Kelly Hanna-Moffat (ranked 7.5) and Terrie E. Moffitt (ranked 15.5).

In EJC in 2006–10, 108 articles were published by 246 authors. Of these, 26 per cent (64) were located in the United Kingdom, 19 per cent (46) were located in the Netherlands and 11 per cent (28) were located in the United States. The others were most commonly from Sweden (14), Switzerland (13) and Finland (10). These articles contained 9,561 cited authors, of which 606 were self-citations and 458 were co-author citations. This produced a total of 8,955 eligible cited authors, an average of 83 cited authors per article.

Table 5 shows the 48 most cited scholars in EJC in 2006–10 (all scholars ranked up to 50). The most cited scholar, David P. Farrington, was cited 90 times. He was a versatile scholar, with 58 different works cited in 34 different articles (31 per cent of all articles in EJC). His most cited work, ‘Developmental and life course criminology’, (Farrington 2003) was cited only five times. The second most cited scholar was Robert J. Sampson, with 82 citations. The highest ranked female scholars in EJC were Terrie E. Moffitt (ranked 3) and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber (ranked 13.5).

Reliability of the scholarly influence measure

Reliability of scholarly influence was examined two ways. First, a combined measure of influence based on all five journals was computed for each scholar by giving each cited scholar a score of 51 minus his/her rank in each journal. Thus, the most cited scholar in each journal had a score of 50, and all scholars ranked outside the top 50 in a journal had scores of 0. Each scholar’s scores on all five journals were summed, yielding a total score out of a theoretical maximum of 250. This measure gives equal weight to all five journals; if raw citation counts were summed, scholars who were highly cited in journals with more citations per article (e.g. CRIM) would have predominated.

Table 6 shows the 30 most cited scholars on this combined measure. Six of the top eight most cited scholars (the top five and the eighth-ranked scholar) were among the most cited scholars in all five journals and the top 18 were among the most cited scholars in at least two of the five journals. The remainder were highly cited in only one of

TABLE 4 *Most cited Scholars in the CJC*

Rank in 2006–10	Name	Cites
1	Julian V. Roberts ^a	33
2	Anthony N. Doob	32
3.5	Richard V. Ericson	30
3.5	David P. Farrington	30
5	Michel Foucault	29
6	Robert J. Sampson	28
7.5	Kelly Hannah-Moffat	26
7.5	Clifford D. Shearing	26
9	David Garland	25
10	Don A. Andrews	24
11	Patrick O'Malley ^b	23
12	Nikolas S. Rose	20
13	James L. Bonta	19
14	R. Karl Hanson	18
15.5	Ulrick Beck	17
15.5	Terrie E. Moffitt	17
18	Kevin D. Haggerty	16
18	Robert D. Hare	16
18	John H. Laub	16
20.5	Peter J. Carrington ^c	15
20.5	Francis T. Cullen	15
24	Alfred Blumstein	14
24	Pierre Bourdieu	14
24	Paul Gendreau	14
24	Phillip C. Stenning	14
24	Scot Wortley	14
28	Rolf Loeber	13
28	Jennifer L. Schulenberg	13
28	Margaret Shaw	13
31	Carla Cesaroni	12
31	J. Michael Hough	12
31	George Pavlich	12
34.5	Nicholas Bala	11
34.5	Stanley Cohen	11
34.5	Alex R. Piquero	11
34.5	Tom R. Tyler	11
42	Zygmunt Bauman	10
42	Jacqueline Cohen	10
42	Timothy J. Hartnagel	10
42	Robert B. Kennedy	10
42	Carol LaPrairie	10
42	Vernon L. Quinsey	10
42	Ralph B. Taylor	10
42	Mark S. Umbreit	10
42	Mark Warr	10
42	David B. Wexler	10
42	Ivan Zinger	10

^aEditor, 1993–2004.^bFrom Australia.^cEditor, 2005 – present.

the five journals. The most cited scholar in the five journals was Robert J. Sampson, who was among the top five most cited scholars in each of the journals. Terrie E. Moffitt (ranked 7) was the only female scholar among the 30 most cited scholars in the combined measure.

