



Changes in the Most-Cited Scholars in 20 Criminology and Criminal Justice Journals Between 1990 and 2015 and Comparisons with the Asian Journal of Criminology

Ellen G. Cohn¹  · David P. Farrington² · Amaia Iratzoqui³

Received: 20 May 2020 / Accepted: 16 July 2020 / Published online: 13 August 2020

© Springer Nature B.V. 2020

Abstract

The main aim of this article is to assess the most-cited scholars in 20 criminology and criminal justice journals in 2015 and to compare them with the most-cited scholars in these journals in 1990–2010 and with the most-cited scholars in the *Asian Journal of Criminology* (AJC) in 2015. Five American criminology journals, five American criminal justice journals, five international criminology journals, and five international criminal justice journals have been studied since 1990. The most-cited scholars tended to be those who carried out research on developmental and life-course criminology. Most of these highly cited scholars were also highly cited in previous years, showing the persistence of scholarly influence. Generally, the most-cited scholars in criminology and criminal justice journals overlapped considerably, as did the most-cited scholars in American and international journals. Also, the most-cited scholars in AJC in 2015 overlapped considerably with the most-cited scholars in these other categories of journals. We conclude that there is considerable agreement in American, Asian, and international criminology and criminal justice on the most-cited, and therefore most influential, scholars.

Keywords Citation analysis · Scholarly influence · Most-cited scholars · Most-cited works · Asian criminology

✉ Ellen G. Cohn
cohne@fiu.edu

David P. Farrington
dpfl@cam.ac.uk

Amaia Iratzoqui
ratzoqui@memphis.edu

¹ Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida International University, PCA 261A, Miami, FL 33199, USA

² Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge CB3 9DA, UK

³ Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Memphis, 325 McCord Hall, Memphis, TN 38152, USA

Introduction

The main aim of this article is to assess the most-cited scholars in 20 criminology and criminal justice journals in 2015, and to compare them with the most-cited scholars in these journals in 1990–2010 and with the most-cited scholars in the *Asian Journal of Criminology* (AJC) in 2015. A previous article in this journal (Farrington et al. 2019) reviewed evidence that numbers of citations are a valid measure of scholarly influence. That article compared the most-cited scholars in AJC in 2006–2015 with the most-cited scholars in the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* (ANZ), *Criminology* (CRIM), and the *European Journal of Criminology* (EJC) during the same time period. Generally, the most-cited scholars in AJC tended to be based in the United States, tended to be working in the area of developmental and life-course criminology, and tended to be highly cited in the other three journals. However, few Asian scholars were highly cited in the other three journals.

Another previous article in this journal (Iratzoqui et al. 2019) pointed out that long-term longitudinal studies of the most-cited scholars are extremely rare, and reviewed the advantages of this approach. That article documented the most-cited scholars in four international journals (ANZ, CRIM, *British Journal of Criminology*—BJC, and *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*—CJC) in 2011–2015 and compared them with (a) the most-cited scholars in these four journals in 1986–1990, 1991–1995, 1996–2000, 2001–2005, and 2006–2010, and (b) the most-cited scholars in AJC in 2006–2010 and 2011–2015. Generally, the most-cited scholars in the four international journals tended to be highly cited in AJC, and their most-cited works tended to be on developmental and life-course criminology, theoretical issues, statistics, or policy issues.

It might be argued that the most-cited scholars in four or five international journals (even very prestigious ones) are not necessarily the most-cited scholars in criminology and criminal justice more broadly. In order to address this issue, Cohn et al. (1998) studied citations in 20 criminology and criminal justice journals (five American criminology, five American criminal justice, five international criminology, and five international criminal justice). Because of the large number of citations and the large amount of work involved, they studied citations in only one year—1990. This analysis was then repeated for 1995 (Cohn and Farrington 1999), 2000 (Cohn and Farrington 2008), 2005 (Cohn and Farrington 2012), and 2010 (Cohn et al. 2014). The present article extends this series up to 2015 and compares the most-cited scholars in these 20 journals in 2015 with the most-cited scholars in AJC in 2015.

