

# Scholarly Influence in Criminology and Criminal Justice of China

Yan Zhang<sup>1</sup>

Received: 3 August 2016 / Accepted: 7 February 2017 / Published online: 9 March 2017  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2017

**Abstract** Scholarly influence in criminology and criminal justice (CCJ) is not a new topic. However, in terms of international scholarly influence in Chinese criminology, there still exists no relevant literature, though emphasis on studying China has been increasingly recognized by the international criminological academy. The current study conducts a comprehensive analysis of 191 CCJ articles on China from 20 mainstream CCJ journals and locates those who have done work on Chinese criminology. By productivity and citation analysis, we obtain several rankings of the scholarly influence in Chinese criminology. The most prolific individual identified by the current study is Jianhong Liu; the most productive institution is the City University of Hong Kong; the most-cited scholar is Steven Messner, and the most-cited work is *Policing and Punishment in China: From Patriarchy to 'The People'* by Michael Dutton. Though the current study focuses on Chinese criminology, few local mainland Chinese scholars and publications in Chinese are among the dominant contributions.

**Keywords** Chinese criminology · Scholarly influence · Citation · Productivity

## Introduction

As a result of international and comparative criminology attracting growing attention this century, emphasis on studying China has been increasingly recognized (Liu et al. 2001a, b; Liu and Messner 2001; Bennett 2004; Broadhurst and Liu 2004; Liu 2007, 2008; Zhang et al. 2008; Messner 2015). Chinese criminology is growing in stature, maturity, and utility (Mei and Wang 2007). Under these circumstances, numerous peer-reviewed criminological articles researching crime and punishment in China have been published, and special issues on this topic have been developed in some leading scientific journals in the last decade. Behind the flourishing pages of Chinese criminology, we can wonder who wields influence in the

---

✉ Yan Zhang  
ian.zhang@anu.edu.au

<sup>1</sup> School of Regulation and Global Governance (RegNet), College of Asia & the Pacific, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

criminological academy of China. In fact, scholarly influence studies in criminology and criminal justice (CCJ) have been under discussion over many years. Productivity and citation analysis are two common measurements to assess scholarly influence in CCJ (Cohn and Farrington 2011). By well-established methodology in western scholarship, the current study is the first one to measure the scholar influence in CCJ domain in China.

## Literature Review

### Scholarly Influence in Criminology and Criminal Justice

There is a fascination in modern societies that almost everything, varying from products, organizations, to academia, tends to be evaluated and ranked (Shichor 2009). A top 10 “something” exists in every aspect of our daily life. This is often connected to the commodification of domains that were previously less commodified. Academia is not an exception. Rankings of universities or programs, such as *The Times Higher Education World University Rankings*, have been applied to interpret educational and academic quality and influence. Following this orientation, abundant studies have measured scholarly influence in CCJ (Copes et al. 2012; Cohn and Farrington 1994, 1998, 1999, 2007, 2008, 2011, 2012a, b; González-Alcaide et al. 2013). Individuals, doctoral programs, and university departments are the primary dimensions assessed (Cohn and Farrington 2007). Citation analysis and publication productivity are the most commonly used measures to determine scholarly influence and prestige (Cohn and Farrington 2011). In the following section, a brief review will be conducted on the exiting citation and productivity studies in the field of criminology.

#### *Productivity*

The assumption that scholars with more published works would enjoy more prestige and influence is one theoretical base of researches on publication productivity (Cohn and Farrington 2012a). In Cohn et al.’s (2000) research, 22 PhD graduates with the most peer-reviewed journal publications were identified. They were publication “stars” that accounted for 39% of all publications within selected journals. Some studies explored the relationship between scholar’s publication and other factors. For example, Frost et al. (2007) found that productivity of criminologists was prone to increase in the initial 5 years after PhD then to being relatively stable as their careers proceeded in the next 20 years. Gender also plays a role in productivity, as male criminologists are nearly twice as productive as their female counterparts on cumulative lifetime publication (Snell et al. 2009), but a greater integration into research networks of female scholars has resulted in a narrowing of this gender gap (Stack 2002).

Parker and Goldfeder (1979) conducted the first study on publication productivity in criminology. They calculated the numbers of publications of authors by institutional affiliation published in ten selected CCJ journals from 1927 to 1977, then a ranking of institutions based on total publications of all faculty in each respective institution. This procedure of counting individual publications first, then adding up the faculty’s works in the same department, is the basic rationale of productivity analysis at an institutional level. Among all the existing productivity studies, Kleck et al. (2007)’s and their follow-up (Kleck and Barnes 2011) merit detailed introduction because their methodological wisdom will be applied in the current study.

In their study, Kleck et al. (2007) intended to evaluate 33 criminal justice doctoral programs<sup>1</sup> from the USA and Canada by counting the publications of their faculty from 2000 to 2005. In total, 541 faculty members were identified (adjunct faculty, instructors, lecturers, graduate assistants, emeritus faculty, and joint-appointment faculty with a major principle appointment in another institution were excluded) from all the targeted programs. Articles by the referred faculty published in 256 journals during 2000 and 2005 were searched within two electronic bibliographic databases: (1) ProQuest Criminal Justice Periodical Index (CJPI) and (2) Web of Science (WOS). When calculating publication counts of the faculty in every program, journal prestige that was assessed by Sorensen et al. (2006) and authorship shares were also considered; then, all the programs were ranked according to the total weighted credits. In the follow-up study, Kleck and Barnes (2011) used the same method to explore ranking changes in 2005–2009 from the previous 5 years. By comparing the 2009 *Top Criminology Schools & Programs in the United States* created by the US News & World Report (2009), we can find that 8 of the top 10 universities in Kleck and Barnes' study (2011) also ranked in the top 10 of the US News & World Report list. This, to some extent, demonstrates the validity of productivity analysis for scholarly influence studies.

### Citation

The basic rationale behind citation assessment of scholarly influence is that “good work is the work that others find useful and consequently cite in their own work” (Chirstenson and Sigelman 1985). It can be more specifically interpreted in the two major assumptions of Meadows (1974): (a) citation indicates influence and (b) most-cited works are the ones that were important in the area. Surprisingly and pitifully, in a citation study, Meho (2007) found that around 90% of peer-reviewed papers in academic journals had never been cited, and it was likely that most works enjoyed readers no more than their own authors, reviewers, and editors. There are several factors determining the frequency of citation for an article: most importantly, the “journal factor” (Callaham et al. 2002), methodological quality of the article (Lee et al. 2002), and the extent to which the article can be reached by readers (Stryker 2002). Methodologically, two sources are commonly used for citation analysis (Cohn and Farrington 2012a): one is electronic databases such as Journal Citation Reports, Google Scholar, or Scopus of Elsevier; the other is a direct examination of reference list of academic works then counting the cumulative amounts of citations of a named scholar or institution.