TABLE 5 *Most cited Scholars in the EJC*

Rank in 2006–10	Name	Cites
1	David P. Farrington	90
2	Robert J. Sampson	82
3	Terrie E. Moffitt	55
4	John H. Laub	54
5	Rolf Loeber	44
6	Travis Hirschi	41
7.5	Terence P. Thornberry	31
7.5	Per-Olof H. Wikström	31
9	Michael R. Gottfredson	30
10	Francis T. Cullen	29
11	Ken Pease	28
13.5	Robert Agnew	27
13.5	Avshalom Caspi	27
13.5	Alex R. Piquero	27
13.5	Magda Stouthamer-Loeber	27
16	Charles R. Tittle	25
17	Daniel S. Nagin	24
19	Stephen Farrall	23
19	Marcus Felson	23
19	Marvin D. Krohn	23
21.5	Harold G. Grasmick	22
21.5	Patricia M. Mayhew	22
23	J. Michael Hough	21
25	Josine Junger-Tas	20
25	Raymond Paternoster	20
25	Jan J. Van Dijk	20
28	Bruce J. Arneklev	19
28	J. David Hawkins	19
28	Paul Nieuwebeerta	19
30.5	Robert J. Bursik	18
30.5	Lawrence E. Cohen	18
32	Henk G. van de Bunt	17
36.5	Frank Bovenkerk	16
36.5	Ronald V. Clarke	16
36.5	Delbert S. Elliott	16
36.5	David Huizinga	16
36.5	Ineke H. Marshall	16
36.5	Travis C. Pratt	16
36.5	John Van Kesteren	16
36.5	Donald J. West	16
44	Jason Ditton	15
44	Marianne Junger	15
44	Dietrich Oberwittler	15
44	Phil A. Silva	15
44	David J. Smith ^a	15
44	Michael Tonry	15
44	Mark Warr	15

^aEditor, 2004–06.

Next, the concordance between journals was assessed. Of the 30 most cited scholars, 18 were highly cited in BJC, 17 in CRIM, 22 in ANZ, 17 in CJC and 19 in EJC. The concordance between each pair of journals was examined. Concordance rates were calculated based on the number of the top 30 most cited scholars identified by both journals, and the number of most cited scholars in the top 30 not identified in either journal.

TABLE 6 *Most cited Scholars in five international journals*

Rank in 2006–10	Name	Score in BJC	Score in CRIM	Score in ANZ	Score in CJC	Score in EJC	Total Score
1	Robert J. Sampson	46	50	50	45	49	240
2	David P. Farrington	43.5	40	49	47.5	50	230
3	John H. Laub	23.5	49	44.5	33	47	197
4	Terrie E. Moffitt	–	42.5	36	35.5	48	162
5	Francis T. Cullen	5.5	46	32	30.5	41	155
6	Daniel S. Nagin	25	45	46.5	–	34	150.5
7	Alex R. Piquero	5.5	42.5	44.5	16.5	37.5	146.5
8	Travis Hirschi	–	47	39	–	45	131
9	David Garland	50	–	29	42	–	121
10	Raymond Paternoster	–	44	46.5	–	26	116.5
11	J. Michael Hough	49	–	11.5	20	28	108.5
12	Michael R. Gottfredson	–	41	21	–	42	104
13	Julian V. Roberts	16.5	–	37	50	–	103.5
14	Clifford D. Shearing	34	–	25	43.5	–	102.5
15	Alfred Blumstein	–	36	39	27	–	102
16	Rolf Loeber	–	–	29	23	46	98
17	Tom R. Tyler	39	–	41	16.5	–	96.5
18	John Braithwaite	47	–	48	–	–	95
19	Michel Foucault	48	–	–	46	–	94
20	Ronald V.G. Clarke	34	15.5	25	–	14.5	89
21	Richard V. Ericson	41	–	–	47.5	–	88.5
22	Pat O'Malley	45	–	–	40	–	85
23	Nikolas S. Rose	43.5	–	–	39	–	82.5
24	Ken Pease	–	–	39	–	40	79
25	Marcus Felson	–	22	18	–	32	72
26	Stephen Farrall	37.5	–	–	–	32	69.5
27	Avshalom Caspi	–	29.5	–	–	37.5	67
29	Robert Agnew	–	26.5	–	–	37.5	64
29	Harold G. Grasmick	–	34.5	–	–	29.5	64
29	Darrell J. Steffensmeier	–	39	25	–	–	64