The 20 journals, chosen from major journals that were being published in 1990, are as follows: five American criminology journals (CRIM, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*—JQC, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*—JRCD, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*—JIV, and *Violence and Victims*—VAV), five American criminal justice journals (*Justice Quarterly*—JQ, *Journal of Criminal Justice*—JCJ, *Crime and Delinquency*—CAD, *Criminal Justice Review*—CJR, and *Federal Probation*—FP), five international criminology journals (ANZ, BJC, CJC, *Crime, Law, and Social Change*—CLSC, and *Criminologie*—CRGE), and five international criminal justice journals (*Crime and Justice*—CAJ, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*—CJB, *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*—IJCA, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*—IJOT, and *Social Justice*—SJ).

The key questions are as follows:

1. To what extent are the most-cited scholars similar or different across 10 American journals, 10 international journals, and AJC?
2. To what extent are the most-cited scholars similar or different across 10 criminology journals, 10 criminal justice journals, and AJC?
3. To what extent are the most-cited scholars similar or different across time, from 1990 to 2015, in five American criminology, five American criminal justice, five international criminology, and five international criminal justice journals?
4. What are the most-cited works of the most-cited scholars?

Methods

Citation data primarily draw from one of three sources: 1) the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI); 2) online scientific archives such as Google Scholar and Elsevier's Scopus, or 3) raw citation counts. Farrington et al. (2019) highlight the various reasons why the first two sources are less than ideal for citation analysis, including that they (1) may include self-citations; (2) may be unclear about what journals, databases, and time periods are covered, and how often the system is updated; (3) can produce variable results based on what search terms are entered; and 4) do not correct for errors in reference lists or missing authors (e.g. where the citation says "et al.") in the original citation.

The third source, raw citation counts, yields much more valid results for citation analysis. Raw citation counts are derived from manual examinations of reference lists of academic publications, counting the number of citations of a given scholar, work, or journal. Cohn and Farrington have used this method throughout their international citation analysis research, beginning with their first work (Cohn and Farrington 1990), and in studies of citations in five-year time periods since then (i.e., for 1986–1990, 1991–1995, 1996–2000, 2001–2005, 2006–2010, and, most recently, 2011–2015). However, raw citation counts are not included without correction. As part of this method, the data are cleaned in order to eliminate self-citations; to correct names of scholars in terms of spelling and initials; to include complete author lists when "et al." is used; and to explicitly specify what outlets are searched across what specified time periods.

Data for the current analyses were obtained from the reference lists of every article in all issues of each of the journals during the calendar year 2015. The classification of "article" included research notes, comments, and rejoinders, but excluded book reviews, book review articles, editorials, letters, and obituaries. Papers were also excluded if institutions were reported as authors. Citations were excluded if they were self-citations (e.g., if David P. Farrington cites an article written by David P. Farrington) but were included if they were co-authored citations (e.g., Ellen G. Cohn would be counted if David P. Farrington cites an article written by Ellen G. Cohn and David P. Farrington). Unpublished reports and conference papers were included if they were cited, but citations of institutional authors were not included.

In addition, the "nationality" of each scholar was coded and analyzed, based on the author's institutional or organizational affiliation as listed in the publication, rather than their country of origin. Thus, for the purposes of the current analyses, "American" scholars were defined as those scholars based in American institutions.

Citations collected from reference lists were inputted into a file that generated counts for each cited author in each article of each issue of all the journals. The data were then cleaned in a multi-step process. References with multiple authors were duplicated so that each co-author could receive a count for the citation. Similarly, references that specified “et al.” rather than listing all authors were corrected to include all authors, when that information was available. References were also manually checked to ensure that no references were omitted, to correct any mistakes in reference lists, including misspelled names or incorrect or missing initials, and to merge scholars who had multiple names (e.g., David Farrington and David P. Farrington). Different orderings of names (e.g., Jianhong Liu and Liu Jianhong) were amalgamated, as were different names of the same person, where known (e.g., where names were changed after marriage or divorce). The final cleaned list of references of each journal was then sorted alphabetically and the number of times each name occurred was counted for a final total.