In terms of citation analysis, Wolfgang et al. (1978) are the criminological pioneers. Based on 3134 peer-reviewed articles and 556 books in criminology published from 1945 to 1972, they (1978) found that 2.2% of these works occupied half the citations identified from all the articles and books. By counting citations on references of articles published in six prestigious CCJ journals from 1991 to 1995, Cohn and Farrington (1998) ranked the quality of 20 CCJ doctoral programs registered in the American Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminal Justice and Criminology (AADPCJC), while more attention was drawn to analyze individual scholarly influence from the perspective of citation. In their researches, Cohn and Farrington (1994, 1998, 2007, 2008, 2012a, b) directly examined the reference list of academic works in CCJ journals within certain years and then counted the citations of all cited authors. The finalized influence ranking was based on the total citations of authors.

<sup>1</sup> They are members of the American Association Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice (AADPCCJ).

## The Prestige of Major Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals

The quality of journals in which scholars publish their works is a common indication of how much he or she contributes to a particular field (Glenn and Villemez 1970; Cohn and Farrington 1998) and is a significant impact on faculty employment, merit, and promotion (Judge et al. 2004; MacKenzie and Piquero 2001). Therefore, systematically assessed prestige of journals could be a useful guide for authors to decide where to submit their works and an indicator of their academic influence (Regoli et al. 1982). There are two commonly used methods of evaluating the quality and prestige of journals. The first is an objective approach based on citation indexes of articles from a “targeted” journal. Databases *Journal Citation Reports (JCR)* created by Institute for Scientific Information (ISI)<sup>2</sup> and *SCImago Journal & Country Rank (SJR)* by Scopus are two frequently used databases to assess the impact of journals (Leydesdorff et al. 2010; Jacso 2010). With *JCR*, indicators such as the total numbers of citations, 5-year impact factor, numbers of source items, impact factor, immediacy index, and cited half-life are applied to quantify journal quality (Magri and Solari 1996). Hitherto, there are 52 journals in total that are under the subject category as Criminology & Penology in *JCR* (Web of Science 2014).

The second approach is considered more subjective, which has been applied in various CCJ journal prestige studies (Parker and Goldfeder 1979; Greene et al. 1985; Williams et al. 1995; Sorensen et al. 2006; Brown and Daly 2008; Gabbidon et al. 2010). Simply speaking, it is a peer-review approach where knowledgeable persons in the field are invited to rank journals under some predetermined scales. The “persons” include chairs or leaders of departments offering criminal justice graduate programs (Brown and Daly 2008), faculty members in CCJ departments (Parker and Goldfeder 1979; Greene et al. 1985), or members of criminological associations such as American Society of Criminology (ASC) and Academy of Criminal Justice Science (ACJS) (Williams et al. 1995; Sorensen et al. 2006; Gabbidon et al. 2010). The current study will use ratings of CCJ journals assessed by Sorensen et al. (2006)<sup>3</sup> as an important indicator of authors’ scholarly influence.

On the Chinese landscape, Yu (2012) listed nine major Chinese CCJ journals: *Crime Study*, *Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency*, *Juvenile Delinquency*, *Journal of Chinese People’s Public Security University (Social Science)*, *Journal of Chinese Prison*, *Crime and Rehabilitation*, *Criminal Justice Science*, *Criminal Law Review* (《刑法学评论》), and *Criminal Law Review* (《刑法学论丛》).<sup>4</sup> In terms of journal prestige, the Chinese Social Science Citation Index (CSSCI) was mentioned, but only *Crime Study* was a member of it. Therefore, it is quite difficult to compare the prestige of these Chinese journals and less possible to include them for analysis in the current study.

<sup>2</sup> Now known as the Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge.

<sup>3</sup> Sorensen et al. carried out a survey among 2176 members in the 2003/2004 membership pool of ACJS and ASC (solely or dually) to assess 69 selected peer-reviewed CCJ journals. Measurement of “rate the following journals on a scale of 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent)” was utilized. After a random 50% sample selection and other screenings, 555 eligible questionnaires were available. The final scores of these 69 journals ranged from 4.48 to 9.13, with an average of 6.55.

<sup>4</sup> The last three are overwhelmingly criminal law oriented. All these journals were ranked by nothing but the year of their establishment. Interestingly, the last two have even shared the same official English title. Besides time information, there were only publishers and journal’s focus being briefly introduced.

## The Current Study

When the terms “scholarly influence” and “criminology/criminal justice” combined with “Chinese/China/People’s Republic of China”<sup>5</sup> are typed into Google and Google Scholar, pitifully but not surprisingly, there is no relevant information available. This is both an opportunity and a challenge for the current study. The precondition is how to operationalize the concept “scholarly influence in CCJ of China.” Farrington et al. aimed at the scholarly influence of the whole CCJ enterprise, and they studied those who published CCJ-focused work in selected journals by productivity and citation analysis. Deductively, if authors who have published articles of CCJ on the topic of China are located, then analysis on these people will be a measure of scholarly influence in CCJ of China. Specifically, a systematic search of articles that focus on China in confined CCJ journals would locate those who have done work on Chinese criminology; then, productivity and citation evaluations on these scholars and their institutions can provide an idea of “scholarly influence in CCJ of China.” This is the rationale of the current study.

## Journals Included

Considering the general selection criteria defined by Cohn and Farrington in their studies (2008, 2012a), along with the purpose of special focus on Chinese criminology, selection criteria are the following:

1. Only journals that have been quantitatively assessed by Sorensen et al. (2006) should be included. This is because journal prestige will also be a measurement comparing scholarly influence in this study.
2. The establishment year of the journal should be prior to 2000, because every included journal should be available as an article searching source between 2000 and 2013. Therefore, journals in Sorensen et al.’s list (2006) such as *Criminology and Public Policy* by Wiley that started in 2001 were excluded.
3. Journals must have published articles on CCJ of China within the given time window (2000–2013).
4. Journals that mainly cover disciplines such as abnormal behavior or legal psychology which overlap with CCJ are not considered. Otherwise, authors who specialize in psychology, medicine, or even hard science are likely to be found in large numbers, rather than criminological experts whom we are actually interested in. This would dramatically increase the workload in counting publications and citations but function only as statistical noise. Therefore, journals like *Aggression and Violent Behavior* have been filtered out.
5. Journals concerned with one specific aspect of CCJ are also problematic for the current study. If those journals are included, the number of articles concentrating on a certain topic will greatly increase, and then, productivity and citations of criminologists in this area will be elevated, which could possibly bias the final scholarly influence assessment (Cohn and Farrington 2012a). Thus, journals such as *Police Quarterly* and *Journal of Drug Issues* were not selected.