Table 7 presents the concordance rates calculated for each pair of journals. First, pairing ANZ with any other journal consistently produced high concordance rates. While several other individual pairings were higher (77 per cent for BJC/CJC and 80 per cent for CRIM/EJC), none of these journals showed consistently high concordance rates across all pairings. Second, BJC clearly was more concordant with journals identifying more British and international scholars (ANZ, CJC) than journals identifying primarily American scholars (CRIM, EJC). The concordance rates for BJC/CRIM (30 per cent) and BJC/EJC (37 per cent) were significantly lower than those for BJC/ANZ (53 per cent) and BJC/CJC. Third, EJC had higher concordance with journals who identified American scholars (ANZ, CRIM); the concordance rates for EJC/ANZ (63 per cent) and EJC/CRIM were significantly higher than those for EJC/BJC and EJC/CJC (33 per cent).

It is clear from these patterns that the most cited scholars in British and Canadian journals are not as frequently cited in American, Australasian and European journals, while the most cited scholars in American journals remain fairly consistent within Australasian and European journals. Despite these general similarities, only three of the top ten scholars in each of the three journals were the same scholars: Robert J. Sampson, John H. Laub and David P. Farrington.

TABLE 7 *Concordance rates between five international journals*

	ANZ	BJC	CJC	CRIM	EJC
ANZ	–	53%	57%	63%	63%
BJC	–	–	77%	30%	37%
CJC	–	–	–	33%	33%
CRIM	–	–	–	–	80%
EJC	–	–	–	–	–

Nature of scholarly influence

The nature of scholarly influence was measured both by the influence of citations (prevalence and frequency) and the influence of individual scholars (specialization and versatility). Table 8 shows the most cited works of the ten most cited scholars. These appear to be evenly divided between books or monographs and journal articles. Travis Hirschi and David Garland were the most clearly specialized scholars, each having relatively few different works cited and a single highly cited work. Their most highly cited works were primarily books, rather than articles. David P. Farrington, Francis T. Cullen, Daniel S. Nagin, Alex R. Piquero and Raymond Paternoster were more versatile, with relatively large numbers of works cited and no highly cited works. Farrington, For example, had 145 different works cited in the five journals in this five-year period but his most cited work had only 17 citations. Similarly, Francis T. Cullen had 100 different works cited, but his most cited work had only 16 citations. Robert J. Sampson, John H. Laub and Terrie E. Moffitt were both specialized and versatile, with each having a relatively large number of works cited but also one or two highly cited works. The majority of the most highly cited works of these most cited scholars focus on life-course theory, developmental criminology or criminal careers.

Limitations of the manual counting method of citation analysis

There are several problems with using citation analysis to measure prestige and influence, including the emphasis on quantity, the bias against specialized researchers and the interpretation of citations (Cohn *et al.* 1998; Cohn and Farrington 2012). First, the focus on overall number of citations has the potential to prioritize quantity over quality. However, citations are highly correlated with other measures of influence; those scholars identified using citation analysis as the most influential also tend to be the scholars who appear in other measures of scholarly influence and prestige. Peer ratings, the receipt of scholarly prizes and election to major offices in scholarly societies all tend to identify the same individuals found by citation-based analyses (see, e.g., Myers 1970; Cole and Cole 1971; Rushton and Endler 1979; Gordon and Vicari 1992). Within the current analyses, all of the top ten most cited scholars are Fellows of ASC, each has won at least one ASC award, five have received the Stockholm Prize and five have served as President of ASC. The consistency across these varying measures of influence supports both the reliability and validity of citations as a gauge of scholarly influence.

Second, citation counts may be biased against scholars working in specialized or less popular areas of research or those who publish primarily in international journals.