Results

Table 1 reports the total number of articles, authors, and eligible cited scholars in each category of five journals in 2015. Several trends may be observed. First, American journals tend to publish the most articles, with 516 articles published in the included American journal groupings for the year 2015, compared with 371 articles in the international journals. Second, American journals tended to primarily cite works by American scholars, particularly in criminal justice journals (90.3%). This is perhaps not surprising given the frequent difficulty in comparing criminal justice policies internationally. However, American scholars tend to dominate the field as a whole, representing a majority (57%) of cited scholars in 20 journals across the world.

The average number of articles published in international journals in 2015 was 37. In contrast, AJC published 18 articles in 2015. The average number of authors (not necessarily all different persons) in international journals was 91, compared with 48 in AJC. Of the authors in international journals, 33.6% were American, compared with 39.6% in AJC. The average number of cited scholars (again not necessarily all different persons) in international journals was 4212, compared with 1593 in AJC. The average number of cited scholars per article was 89 in AJC, compared with 114 in international journals.

Table 2 shows the five most-cited scholars in each journal in 2015. Among the American criminology journals, Robert J. Sampson dominated, being the top-cited scholar in three of the journals (CRIM, JQC, and JRCD), with Murray A. Straus being the top scholar in the other two journals (JIV and VAV). Sampson was also the most-cited scholar in two of the American criminal justice journals (JQ and CAD), as well as one international criminal justice journal (CAJ). In the international groupings, Don A. Andrews was the top scholar in one criminology (CJC) and two criminal justice (CJB and IJOT) journals. Interestingly, in the French language Canadian journal CRGE, only 3.3% of authors were American, but the five most-cited scholars were all American.

Table 3 reports the 10 most-cited scholars in each group of journals in 2015 and also compares the consistency of their ranks in previous years (1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010, 2015). In order to rank the scholars and give equal weight to each journal, each scholar was given a score of 51 minus their rank in each journal. Thus, the top-ranked scholar in a journal would score 50, the 50th-ranked scholar would score 1, and all scholars outside the top 50 would score zero. The total scores in five journals are shown in Table 3.

Table 1 Articles, authors, and eligible cited scholars in 20 Journals in 2015

Title	Articles	Authors	%US	Cited scholars
American criminology journals				
<i>Criminology</i> (CRIM)	28	77	81.8	3960
<i>Journal of Quantitative Criminology</i> (JQC)	27	77	68.8	4231
<i>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</i> (JRCD)	34	99	67.7	4102
<i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> (JIV)	171	582	63.6	19,262
<i>Violence and Victims</i> (VAV)	66	200	70.5	8342
Total	326	1035	70.5	39,897
American criminal justice journals				
<i>Justice Quarterly</i> (JQ)	41	97	96.9	5391
<i>Journal of Criminal Justice</i> (JCJ)	55	173	72.8	10,016
<i>Crime and Delinquency</i> (CAD)	55	135	85.9	5884
<i>Criminal Justice Review</i> (CJR)	23	50	96.0	3134
<i>Federal Probation</i> (FP)	16	27	100.0	286
Total	190	482	90.3	24,711
International criminology journals				
<i>Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology</i> (ANZ)	28	71	5.6	3174
<i>British Journal of Criminology</i> (BJC)	67	131	20.5	6657
<i>Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice</i> (CJC)	20	46	4.3	1670
<i>Crime, Law, and Social Change</i> (CLSC)	27	45	35.6	2512
<i>Criminologie</i> (CRGE)	24	60	3.3	2164
Total	166	353	13.9	16,177
International criminal justice journals				
<i>Crime and Justice</i> (CAJ)	11	23	47.8	2942
<i>Criminal Justice and Behavior</i> (CJB)	69	201	60.2	9396
<i>International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice</i> (IJCA)	17	35	71.4	1767
<i>International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology</i> (IJOT)	81	259	32.4	10,376
<i>Social Justice</i> (SJ)	27	38	55.3	1465
Total	205	556	53.4	25,946
Total American journals	516	1517	80.4	64,608
Total international journals	371	909	33.6	42,123
Total criminology journals	492	1388	42.2	56,074
Total criminal justice journals	395	1038	71.9	50,657
Total for all journals	887	2426	57.0	106,731

% US shows the percent of scholars located in the USA

In American journals, Sampson remained consistent; since 1990, he has been in the top 10, and since 2000, he has been the most-cited scholar. David P. Farrington, John H. Laub, and Travis Hirschi also displayed similar, though not as highly ranked, rates of consistency over the years. Hirschi also remained consistently influential in the American criminal justice journals, and Francis T. Cullen rose from the top 15 in 1990 and 1995 to be in the top 1 or 2 since the year 2000. Less consistency was evident in either international series; only Cullen was within the top 30, and then the top 10, scholars in international criminal justice journals in all years.