<sup>5</sup> The current analysis only focuses on the People’s Republic of China. It would be better if the Greater China, including the PRC, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau, is taken into account.

One flaw of Sorensen's list is that it did not encompass the *British Journal of Criminology* (*BJC*), *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* (*ANZJC*), and *International Journal of Law Crime and Justice* (*IJLCJ*),<sup>6</sup> three well-known publications in the CCJ field which were included in other journal prestige (Brown and Daly 2008; Stack 1987) and scholarly influence studies (Cohn and Farrington 1999, 2008, 2012a; Kleck et al. 2007; Kleck and Barnes 2011). These two journals also satisfy the four selection criteria established earlier, except the first one. Therefore, they must not be missed for the current study. Kleck and Barnes (2011) have offered an alternative way to solve this problem. They found there were 19 journals shared by both Sorensen's study (2006) and an earlier journal prestige study (Sorensen et al. 1992). So, Kleck and Barnes used the scores of the 19 journals in the previous study (1992) as independent variables and the newer ones as dependent variables to conduct an estimated bivariate regression. Finally, the equation "New = 3.78 + 0.308OLD" was generated. Again, *BJC*, *ANZJC*, and *IJLCJ* were rated in the old study with a weighting of 11.15, 7.17, and 8.79, respectively. Using this method, the following list of 20 CCJ journals was included in the current study (Table 1).

Compared with the 20 CCJ journals (ten from the USA and ten from other countries) selected by Cohn and Farrington's studies (2012a, b), we can find that 14 of those 20 journals overlap with the current study. Scores of the journals selected by this study range from 5.40 to 9.13, which are consistent with the distribution of that of the 69 journals in Sorensen et al. (2006) study. Therefore, we can conclude that the 20 journals for the current study are representative and valid for scholarly influence research.

## Articles Included

Terms "China," "Greater China," "Chinese," "Mainland China," and "People's Republic of China" were searched. We directly read every article which was listed to assess "relevance" after the first step of screening. Then, we selected articles that were published between 2000 and 2013. Meanwhile, we excluded articles that were solely concerned with Taiwan, Hong Kong, or Macau or comparative researches between them. Articles that did a comprehensive comparison of numerous areas, among which China was occasionally discussed, were also not included.<sup>7</sup> This selection round involved very careful browsing on abstracts, sometimes even the methodology part, when the article titles did not reveal distinctive information. "Articles" included original research, research notes, special issues, etc., while book reviews, editorials, and obituaries were excluded (Cohn and Farrington 2012a). In total, there were 191 publications from the 20 named CCJ journals found. Then, information such as authors' institutions, adopted research methods, and study topics was recorded.

There may be some criticisms on the selected articles because 191 seem to not be sufficient to tell the criminological story of China. However, Heberton and Jou (2013) conducted a massive search for CCJ articles on People's Republic of China (mainland only) published between 2000 and 2010.<sup>8</sup> This provided a sound coverage that could filter as many articles and

<sup>6</sup> Formerly known as the *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*.

<sup>7</sup> For instance, Knepper (2012) carried out a study of women trafficking, which accommodated 6500 interviews across 28 counties; China was included but only mentioned as background information for a few times.

<sup>8</sup> They used four comprehensive e-databases, including *Criminal Justice Abstracts*, *Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge*, *PsycINFO*, and *National Criminal Justice Reference Service*. Terms for searching included "court," "delinquency," "crime," "crim\*," "drug," "drugs," "justice," "just\*," "juvenile," "offender," "police," "pol\*," "off\*," "prison," "pris\*," "sentencing," "sexual," and "sex\*."

**Table 1** Twenty selected CCJ journals for the current study

Journal title	Rating
Criminology	9.13
Justice Quarterly	8.71
Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency	8.60
Crime and Delinquency	8.19
Journal of Quantitative criminology	8.07
Theoretical Criminology	7.46
Criminal Justice and Behavior	7.37
Journal of Criminal Justice	7.24
British Journal of Criminology	7.21
Journal of Interpersonal Violence	7.03
Punishment and Society	6.80
Violence and Victim	6.80
Crime, Law and Social Change	6.77
International Journal of Law Crime and Justice	6.49
International Criminal Justice Review	6.46
International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice	6.40
International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology	6.36
Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice	6.34
Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology	5.98
Criminal Justice Studies	5.40

Source: Sorensen et al. (1992, 2006)

journals as possible. Finally, 201 articles were obtained. In the current study, 140 articles were found within 2000 and 2010 by searching through just 20 journals. If regarding the 201 articles as the population, 140 as samples, to some extent, the 20 selected journals were representative and our searching strategy was efficient, especially given that journals and articles which were not suitable for the current study have been eliminated.

### Productivity Analysis

Authorship status is regarded as a significant determination of candidate quality for job seeking and is increasingly important in tenure decisions (Seipel 2003); therefore, how to grant credits to authors of 191 articles, among which about 58% were multiple authored, cannot escape from consideration. The current study applied the following rating system for authorship credits established by Kleck et al. (2007, 2011):

- Sole author = 1.00
- First of two authors = 0.60 and second of two authors = 0.40
- First of three authors = 0.40, second of three authors = 0.35, and third of three authors = 0.25
- First of four or more authors = 0.40 and second or later of four or more authors =  $(0.60 / (k - 1))$ , where  $k$  = total number of authors

### Citation Counting

We approached alphabetical lists of all the references in each of the 191 articles and then counted the citations basically as Cohn and Farrington did in their studies (2008, 2012b).



Authors in all cited works on the reference list, including research papers, books, unpublished materials, and conference reports (excluding book reviews), were counted. Institutional authors, such as the PRC Ministry of Public Security, to name one, were not recorded. There were also some Chinese news reports and online information cited, while even if the original documents were located, it was very hard to accurately distinguish the author's identity because usually only the information of author's full name was available. Therefore, news reports were not included. Multiple authors in the same publication would be equally treated regardless of author order. One important thing is that self-citations were excluded while the situation of coauthor was considered.<sup>9</sup> Titles of cited materials were also recorded.<sup>10</sup>