TABLE 8 *Most cited works of the most cited scholars in five international journals*

Rank	Author (work/year)	Number of citations
1	Robert J. Sampson – 96 different works cited; 29 (30%) cited once	
	Top 2 works account for 19% of all cites	
	Sampson and Laub (1993)	67
2	Sampson et al. (1997)	50
	David P. Farrington – 145 different works cited; 79 (54%) cited once	
	Top 3 works account for 12% of all cites	
	Piquero et al. (2003)	17
	Piquero et al. (2007)	11
3	Farrington (2003)	11
	John H. Laub – 52 different works cited; 21 (40%) cited once	
	Top 2 works account for 38% of all cites	
	Sampson and Laub (1993)	66
4	Laub and Sampson (2003)	42
	Terrie E. Moffitt – 57 different works cited; 19 (33%) cited once	
	Top 2 works account for 27% of all cites	
	Moffitt (1993)	44
5	Moffitt et al. (2001)	15
	Francis T. Cullen – 100 different works cited; 57 (57%) cited once	
	Top 2 works account for 13% of all cites	
	Pratt and Cullen (2000)	16
6	Pratt and Cullen (2005)	10
	Daniel S. Nagin – 64 different works cited; 26 (41%) cited once	
	Top 3 works account for 17% of all cites	
	Nagin (2005)	13
7	Nagin and Land (1993)	12
	Laub et al. (1998)	12
	Alex R. Piquero – 74 different works cited; 50% cited once	
	Top 3 works account for 19% of all cites	
8	Piquero et al. (2003)	13
	Piquero et al. (2007)	9
	Piquero and Tibbetts (1996)	9
	Travis Hirschi – 30 different works cited; 43% cited once	
9	Top 2 works account for 65% of all cites	
	Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990)	89
	Hirschi (1969)	55
	David Garland – 33 different works cited; 48% cited once	
10	Top 2 works account for 52% of all cites	
	Garland (2001)	81
	Garland (1996)	26
	Raymond Paternoster – 54 different works cited; 24% cited once	
	Top 2 works account for 12% of all cites	
	Nagin and Paternoster (1993)	12
	Paternoster and Simpson (1996)	10

While some specialized scholars may be extremely influential in their own areas, the limited number of others in that specialty may mean that they are less likely to be highly cited in mainstream journals ([Chapman 1989](#)). Limiting the scope of analysis to mainstream journals may give the impression that these less mainstream and more specialized scholars are not influential.

Finally, [Chapman \(1989: 341\)](#) argued that citation analysis does not allow distinctions among citations that are positive, negative or neutral ([Chapman 1989: 341](#)). A scholar may be highly cited because others are criticizing his/her work. However, as [Cohn and Farrington \(1994a\)](#) noted, if a researcher takes the time and effort to criticize a scholarly work in print, that work clearly has had some influence on that researcher, which

is what the measure is intended to capture. Further, prior research indicates that the vast majority of citations are positive or neutral (see, e.g., [Cohn and Farrington 1994a](#)), minimizing this potential issue.

Conclusions

The current study provides a snapshot of scholarly influence and prestige within five international journals during the five-year period, 2006–10. The first hypothesis, which predicted that the most cited scholars were more likely to be American, was supported. Of the ten most cited scholars in the five journals, nine (all but Farrington) were American, based on affiliation.¹ The second hypothesis, which predicted that scholars would be versatile rather than specialized, was also supported. Scholars tended to be more versatile, with only two of the ten most cited (Hirschi and Garland) being clearly specialized. A large proportion of the works of the most cited scholars (ranging from 24 to 57 per cent) were only cited once. The most cited works of the most clearly versatile scholars (Farrington, Cullen, Nagin, Piquero and Paternoster) accounted for only a small percentage of their total citations in all five journals (ranging from 12 to 19 per cent), while even the most cited works of those scholars showing evidence of both specialization and versatility (Sampson, Laub and Moffitt) accounted for well under half of their total citations (ranging from 19 to 38 per cent).