Table 4 combines the journals into groups of 10 to examine the similarities and differences between criminology and criminal justice journals and between American and international journals. In the 10 criminology journals, Sampson, Farrington, and Hirschi all ranked in the top 30 in all years. In the 10 criminal justice journals, Cullen, Sampson, Farrington, and Hirschi were joined by Andrews as the top scholars retaining significant influence over time. In the 10 American journals, Sampson, Cullen, Farrington, and Hirschi remained influential, but Michael

Table 2 Five most-cited scholars in each journal in 2015

American criminology journals

CRIM	R.J. Sampson (48); D.P. Farrington (31); D.L. Weisburd (31); J.E. Eck (25); A.R. Piquero (23)
JQC	R.J. Sampson (46); A.R. Piquero (45); D.L. Weisburd (39); F.T. Cullen (27); D.S. Nagin (23); S.W. Raudenbush (23)
JRCD	R.J. Sampson (72); D.L. Weisburd (36); D.P. Farrington (35); A.R. Piquero (34); S.W. Raudenbush (30)
JIV	M.A. Straus (104); D. Finkelhor (56); S.L. Hamby (55); J.C. Campbell (53); M.P. Koss (51)
VAV	M.A. Straus (38); D. Finkelhor (25); S.L. Hamby (20); D.G. Kilpatrick (20); S. Einarsen (19); K.D. O'Leary (19)

American criminal justice journals

JQ	R.J. Sampson (55); T.R. Tyler (51); A.R. Piquero (43); F.T. Cullen (27); J.H. Laub (27); C.R. Tittle (27)
JCJ	M. DeLisi (98); A.R. Piquero (86); R.D. Hare (80); M.G. Vaughn (70); K.M. Beaver (70)
CAD	R.J. Sampson (81); A.R. Piquero (41); D.P. Farrington (36); J.H. Laub (36); F.T. Cullen (34)
CJR	R. Wright (42); R.V. Clarke (25); B.A. Jacobs (21); D.A. Andrews (20); G.R. Newman (16)
FP	J.L. Bonta (4); M. Alexander (3); D.A. Andrews (3); G. Bourgon (3); S.J. Ervin (3); A.M. Holsinger (3); D.L. MacKenzie (3); D. Murphy (3); S.T. Walters (3)

International criminology journals

ANZ	T.E. Moffitt (34); R. Loeber (28); A.R. Piquero (27); D.P. Farrington (25); R.J. Sampson (24)
BJC	T.R. Tyler (22); R.J. Sampson (21); J. Braithwaite (20); R.V. Clarke (19); D. Garland (17)
CJC	D.A. Andrews (13); J.L. Bonta (12); P.-O. H. Wikstrom (11); L.E. Cohen (8); D.W. Osgood (8); A.R. Piquero (8); R.J. Sampson (8)
CLSC	N. Gunningham (9); D. Thornton (9); A. Crawford (8); R.A. Kagan (8); M. Schuilenburg (8); T.R. Tyler (8)
CRGE	S.H. Decker (22); F.-A. Esbensen (18); M.W. Klein (12); C.L. Maxson (11); T.P. Thornberry (11)

International criminal justice journals

CAJ	R.J. Sampson (21); J.P. Caulkins (17); B. Bieleman (16); E.E. Cauffman (16); M. Tonry (14)
CJB	D.A. Andrews (90); J.L. Bonta (71); R.K. Hanson (51); A.R. Piquero (39); F.T. Cullen (38)
IJCA	J.S. Levenson (20); G. LaFree (13); W.A. Pridemore (10); R.K. Hanson (9); T.R. Tyler (9)
IJOT	D.A. Andrews (65); J.L. Bonta (51); F.T. Cullen (44); D.P. Farrington (39); T. Ward (35)
SJ	T. Mathiesen (11); L. Wacquant (9); A.Y. Davis (8); D. Garland (8); J. Sim (8)

For abbreviations of journals, see Table 1. The most-cited five scholars are shown in general, but there can be more than five where there are ties

R. Gottfredson also emerged as a consistently highly cited scholar. In the 10 international journals, only Sampson, Farrington, and James L. Bonta were ranked in the top 20 since 2000.