Since only the family name with the initials of given and/or middle name was offered in many references, a laborious and time-consuming check against the original publications for authors' full names was conducted. This efficiently minimized typos and confirmed the identity of cited authors. Sometimes, checking authors' CV and personal website for publication experience was also necessary to match cited works with relevant authors. In addition, there were considerable Chinese resources being cited, which made this procedure for the current study more complicated than that of Cohn and Farrington's research. First of all, name spelling in modern Chinese Pinyin and in the traditional one is quite different. For example, Chu, Tung Tsu, was cited by Wong (2000), while in Chen's article (2002), it became Chu, Tongzu, which required a rigorous examination before confirmation. The other problem caused by cited documents in Chinese was that in some cases, the citing authors directly translated the title (including journal title) into English, instead of Pinyin or original English title (if available), and then referenced it. Because of different understandings, translation skills, and preference of the citing authors, occasionally, the same Chinese publication was cited in two articles in different names.<sup>11</sup> To find the original pieces of these cited works was a very difficult job, because direct searching by the translated title (or back translation) could hardly locate them precisely. To surmount this problem, a comprehensive fuzzy search was applied. For example, for the reference "Zhou et al. (2004) *New Contemporary Positive Criminology—Study of Criminal Behavior*. Beijing: People's Court Press," cited by Liu (2008), individual Chinese terms "当代(contemporary)," "实证(positive)," "犯罪学(criminology)," and "犯罪行为 (criminal behavior)" combined with the name of publisher and publishing year, along with author's family name "周Zhou," "刘Liu," and "王Wang"<sup>12</sup> as the supplemented information, were typed into "Google" to search for the original article. This turned out to be an effective strategy to identify cited publications and authors. In total, we recorded 9515 citations by the 191 articles with an average of 49.8 per article. The self-citation rate was 6.19%.

The same authors and publications cited by the 191 articles were confirmed, and the frequencies of their citation were added up. Then, the most-cited scholars and publications were identified and ranked. As Cohn and Farrington defended (2008), in spite of careful checking, this method cannot guarantee exactly replicated results by other researchers because of different understandings of the article for selection, reference omission, difficulties in

<sup>9</sup> For instance, Jianhong Liu's sole article in British Journal of Criminology cited an article which he coauthored with Steven F. Messner. In this case, Messner would be granted a credit for being cited while Liu not.

<sup>10</sup> In some cases, materials like *China Yearbook* in different years were cited by one article. In this situation, only one credit would be granted.

<sup>11</sup> Even *Chinese Yearbook* sometimes was differently cited as *China Yearbook*, *Yearbook of China*, or *China Statistical Yearbook*.

<sup>12</sup> Presumably, because many different Chinese family names share the same spelling in Chinese Pinyin.



**Table 2** Productivity ranking by publication numbers

Rank	Scholars	Articles numbers	Annual productivity
1	Jianhong Liu	19	1.36
2	Lening Zhang	16	1.14
3	Hong Lu	13	0.93
4	Yuning Wu	12	0.86
5	Shanhe Jiang	10	0.71
5	Ivan Y. Sun	10	0.71
5	Steven F. Messner	10	0.71
8	Bin Liang	9	0.64
9	Eric G. Lambert	8	0.57
9	Kam C. Wong	8	0.57

distinguishing authors, and clerical errors, but confidently, the major conclusions would be supported by future replicated studies, merely with marginal changes.

## Findings

### Scholarly Influence in Criminology and Criminal Justice of China

#### *Productivity*

Table 2 shows the top 10 productive scholars regardless of the author order. Jianhong Liu produced 19 of the 191 articles as sole or coauthors, followed by Lening Zhang with 16 articles. Among the ten most productive criminologists in Chinese criminology, eight were ethnic Chinese, except Steven F. Messner and Eric G. Lambert.

Table 3 is a ranking that takes authorship into consideration. This is based on the authorship weights by Kleck et al. (2007). Jianhong Liu is still ranking at the first place, and Lening Zhang falls to the third place. Eight of the top 10 scholars in Table 3 are also in the top 10 productive list of Table 2 in which authorship was not taken into account. Susan Trevaskes and Jianhua Xu are new faces in the weighted ranking. Maybe because they are habitual sole authors and researchers, which gives them more credits per article. In the current study, we find that there are in total 228 authors sharing the 191 articles, that is, 0.84 article per person, while the top 10 productive criminologists comprised only 4.4% of the total authors but generated 30.2% of the total publications in Chinese criminology (Table 3).

Table 4 is the productivity ranking, considering both authorship and journal prestige.<sup>13</sup> This weighting system takes both the journal's quality and the contribution that an author made to the article into account to comprehensively reflect the scholarly influence. In this ranking, Jianhong Liu is still the prolific leader of Chinese criminology, followed by Lening Zhang. After a check against the to-date CVs of the top 10 stars, we find that only Steven F. Messner and Susan Trevaskes are not ethnic Chinese; however, only Jianhong Liu is from a greater China institution—University of Macau. The other eight are all based at US universities, and

<sup>13</sup> For instance, Lening Zhang, Steven F. Messner, and Jianhong Liu copublished an article in *Criminology* which was rated as 9.13 by Sorensen et al. (2006). For this article, Lening Zhang as the first author got  $0.4 \times 9.13 = 3.65$  points, Steven Messner as the second author got  $0.35 \times 9.13 = 3.20$  points, and Liu got  $0.25 \times 9.13 = 2.28$  points.

**Table 3** Productivity ranking by weighted authorship

Rank	Scholars	Weighted authorship	All articles (%)
1	Jianhong Liu	10.05	5.261
2	Kam C. Wong	8.00	4.188
3	Lening Zhang	7.40	3.874
4	Hong Lu	6.35	3.324
5	Susan Trevaskes	5.00	2.617
6	Bin Liang	4.80	2.513
7	Yuning Wu	4.75	2.487
8	Shanhe Jiang	4.00	2.094
9	Ivan Y. Sun	3.90	2.042
10	Jianhua Xu	3.40	1.780
Total		57.65	30.180

one is from an Australian university. Eight of them are full professors; two are associate professors. Some of them are CCJ department heads such as Lening Zhang and Kam C. Wong.

Authors' institutions of employment when the article was published have also been recorded. Table 5 shows that in the current study, there are three Hong Kong-based universities: City University of Hong Kong, University of Hong Kong, and Chinese University of Hong Kong ranking in the top 10 productive institutions, which stands at the first, third, and seventh places, respectively. However, there are no individual stars from these three universities. This demonstrates the tradition and strength of Hong Kong in Chinese criminology. Meanwhile, it is not surprising that University of Nevada, Wayne State University, Griffith University, University of Toledo, and Oklahoma State University enter into the top 10 Chinese criminological research "factories," because they own top 10 "producers" (see Table 4). Though Jianhong Liu is the most productive author, the University of Macau does not appear in the institutional ranking. This is because he was a previous faculty member of Rhode Island College before his commitment to University of Macau in 2007, which greatly partakes of the credits of the latter one and takes the former into this list. Similarly, because of Kam C. Wong's shifting employment, nor does Xavier University appear in this ranking.