The third hypothesis, which predicted that the most cited works of the most cited scholars would involve research on developmental and life-course criminology and criminal careers, was also supported. The majority of the works of the most cited scholars focused on the research pioneered by Farrington, Moffitt, Sampson and Laub, works that have consistently remained prevalent in citation analyses concerning CCJ ([Cohn and Farrington 2012](#); [Cohn et al. 2013](#)). The prevalence of these works, above and beyond the versatility of the scholars authoring them, should not be underestimated. In his recent ASC presidential address, Cullen noted that criminological research has been housed under a paradigm of ‘adolescence-limited criminology’ but more recently has begun to shift towards a new framework termed life-course criminology ([Cullen 2011](#)). Clearly, criminology is in the throes of a renewed interest in criminal behaviour over the life course. Because EJC is a fairly new journal, it is not possible to examine earlier waves of data for comparison. However, a continuing examination of the journals over the next five years (2011–15) may provide interesting information regarding possible changes in scholarly focus among the various countries.

The last three hypotheses tested the reliability of citations counts as a measure of scholarly influence by examining the concordance between EJC and the other journals. The fourth hypothesis drew upon prior research to predict similarities between CRIM and ANZ and between BJC and CJC (see [Cohn and Farrington 2007](#)). This hypothesis was also supported. CRIM and ANZ displayed the most concordance; Robert J. Sampson was the most cited scholar in both journals and five of the ten most cited scholars were

¹ In this research, the coding of country of affiliation was based on current location and affiliation. Therefore, David Garland, although originally from the United Kingdom, was coded as American because of his current post in the United States.

the same in both journals. BJC and CJC also showed considerable concordance, with five scholars appearing among the ten most cited in both journals.

The fifth hypothesis, which predicted concordance between the most cited scholars in BJC and EJC, was not supported. The concordance rate between BJC and EJC was only 37 per cent with only 3 of the 10 most cited scholars in BJC also among the 30 most cited scholars in EJC. Finally, the sixth hypothesis predicted discordance among the most cited scholars in EJC compared to the other international journals. This hypothesis was not fully supported. There was clear discordance between EJC and BJC (37 per cent) and between EJC and CJC (33 per cent). However, there was much higher concordance between EJC and CRIM (80 per cent) and between EJC and ANZ (63 per cent), with 15 of the most cited scholars in EJC also among the most cited in these two journals. This finding is surprising given the assumption that EJC would have more similarity to BJC, as both are based in Europe and would be expected to reflect the state of European criminology. Instead, EJC appears to be most similar to CRIM, which is based in the United States and is largely US-centric, and to also show some similarity to ANZ, which has an Australasian focus.

Concordance analyses give equal weight to all five journals and, by implication, give equal weight to American, Australasian, British, Canadian and European criminology. Despite this, it is interesting to note that, of the ten most cited scholars in the five journals combined, nine (all but Farrington) are American by affiliation, supporting previous research (Miller *et al.* 2000; Barberet 2007; Cohn *et al.* 2013). The two North American journals, CRIM and CJC, were the most parochial; 90 per cent of all articles in CRIM were written by American authors and 87 per cent of all articles in CJC were written by Canadians. ANZ was also fairly parochial, with 62 per cent of the published articles written by scholars from Australia or New Zealand. In contrast, only 50 per cent of the articles in BJC were written by scholars from the United Kingdom. Not surprisingly, EJC was the least parochial of the five journals, with no more than about a quarter of all authors coming from any single country. However, nearly all (91 per cent) were from Europe (including the United Kingdom); of the remainder, five were from North America and one was from South America.

Two points invite future research. First, it is clear that scholarly influence is linked to the journal's geographic realm as the most influential scholars do not remain consistent across a broader international focus. Authors submitting manuscripts for publication may choose to cite certain top scholars over others based on the journal of submission. One reason that BJC and CJC may be different from CRIM, ANZ and EJC is that these journals may have a greater impact on international criminology. Unlike EJC, also a European journal, the most cited scholar in BJC (Garland) was an American (as noted above, since he has been based in the United States since 1997, Garland is considered American by affiliation for the purposes of this research). However, the remaining top ten scholars were British (e.g. Hough, Farrington), French (e.g. Michel Foucault) and Australian (e.g. John Braithwaite), with only a single additional American counted among this group (Sampson). Similarly, while the top scholars in CJC were mainly Canadian, including the number one most cited author (Julian V. Roberts), the other scholars were British (e.g. Farrington), French (e.g. Foucault) and American (e.g. Sampson). The multinational orientation of these scholars indicates that British and Canadian criminologists may be more exposed or open to the influence of international scholars, particularly scholars who may be more specialized, and be more likely

to cite these scholars in their own work. One task may be to expand the coverage of comparison to include a larger number of international journals.