Table 5 presents the most-cited scholars (all those ranked up to 40 on their total scores) across all 20 journals in 2015 and reports their score across criminology and criminal justice journal groupings. Of the top four, only Alex R. Piquero was new since 2000; the other three (Sampson, Farrington, and Cullen) were highly ranked from 1990 onwards. Outside the top four, only Hirschi and Gottfredson were ranked in the top 40 in every year. The top eight scholars generally scored higher in criminal justice journals, indicating a more significant representation in that field; the sole exception was Sampson, who scored higher in criminology journals.

Table 6 shows the 50 most-cited scholars in AJC in 2015. The most-cited scholars were Ken Pease, Alex R. Piquero, Rolf Loeber, and John H. Laub. Of the 50 scholars, 33 were American, eight were British, three were Australian, and six were based in an Asian country (two in Japan, two in Hong Kong, one in Taiwan, and one in Macau). Of the 41 most-cited scholars in 20 journals in Table 5, 14 were among the most-cited scholars in AJC, which seems quite a remarkable overlap. Eight of the top 10 in Table 5 were highly cited in AJC, and conversely four of the top 10 in AJC were in Table 5.

Table 3 Most-cited scholars in groups of five journals in 2015

Scholar	Rank in 2015	Rank in 2010	Rank in 2005	Rank in 2000	Rank in 1995	Rank in 1990	Score in 2015
Five American criminology journals							
Robert J. Sampson	1	1	1	1	5	10.5	168.5
David L. Weisburd	2	19	–	–	–	–	145.5
Alex R. Piquero	3	10	21.5	–	–	–	142
David P. Farrington	4	5	5	2	4	6.5	131.5
John H. Laub	5	3	2	5	21	–	125
John E. Eck	6	–	–	–	–	–	124.5
Francis T. Cullen	7	22	–	–	–	–	124
Travis Hirschi	8	23.5	3	3	1	4	120.5
Daniel S. Nagin	9	4	10	11.5	–	–	118.5
Stephen W. Raudenbush	10	2	–	–	–	–	117.5
Five American criminal justice journals							
Alex R. Piquero	1	3.5	6	–	–	–	178
Francis T. Cullen	2	1	2	1	12.5	14	177.5
Robert J. Sampson	3	2	1	4	–	–	144
David P. Farrington	4	11.5	–	9	–	7	130.5
Daniel S. Nagin	5	14	–	–	–	–	125
Travis Hirschi	6	10	16.5	6	2	5.5	124.5
Michael R. Gottfredson	7	9	–	–	4	20	115.5
John H. Laub	8	17	3	–	–	–	115
Robert Agnew	9	29	–	5	–	–	110.5
Stephen W. Raudenbush	10	–	–	–	–	–	106.5
Five international criminology journals							
Robert J. Sampson	1	3	–	23.5	–	–	169.5
Tom R. Tyler	2	2	–	–	–	–	96.5
Alex R. Piquero	3	8	–	–	–	–	93.5
Terence P. Thornberry	4	–	–	–	–	–	88.5
Michel Foucault	5	4	–	2	27	–	86
David P. Farrington	6.5	23.5	1	–	15	20.5	76
Per-Olof H. Wikstrom	6.5	–	–	–	–	–	76
David Garland	8	1	6	6	–	–	73
Terrie E. Moffitt	9	–	9	–	–	–	67.5
Seena Fazel	10	–	–	–	–	–	66
Five international criminal justice journals							
Robert J. Sampson	1	6	1	–	5	–	139
David P. Farrington	2	11.5	–	–	10	7.5	135
R. Karl Hanson	3	1	12	–	–	–	133
Alex R. Piquero	4	8	–	–	–	–	124.5
Francis T. Cullen	5	9	18.5	22	22.5	26.5	119.5
John H. Laub	6.5	–	4	–	–	–	100
Don A. Andrews	6.5	11.5	3	12	–	–	100
James L. Bonta	8	7	2	28.5	–	–	98
Edward J. Latessa	9	–	–	–	–	–	96.5
Tom R. Tyler	10	–	–	–	–	–	87