### *Most-Cited Scholars*

Table 6 indicates that Steven F. Messner is the most-cited scholar in Chinese criminology, having been cited 115 times in 43 of the 191 articles, followed by Lening

**Table 4** Individual productivity ranking by total credits

Rank	Scholars	Total credits	Current employment
1	Jianhong Liu	61.835	Professor, University of Macau
2	Lening Zhang	52.313	Professor, Saint Francis University
3	Kam C. Wong	52.040	Professor, Xavier University, Cincinnati
4	Hong Lu	44.166	Professor, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
5	Susan Trevaskes	33.970	Professor, Griffith University
6	Yuning Wu	32.928	Associate professor, Wayne State University
7	Bin Liang	32.608	Associate professor, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa
8	Shanhe Jiang	29.708	Professor, University of Toledo
9	Ivan Y. Sun	26.782	Professor, University of Delaware
10	Steven F. Messner	23.840	Professor, University at Albany

**Table 5** Most productive institutions in Chinese criminology

Rank	School	Authorship weighted productivity	Total credits
1	City University of Hong Kong	9.10	59.589
2	University of Nevada	8.45	57.248
3	University of Hong Kong	7.45	50.477
4	Saint Francis University	7.00	48.909
5	Wayne State University	6.90	48.275
6	Rhode Island College	6.30	42.034
7	Chinese University of Hong Kong	5.85	40.306
8	Griffith University	5.60	37.558
9	University of Toledo	5.60	37.556
10	Oklahoma State University-Tulsa	5.20	35.316

Zhang (108 times) and Jianhong Liu (92 times). Among the 20 most-cited scholars, Chinese faces and their international counterparts share an approximately even split (9 to 11). While from the context of global criminology, only Francis T. Cullen, Robert J. Sampson, and David P. Farrington are also the top 20 cited scholars in 20 CCJ journals in 2005 (Cohn and Farrington 2012a). That is to say, the majority of influential scholars in Chinese criminology are not the most-cited ones in the general CCJ enterprise. Regarding research interests, scholars such as Lening Zhang, Lu Hong, Michael Robert Dutton, and Borge Bakken claimed China as their specialization in their CVs or profile webpages. Jianhong Liu, Liqun Cao, Hong Lu, and Bin Liang focus on criminology from a comparative perspective. Among the top 20 cited scholars, Robert J. Sampson and David P. Farrington are Stockholm Prize holders. Robert J. Sampson, Steven F. Messner, David P. Farrington, and Francis T. Cullen are past presidents of the ASC. Jianhong Liu is the founding President of the Asian Criminological Society and the recipient of Freda Adler Distinguished Scholar Award. The status and achievement of the identified scholars can reflect their scholarly influence and demonstrate the validity of this study. One person who should be specially mentioned is Zedong Mao, the founding father of the PRC. Chairman Mao has been cited 23 times in these 191 articles, ranking at the 36th most cited in the current study.

Gordon and Vicari (1992) suggested that the most productive scholars are indeed also the most-cited and influential scholars. While from the comparison of productive and top 10 cited scholars in Chinese criminology in Table 7, we can see only four prolific stars still survive in the citation competition. Jianhong Liu slightly descends from the most productive scholar to the third most-cited one. Lening Zhang and Hong Lu stay at the same place in both rankings. Steven F. Messner becomes the cited champion in Chinese criminology. The reason why Dean G. Rojek and Borge Bakken are influential in citation but not in productivity is possibly that their frequently cited works are books or chapters in books which are not included in the productivity analysis of the current study (see Table 8).

### *Most-Cited Works*

The cited works have also been identified by this study (Table 8). The most-cited publication by these 191 articles is *Policing and Punishment in China: From Patriarchy to 'The People'*

**Table 6** Twenty most-cited scholars in Chinese criminology

Rank	Scholar names	Cited times	Numbers of citing articles
1	Steven F. Messner	115	43
2	Lening Zhang	108	46
3	Jianhong Liu	92	43
4	Hong Lu	67	41
5	Francis T. Cullen	61	28
5	Michael R. Dutton	61	43
7	Terance D. Miethe	55	31
7	Dean G. Rojek	55	35
9	Robert J. Sampson	52	23
10	Borge Bakken	48	34
10	Marvin D. Krohn	48	29
12	Liqun Cao	46	27
13	Zhou Lu	40	25
14	Allen E. Liska	37	24
15	Xiaogang Deng	33	26
16	David P. Farrington	31	8
17	Murray A. Straus	30	13
17	Kam C. Wong	30	20
19	Dengke Zhou	29	21
20	Bin Liang	28	22

(Dutton 1992), which has been cited by 25 articles (13.1% of the total). *China Law Yearbook* and *China Statistical Yearbooks* are the most important published data sources for crime and criminal justice researches in China (Liu 2008), so it is no wonder that they rank as the second and fourth most-cited publications in the current study. Michael R. Dutton, Dean G. Rojek, and Borge Bakken et al. who among the top 20 cited scholars also have sole-authored works rank among the most influential publications. Ten of the 13 academic works (two Yearbooks are excluded) were published before the year of 2000. Another evident pattern is that most of the top cited works are China focused, especially on the social control of China. Only *Crime, Shame and Reintegration* (Braithwaite 1989) is not a region-orientated one, but a theoretical masterpiece of criminology. Braithwaite (2002, 2015) regarded Confucius as the most important philosopher of restorative justice, and shaming in a reintegrative manner grows well in the communitarian culture of the east (Braithwaite 1989), so appearance of this work here makes sense. Among the top 15 cited works, only *Urban Life in Contemporary China* by Martin King Whyte and William L. Parish is from the perspective of sociology rather than

**Table 7** Top 10 productive and cited scholars in Chinese criminology

Rank	Most productive scholars	Most-cited scholars
1	Jianhong Liu	Steven F. Messner
2	Lening Zhang	Lening Zhang
3	Kam C. Wong	Jianhong Liu
4	Hong Lu	Hong Lu
5	Susan Trevaskes	Francis T. Cullen
6	Yuning Wu	Michael Robert Dutton
7	Bin Liang	Terance D. Miethe
8	Shanhe Jiang	Dean G. Rojek
9	Ivan Y. Sun	Robert J. Sampson
10	Steven F. Messner	Borge Bakken