Second, the finding of general concordance between CRIM, ANZ and EJC in the most cited scholars addresses the justification for the inclusion of EJC in the analyses. EJC identifies as an international journal, and the current analyses support that description, at least with regards to an American comparison. It is clear that the international scholars publishing in EJC tend to predominantly cite US scholars (eight of the top ten most cited scholars in EJC were American) and these scholars also tend to be cited in the more parochial CRIM. The frequent citation of American scholars in EJC indicates that American criminology must have some impact on the evolution and expansion of European criminology, at least indirectly in terms of collaborations with American scholars. However, while EJC could provide opportunities for American criminologists to publish research and reach international scholars, this study found that only 9 per cent of the published authors in EJC were from the United States. It is evident that American authors currently do not consider EJC to be as important an outlet for their research as they do other international journals.

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, H. E. (1983), 'Comment: A Reaction to "An Analysis of Citations in Introductory Criminology Textbooks," *JCJ* 10(3)', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11: 177–8.
- BARBERET, R. (2007), 'The Internalization of Criminology? A Content Analysis of Presentations at American Society of Criminology Conferences', *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18: 406–27.
- BAUER, K. and BAKKALBASI, N. (2005), 'An Examination of Citation Counts in a New Scholarly Communication Environment', *D-Lib Magazine* [On-line serial] 11, available at <http://dlib.org/dlib/september05/bauer/09bauer.html>. Last accessed 19 May 2015.
- CHAPMAN, A. J. (1989), 'Assessing Research: Citation-Count Shortcomings'. *The Psychologist*, 8: 336–44.
- COHN, E. G. and FARRINGTON, D. P. (1990), 'Differences Between British and American Criminology: An Analysis of Citations', *British Journal of Criminology*, 30: 467–82.
- . (1994a), 'Who Are the Most-Cited Scholars in Major American Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals?' *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22: 517–34.
- . (1994b), 'Who Are the Most Influential Criminologists in the English-Speaking World?' *British Journal of Criminology*, 34: 204–25.
- . (1996), "Crime and Justice" and the Criminology and Criminal Justice Literature', in M. Tonry, ed., *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 20, 265–300. University of Chicago Press.
- . (1999), 'Changes in the Most-Cited Scholars in Twenty Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals Between 1990 and 1995', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27: 345–59.
- . (2007), 'Changes in Scholarly Influence in Major International Criminology Journals between 1986 and 2000', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40: 335–60.
- . (2012), *Scholarly Influence in Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- COHN, E. G., FARRINGTON, D. P. and IRATZOQUI, A. (2013), *Most-Cited Scholars in Criminology and Criminal Justice, 1986–2010. SpringerBriefs in Criminology*. Springer International Publishing.