**Table 8** Top 15 most-cited publications in Chinese criminology

Rank	Names of most-cited publications	Cites
1	Policing and Punishment in China: From Patriarchy to ‘The People’ Michael R. Dutton 1992	25
2	China Law Yearbook Press of Statistical Yearbook of China, various years	21
3	Changing Directions of Chinese Social Control Dean G. Rojek 1996	19
4	China Statistical Yearbooks Press of Law Yearbook of China, various years	17
5	Criminal Justice in Post-Mao China: Analysis and Documents Shao-chuan Leng and Hungdah Chiu 1985	15
6	Strike Hard: Anti-Crime Campaigns and Chinese Criminal Justice, 1979–1985 Harold M. Tanner 1999	15
6	To Get Rich is Glorious: Rising Expectations, Declining Control, and Escalating Crime in Contemporary China Xiaogang Deng and Ann Cordilia 1999	15
6	Tradition of The Law and Law of The Tradition—Law, State, and Social Control in China Xin Ren 1997	15
6	Urban Life in Contemporary China. Martin King Whyte and William L. Parish 1984	15
10	The Exemplary Society: Human Improvement, Social Control, and The Dangers of Modernity in China Borge Bakken 2000	14
11	Crime, Shame and Reintegration John Braithwaite 1989	13
11	Economic Reform, the Floating Population, and Crime: The Transition of Social Control in China. Daniel J. Curran 1998	13
13	Chinese Social Control: From Shaming and Reintegration to “Getting Rich Is Glorious” Dean G. Rojek 2001	12
13	Missing the Target? Policing Strategies in The Period of Economic Reform. Michael Dutton and Lee Tianfu 1993	12
15	Sources of Variation in Pro-death Penalty Attitudes in China: an Exploratory Study of Chinese Students at Home and Abroad. Bin Liang, Hong Lu, Terance D. Miethe and Lening Zhang 2006	11

criminology. In the most-cited work, Dutton (1992) invited readers to an exploration of how it can construct a context in which China’s regimes for social punishment and regulation can be understood and examined. By applying Foucault’s genealogical method, he created a historical view of China’s traditional systems of social regulation and control and suggested that the arrangement of the technologies of control and reform of the individual outside prisons can be interpreted as part of a piecemeal response to a crisis in socialism precipitated by economic reform (Dutton 1992). Dutton’s work has initiated theoretical and methodological wisdom to understand the landscape of social control of China for both western and eastern scholars with an interest in China and become a classic with a high scholarly influence. Another popularly cited work by Tanner (1999) looked into the “Strike Hard” policy of China. Given that social control research in the west suffered from insufficient source materials and overabundant ideological commitments at that time, Tanner’s work both thoughtfully reflected the real-time problems and well researched and documented the arguments around the Strike Hard of Chinese criminal justice in the 1980s (Dutton 2000). Many of the materials that it gathered are hard to get and classify, which strengthened its values and planted a flag for following researchers interested in CCJ topics in China.

## Discussion and Conclusion

### Discussion of Findings

From the previous findings, it is not difficult to conclude that there are three groups of people who are influential in Chinese criminology. These include those who have a general impact on criminology all over the world. They are either leaders of prestigious criminological associations or outstanding CCJ prize holders whose scholarly influence has been analyzed by prior studies. Their wisdom, such as Sampson and Farrington's life course study and Braithwaite's reintegrative shaming theory, has dramatically expanded the territory of contemporary criminology, and Chinese criminology has been influenced by them. The second group consists of the early western scholars between the 1980s and 1990s who had an oriental interest. Their works brought a general picture of Chinese criminology, especially the social control of China, to western academia and boosted the enlightenment and insights of their successors in criminological research in China. The third group accommodates a group of ethnic Chinese whose prior education and current careers are based on US universities (Hebenton and Jou 2010). They are outstanding both in the citation and in the productivity analysis of this study.<sup>14</sup> This group seems to be the most important one. Two decades after the Open Door Policy since 1978 witnessed a wave of studying abroad in China under the instruction of Deng Xiaoping that "I support for sending students in thousands to study abroad, rather than just several ones." (Wang 2014). After checking the CVs of scholars who have influenced Chinese criminology, especially those who are outstanding both in productivity and in citation, we can find that most of the third group was once in the "studying abroad wave." Ross and Dai (2012) conducted a survey on 16 scholars of China who earned doctorates of CCJ in the USA and stayed there during the past two decades. Some profiles were revealed. For example, more than half of them (56.2%) were 41 years of age or older. The majority stayed in the USA because of better job prospects. Thirteen have published research articles on topics related to CCJ of PRC, and 87.5% of scholars have presented at least one or more papers on the PRC at US conferences with the numbers ranging from 3 to 30. We are not able to confirm that those scholars targeted by Ross and Dai were those located in the current study, but we should accept the fact that Chinese criminology is dynamic. This is ultimately a result of local–global interaction by translating ideas and communicating with foreign scholars and collaborators. The wisdom and interest from overseas, especially by those influential scholars (e.g., Broadhurst and Liu 2004; Liang and Lu 2006; Zhang et al. 2007), have had self-reflexive impacts on the nature of domestic criminology (Hebenton and Jou 2010). How the "local" interacts with the "overseas" is still not clear. What is more, in the current study, we can hardly find domestic products (individuals, institutions, and publications) that have a significant influence on the CCJ of China. Besides, how exactly those identified influential scholars have an impact on Chinese criminology still needs elaborate research.

### Limitations of the Current Study

One limitation of the current study is rooted in the general shortcomings of citation analysis itself (Cohn and Farrington 1995). Firstly, the number of citations that a certain scholar has in

<sup>14</sup> The top prolific scholar Jianhong Liu belonged to this group because he transferred his employment from Rhode Island College of USA to University of Macau in 2007.

some ways depends on how many publications he/she has produced. Therefore, we cannot assert that the most-cited scholars automatically have high-quality works that are frequently cited and can influence others, because he/she may just own larger numbers of more accessibly citable works than others. Secondly, citations can also be negative, but we cannot differentiate whether one author cited another because of approval or criticism just by counting the citations. Thirdly, to some extent, citation is a personal matter. It may be possible that one cites another one's work because they are acquaintances rather than because of the publication's quality.

Another limitation of this study is the narrow article coverage. Though, the journal selection criteria and the article searching strategies of the current study are reasonable and efficient, all the analysis and conclusions are only based on 191 articles from 20 mainstream CCJ journals. There must be some other peer-reviewed articles being missed. Additionally, books, textbooks, and conference papers, etc. are not included for productivity analysis, which would consequently discount the validity of our conclusion, both for productivity and for citation ranking.

The fundamental flaw of this research is that the aim of the current study is to explore the scholarly influence of the criminology of China, yet no document in Chinese entered the data for analysis. Though our citation analysis has located some Chinese publications, no patterns are found because of the limited numbers.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

Expanding journal and article coverage can strengthen the validity of conclusions. E-databases can also be utilized to search for articles. The starting date could be pushed back before 2000 to trace the footprints of the development of Chinese criminology, and then, more patterns may be unveiled such as longitudinal changes of scholarly influence within different developmental periodizations.

Large numbers of Chinese publications and local criminologists should also be considered. This will portray Chinese criminology more comprehensively. Not only the crime patterns of China, but also the scholarly influence of scholars and institutions, academic fruit, and criminological ecology within the PRC can be more accessible to the international scholars. This will bring more Chinese contributions to the knowledge growth of the whole criminological field. However, the issue of how to standardize the measurement of prestige of publications across Chinese and English deserves further exploration.

The current study only focuses on the PRC, so future research can also be conducted in a comparative manner between the PRC, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau. Then, both the similarities and diversities of criminological development in Greater China, where cultural consanguinity and political diversity coexist, can be explored.

Last but not least, a lot of ethnic Chinese criminologists, whose careers are based on US universities, have been identified by this study. A further exploration can be conducted on these scholars, especially for the most influential ones both in productivity and in citation. For example, several of them habitually coauthor articles, so advanced bibliometric analysis can reveal the academic networks between them. Their career and publication trajectory may also indicate the development of Chinese criminology and its market in the whole criminological enterprise and can reflect how western criminology is affecting the Chinese tradition.



**Acknowledgements** Special thanks are due to Professor John Braithwaite for his valuable comments and suggestions.

### Compliance with Ethical Standards

**Funding** No funding was received to complete this manuscript.

**Ethical Approval** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

**Informed Consent** Not applicable.

**Conflict of Interest** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## References

- Bakken, B. (2000). *The exemplary society: Human improvement, social control, and the dangers of modernity in China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, R. R. (2004). Comparative criminology and criminal justice research: the state of our knowledge. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(1), 1–21.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice & responsive regulation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2015). Rethinking criminology through radical diversity in Asian reconciliation. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 10(3), 183–191.
- Broadhurst, R., & Liu, J. (2004). Introduction: crime, law and criminology in China. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37, 1–12.
- Brown, M., & Daly, K. (2008). *Australia and New Zealand Society of Criminology report on criminology bibliometrics development*. Retrieved from Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology: [http://www.anzsoc.org/docs/bibliometrics\\_report.pdf](http://www.anzsoc.org/docs/bibliometrics_report.pdf).
- Callaham, M., Wears, R., & Weber, E. (2002). Journal prestige, publication bias, and other characteristics associated with citation of published studies in peer reviewed journals. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287, 2847–2850.
- Chen, X. (2002). Social control in China: applications of the labeling theory and the reintegrative shaming theory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 46(1), 45–63.
- Chirstenson, J., & Sigelman, L. (1985). Accrediting knowledge: journal stature and citation impact in social science. *Social Science Quarterly*, 66, 964–975.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1994). Who are the most influential criminologists in the English-speaking world? *British Journal of Criminology*, 34, 204–225.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1995). The validity of citations as a measure of influence in criminology. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 143–145.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1998). Assessing the quality of American doctoral program faculty in criminology and criminal justice, 1991–1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9, 187–210.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1999). Changes in the most-cited scholars in twenty criminology and criminal justice journals between 1990 and 1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 345–359.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). Changes in scholarly influence in major international journals between 1986 and 2000. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40, 335–360.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2008). Scholarly influence in criminology and criminal justice journals in 1990–2000. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 11–21.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Scholarly influence and prestige in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(1), 5–11.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2012a). *Scholarly influence in criminology and criminal justice*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2012b). Scholarly influence in criminology and criminal justice journals in 1990–2005. *Criminal Justice Review*, 3, 360–383.
- Cohn, E. G., Farrington, D. P., & Sorensen, J. R. (2000). Journal publications of Ph.D. graduates from American criminology and criminal justice programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11, 35–48.
- Copes, H., Khey, D. N., & Tewksbury, R. (2012). Criminology and criminal justice hit parade: measuring academic productivity in the discipline. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 23(4), 423–440.
- Curran, D. J. (1998). Economic reform, the floating population, and crime: the transformation of social control in China. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 14(3), 262–280.
- Deng, X., & Cordilia, A. (1999). To get rich is glorious: rising expectations, declining control, and escalating crime in contemporary China. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 43(2), 211–229.
- Dutton, M. R. (1992). *Policing and punishment in China: from patriarchy to “the people”*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dutton, M., & Tianfu, L. (1993). Missing the target? Policing strategies in the period of economic reform. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39(3), 316–336.
- Dutton, M. (2000). Strike hard!: anti-crime campaigns and Chinese criminal justice, 1979–1985. By Harold M. Tanner. [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asian Program, 1999. x+ 253 pp. \$28.00. ISBN 1-885445-04-0.]. *The China Quarterly*, 162, 575–577.
- Frost, A., Phillips, N., & Clear, T. (2007). Productivity of criminal justice scholars across the career. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(3), 428–443.
- Gabbidon, S. L., Higgins, G., & Martin, F. (2010). Press rankings in criminology/criminal justice: a preliminary assessment of book Publisher quality. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 21(3), 229–244.
- Glenn, N., & Vilemez, W. (1970). The productivity of sociologists at 45 American universities. *The American Sociologist*, 51, 244–252.
- González-Alcaide, G., Melero-Fuentes, D., Aleixandre-Benavent, R., & Valderrama-Zurián, J. (2013). Productivity and collaboration in scientific publications on criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 24(1), 15–37.
- Gordon, R. A., & Vicari, P. J. (1992). Eminence in social psychology: a comparison of textbook citation, social sciences citation index, and research productivity ratings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 26–38.
- Greene, J. R., Bynum, T. S., & Webb, V. J. (1985). Paradigm development in crime-related education: the role of significant others. *Criminal Justice Review*, 10, 7–17.
- Hebenton, B., & Jou, S. (2010). Criminology in and of China: discipline and power. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26(1), 7–19.
- Hebenton, B., & Jou, S. (2013). Taiwan’s criminological “footprint”—a review and analysis of English-language publication trends for Taiwan and selected Asian comparators (2000–2010). *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 37(2), 159–173.
- Jasco, P. (2010). Comparison of journal impact rankings in the SCImago Journal & Country Rank and the Journal Citation Reports databases. *Online Information Review*, 34(4), 642–657.
- Judge, T. A., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Bretz, R. D. (2004). A longitudinal model of sponsorship and career success: a study of industrial-organizational psychologists. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 271–303.
- Kleck, G., & Barnes, J. C. (2011). Article productivity among the Faculty of Criminology and Criminal Justice Doctoral Programs, 2005–2009. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(1), 43–66.
- Kleck, G., Wang, S., & Tark, J. (2007). Article productivity among the Faculty of Criminology and Criminal Justice Doctoral Programs, 2000–2005. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(3), 385–405.
- Knepper, P. (2012). Measuring the threat of global crime: insights from research by the league of nations into the traffic in women. *Criminology*, 50(3), 777–809.
- Lee, P., Schotland, M., Bacchetti, P., & Bero, L. (2002). Association of journal quality indicators with methodological quality of clinical research articles. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287, 2805–2808.
- Leng, S. C., & Chiu, H. (1985). *Criminal justice in Post-Mao China: analysis and documents*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Leydesdorff, L., Moya-Anegón, F., & Guerrero-Bote, V. P. (2010). Journal maps on the basis of Scopus data: a comparison with the Journal Citation Reports of the ISI. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(2), 352–369.
- Liang, B., & Lu, H. (2006). Conducting fieldwork in China: observations on collecting primary data regarding crime, law, and the criminal justice system. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 22, 157–172.
- Liang, B., Lu, H., Miethe, T. D., & Zhang, L. (2006). Sources of variation in pro-death penalty attitudes in China an exploratory study of Chinese students at home and abroad. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(1), 119–130.