- COHN, E. G., FARRINGTON, D. P. and WRIGHT, R. A. (1998), *Evaluating Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Greenwood Press.
- COLE, J. R. and COLE, S. (1971), 'Measuring the Quality of Sociological Research: Problems in the Use of the Science Citation Index', *The American Sociologist*, 6: 23–9.
- CULLEN, F. T. (2011), 'Beyond Adolescence-Limited Criminology: Choosing Our Future - The American Society of Criminology 2010 Sutherland Address', *Criminology*, 49: 287–330.
- DAVIS, J. and SORESENSEN, J. R. (2010), 'Doctoral Programs in Criminal Justice and Criminology: A Meta-Analysis of Program Ranking', *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7: 6–23.
- DESS, H. M. (2006), 'Database Reviews and Reports: Scopus', *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, Winter.
- FABIANIC, D. A. (2012), 'Publication Profiles at Point of Promotion of Criminal Justice Faculty', *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 23: 65–80.
- FARRINGTON, D. P. (2003), 'Developmental and Life-Course Criminology: Key Theoretical and Empirical Issues - The 2002 Sutherland Award Address', *Criminology*, 41: 221–5.
- GABBIDON, S. L. and COLLINS, R. (2012), 'Using Google Scholar to Determine the Most Cited Criminology and Criminal Justice-Related Books', *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 33–45.
- GARLAND, D. (1996), 'The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society', *British Journal of Criminology*, 36: 445–71.
- . (2001), *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. University of Chicago Press.
- GIBLIN, M. J. and SCHAFER, J. A. (2008), 'Comprehensive Examination Reading Lists as Indicators of Scholar Impact and Significance', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26: 81–9.
- GORDON, R. A. and VICARI, P. J. (1992), 'Eminence in Social Psychology: A Comparison of Textbook Citation, Social Sciences Citation Index, and Research Productivity Rankings', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18: 26–38.
- GOTTFREDSON, M. R. and HIRSCHI, T. (1990), *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford University Press.
- GREEN, G. S. (1997), 'Using Citation Counts in Criminology as Measures of Intellectual Influence: A Comment on Wright and Soma, Myself, and Others', *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 20: 179–86.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1969), *Causes of Delinquency*. University of California Press.
- KLECK, G. and BARNES, J. C. (2011), 'Article Productivity Among the Faculty of Criminology and Criminal Justice Doctoral Programs, 2005–2009', *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22: 43–66.
- LAUB, J. H., NAGIN, D. S. and SAMPSON, R. J. (1998), 'Trajectories of Change in Criminal Offending: Good Marriages and the Desistance Process', *American Sociological Review*, 63: 225–38.
- LAUB, J. H. and SAMPSON, R. J. (2003), *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Harvard University Press.
- LONG, H., BOGGESE, L. N. and JENNINGS, W. G. (2011), 'Re-Assessing Publication Productivity Among Academic "Stars" in Criminology and Criminal Justice', *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22: 102–17.
- MEADOWS, A. J. (1974), *Communication in Science*. Butterworths.
- MEHO, L. I. and YANG, K. (2007), 'Impact of Data Sources on Citation Counts and Rankings of LIS Faculty: Web of Science versus Scopus and Google Scholar', *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58: 2105–25.

- MILLER, J. M., WRIGHT, R. A. and SMITH, M. M. (2000), “Mostly Male and American”: The Reporting of Women and Crime Scholarship in Introductory Criminology Textbooks’, *The Justice Professional*, 13: 233–45.
- MOFFITT, T. E. (1993), ‘Adolescence-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Antisocial Behaviour: A Developmental Taxonomy’, *Psychological Review*, 100: 674–701.
- MOFFITT, T. E., CASPI, A., RUTTER, M. and SILVA, P. A. (2001), *Sex Differences in Antisocial Behaviour: Conduct Disorder, Delinquency, and Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study*. Cambridge University Press.
- MYERS, C. R. (1970), ‘Journal Citations and Scientific Eminence in Contemporary Psychology’, *American Psychologist*, 25: 1041–48.
- NAGIN, D. S. (2005), *Group-Based Modeling of Development Over the Life Course*. Harvard University Press.
- NAGIN, D. S. and LAND, K. C. (1993), ‘Age, Criminal Careers, and Population Heterogeneity’, *Criminology*, 31: 327–62.
- NAGIN, D. S. and PATERNOSTER, R. (1993), ‘Enduring Individual Differences and Rational Choice Theories of Crime’, *Law and Society Review*, 27: 467–96.
- OLIVER, W. M., SWINDELL, S., MARKS JR., J. and BALUSEK, K. (2009), ‘Book ‘em Dano: The Scholarly Productivity of Institutions and Their Faculty in Criminal Justice Books’, *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 6: 59–78.
- ORRICK, E. A. and WEIR, H. (2011), ‘The Most Prolific Sole and Lead Authors in Elite Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals, 2000–2009’, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22: 24–42.
- PATERNOSTER, R. and SIMPSON, S. (1996), ‘Sanction Threats and Appeals to Morality: Testing a Rational Choice Model of Corporate Crime’, *Law and Society Review*, 30: 549–84.
- PIQUERO, A. R., FARRINGTON, D. P. and BLUMSTEIN, A. (2003), ‘The Criminal Career Paradigm’, in M. Tonry, ed., *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 30, 359–506. University of Chicago Press.
- . (2007), *Key Issues in Criminal Career Research*. Cambridge University Press.
- PIQUERO, A. R. and TIBBETTS S. A. (1996), ‘Specifying the Direct and Indirect Effects of Low Self-Control and Situational Factors in Decision-Making’, *Justice Quarterly*, 13: 481–510.
- PRATT T. C. and CULLEN F. T. (2000), ‘The Empirical Status of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s General Theory of Crime: A Meta-Analysis’, *Criminology*, 38: 931–64.
- . (2005), ‘Assessing Macro-Level Predictors and Theories of Crime: A Meta-Analysis’, *Crime and Justice*, 32: 373–450.
- RICE, S. K., COHN, E. G. and FARRINGTON, D. P. (2005), ‘Where Are They Now? Trajectories of Publication “Stars” From American Criminology and Criminal Justice Programs’, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16: 244–264.
- RICE, S. K. HICKMAN, M. J. and REYNOLDS, P. (2011), ‘A Preliminary Assessment of Small World Scholarship Networks in Criminology and Criminal Justice’, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22: 67–83.
- ROBERTS, J. V. (1992), ‘Public Opinion, Crime, and Criminal Justice’, in M. Tonry, ed., *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 16, 99–180. University of Chicago Press.
- . (2002), *The Use of Victim Impact Statements in Sentencing: A Review of International Research Findings*. Policy Centre for Victim Issues, Department of Justice Canada.
- ROBERTS, J. V. and MELCHERS, R. (2003), ‘The Incarceration of Aboriginal Offenders: Trends From 1978 to 2001’, *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 45: 211–43.
- RUSHTON, J. P. and ENDLER, N. S. (1979), ‘More To-Do About Citation Counts in British Psychology’, *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 32: 107–9.

- SAMPSON, R. J. and LAUB, J. H. (1993), *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Harvard University Press.
- SAMPSON, R. J., RAUDENBUSH, S. W. and EARLS, F. E. (1997), 'Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy', *Science*, 277: 918–24.
- SHICHOR, D. (1982), 'An Analysis of Citations in Introductory Criminology Textbooks: A Research Note', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10: 231–7.
- SHUTT, J. E. and BARNES, J. C. (2008), 'Reexamining Criminal Justice "Star Power" in a Larger Sky: A Belated Response to Rice *et al.* on Sociological Influence in Criminology and Criminal Justice', *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 19: 213–26.
- SORENSEN, J. R. and PILGRIM, R. (2002), 'The Institutional Affiliations of Authors in Leading Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30: 11–18.
- STEINER, B. and SCHWARTZ, J. (2006), 'The Scholarly Productivity of Institutions and Their Faculty in Leading Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals', *Journal of Criminal Justice* 34: 393–400.
- STENNING, P. and ROBERTS, J. V. (2001), 'Empty Promises: Parliament, the Supreme Court, and the Sentencing of Aboriginal Offenders', *Saskatchewan Law Review*, 64, 137–68.
- WOLFGANG, M. E., FILGLIO, R. M. and THORNBERRY, T. P. (1978), *Evaluating Criminology*. Elsevier.
- WRIGHT, R. A. (2000), 'Recent Changes in the Most-Cited Scholars in Criminology: A Comparison of Textbooks and Journals', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28: 117–28.
- . (2002), 'Recent Changes in the Most-Cited Scholars in Criminal Justice Textbooks', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30: 183–95.
- WRIGHT, R. A. and FRIEDRICHS, D. O. (1998), 'The Most-Cited Scholars and Works in Critical Criminology', *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9: 211–31.
- WRIGHT, R. A., MALIA, M. and JOHNSON, C. W. (1999), 'Invisible Influence: A Citation Analysis of Crime and Justice Articles Published in Leading Sociology Journals', *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 22:147–69.
- WRIGHT, R. A. and MILLER, J. M. (1998), 'The Most-Cited Scholars and Works in Police Studies', *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 21: 240–54.