- Liu, J. (2007). Developing comparative criminology and the case of China an introduction. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(1), 3–8.
- Liu, J. (2008). Data sources in Chinese crime and criminal justice research. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 50(3), 131–147.
- Liu, J., & Messner, S. F. (2001). Modernization and crime trends in China's reform era. *Contributions in Criminology and Penology*, 53, 3–22.
- Liu, J., Zhang, L., & Messner, S. F. (2001a). Introduction: impact of market transition—changing crime and social control in China. *CONTRIBUTIONS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLOGY*, 53, xi–xi.
- Liu, J., Zhang, L., & Messner, S. F. (Eds.). (2001b). *Crime and social control in a changing China* (No. 53). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- MacKenzie, D. L. & Piquero, A. (2001). *Winning tenure in criminology and criminal justice*. American Society of Criminology, Columbus, OH: Monograph published by the Division on Corrections and Sentencing.
- Magri, M., & Solari, A. (1996). The SCI journal citation reports: a potential tool for studying journals? *Scientometrics*, 35(1), 93–117.
- Meadows, A. J. (1974). *Communication in science*. London: Butterworths.
- Meho, L. I. (2007). The rise and rise of citation analysis. *Physics World*, 20, 32–36.
- Mei, J., & Wang, M. (2007). Social change, crime, and criminology in China. *Crime & Justice International*, 23, 14–21.
- Messner, S. F. (2015). When west meets east: generalizing theory and expanding the conceptual toolkit of criminology. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 10(2), 117–129.
- Parker, L. C., & Goldfeder, E. (1979). Productivity ratings of graduate programs in criminal justice based on publication in ten critical journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7(2), 125–133.
- Regoli, R., Poole, E. D., & Miracle, A. W. (1982). Assessing the prestige of journals in criminal justice: a research note. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10, 57–67.
- Ren, X. (1997). *Tradition of the law and law of the tradition: law, state, and social control in China* (No. 50). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Rojek, D.G. (1996). Changing directions of Chinese social control. In C. B. Fields & R. H. Moore Jr. (Eds.), *Comparative criminal justice: traditional and nontraditional systems of law and control* (pp. 234–249). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Rojek, D. G. (2001). Chinese social control: from shaming and reintegration to getting rich is glorious. *Contributions in Criminology and Penology*, 53, 89–104.
- Ross, J. I., & Dai, M. (2012). The dissemination of criminological and criminal justice knowledge and practice: a profile of People's Republic of China scholars who earn doctorates in the United States. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 7(3), 225–238.
- Seipel, M. O. (2003). Assessing publication for tenure. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 39(1), 79–88.
- Shichor, D. (2009). “Scholarly influence” and white-collar crime scholarship. *Crime Law and Social Change*, 51, 175–187.
- Snell, C., Sorensen, J., Rodriguez, J., & Kuanling, A. (2009). Gender differences in research productivity among criminal justice and criminology scholars. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 288–295.
- Sorensen, J., Patterson, A. L., & Widmayer, A. (1992). Publication productivity of faculty members in criminology and criminal justice doctoral programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3(1), 1–33.
- Sorensen, J., Snell, C., & Rodriguez, J. (2006). An assessment of criminal justice and criminology journal prestige. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 17(2), 297–322.
- Stack, S. (1987). Measuring the relative impacts of criminology and criminal justice journals: a research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 4, 475–484.
- Stack, S. (2002). Gender and scholarly productivity: the case of criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 175–182.
- Stryker, J. (2002). Reporting medical information: effects of press releases and newsworthiness on medical journal articles' visibility in the news media. *Preventive Medicine*, 35, 519–530.
- Tanner, H. M. (1999). *Strike hard!: anti-crime campaigns and Chinese criminal justice* (pp. 1979–1985). Ithaca, NY: East Asia Program-Cornell University.
- U. S. News and World Report. (2009). Retrieved from <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/criminology-rankings>. Accessed 10 Oct 2014.
- Wang, Z. (2014). The development of studying abroad in China. *Occupational Education*, 5, 234 (王梓仲, 2014, 我国出国留学教育高速发展的原因分析, 《职业教育》, 第5期, 234页).
- Web of Science. (2014). *Journal Citation Reports*. Retrieved from <https://jcr.incites.thomsonreuters.com>. Accessed 8 Sept 2014.
- Whyte, M. K., & Parish, W. L. (1984). *Urban life in contemporary China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

- Williams III, F. P., McShane, M. D., & Wagoner, C. P. (1995). Differences in assessments of relative journal prestige and utility of criminal justice and criminology journals. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *19*, 215–238.
- Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Thornberry, T. P. (1978). *Evaluating criminology*. New York: Elsevier.
- Wong, K. (2000). Black's theory on the behavior of law revisited IV: the behavior of Qing law. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, *28*, 327–374.
- Yu, Y. (2012). A review of existing criminological journals and articles in China. *Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Research*, *6*, 43–49 (于阳,2012,犯罪学相关期刊及犯罪学论文介评,《预防青少年犯罪研究》,6期,43-49页).
- Zhang, L., Messner, S. F., & Liu, J. (2007). Criminological research in contemporary China: challenges and lessons learned from a large-scale criminal victimization survey. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *51*, 110–121.
- Zhang, L., Messner, S. F., & Liu, J. (2008). A critical review of recent literature on crime and criminal justice in China: research findings, challenges, and prospects (introduction). *Crime, Law and Social Change*, *50*(3), 125–130.
- Zhou, L., Liu, W., & Wang, Z. (2004). *New contemporary positive criminology. Study of Criminal Behavior*. Beijing: People's Court Press.