Ranks up to 30 in prior years are shown

Table 4 Ten most-cited scholars in groups of ten journals in 2015

Scholar	Rank in 2015	Rank in 2010	Rank in 2005	Rank in 2000	Rank in 1995	Rank in 1990	Score in 2015
10 criminology journals							
Robert J. Sampson	1	1	2	1	8.5	24.5	338
Alex R. Piquero	2	6	–	–	–	–	235.5
David P. Farrington	3	4	1	2	3	3	207.5
John H. Laub	4	2	4	8	28	–	183
Francis T. Cullen	5	–	–	–	–	7	174
Travis Hirschi	6	22	5	4	1	5	170.5
Rolf Loeber	7	17	–	–	–	–	165
Daniel S. Nagin	8	3	6	20.5	–	–	157.5
Marcus Felson	9.5	–	–	–	–	–	145.5
David L. Weisburd	9.5	19	–	–	–	–	145.5
10 criminal justice journals							
Alex R. Piquero	1	3	13.5	–	–	–	302.5
Francis T. Cullen	2	1	2	1	4	11	297
Robert J. Sampson	3	2	1	4	10	–	283
David P. Farrington	4	6	13.5	5	27	4	265.5
John H. Laub	5	–	3	–	–	–	215
Daniel S. Nagin	6	14	–	–	–	–	204.5
Travis Hirschi	7	11	–	6.5	3	1	200
Don A. Andrews	8	10	5	15	12	–	192.5
James L. Bonta	9	9	4	–	–	–	190
Tom R. Tyler	10	–	–	–	–	–	185.5
10 American journals							
Alex R. Piquero	1	3	10	–	–	–	320
Robert J. Sampson	2	1	1	1	6	18	312.5
Francis T. Cullen	3	2	5	8.5	29	26.5	301.5
David P. Farrington	4	4	4	3	8	5	262
Travis Hirschi	5	11	3	2	1	3	245
Daniel S. Nagin	6	6	9	18.5	–	–	243.5
John H. Laub	7	7	2	8.5	30	–	240
Stephen W. Raudenbush	8	8	–	–	–	–	224
Michael R. Gottfredson	9	13	7	13.5	4	4	194
Rolf Loeber	10	19	–	–	–	–	181.5
10 international journals							
Robert J. Sampson	1	1	2	15	–	–	308.5
Alex R. Piquero	2	3	–	–	–	–	218
David P. Farrington	3	6	1	19	6	6.5	211
Tom R. Tyler	4	8	–	–	–	–	183.5
Francis T. Cullen	5	18	–	10	–	1	169.5
John H. Laub	6	22.5	8	–	–	–	158
Terrie E. Moffitt	7	13.5	–	–	–	–	150.5
Don A. Andrews	8	22.5	9.5	–	–	–	150
James L. Bonta	9	16	3	13	–	–	147
Shadd Maruna	10	–	–	–	–	–	141

Ranks up to 30 in prior years are shown

Table 7 compares the 20 journals in 2015 to a smaller subset of nine journals for which citation data were analyzed across a five-year period (2011–2015). The top five scholars were identical across both groupings, albeit in a slightly different ordering: Sampson, Piquero, Farrington, Cullen, and Laub (with Piquero and Farrington switching places from the one-year to the five-year comparison). Hirschi, Daniel S. Nagin, and Terrie E. Moffitt also appeared in the top 10 rankings across both comparisons.

Table 5 Forty most-cited scholars in all twenty journals in 2015

Rank in 2015	Rank in 2010	Rank in 2005	Rank in 2000	Rank in 1995	Rank in 1990	Name	CRM score	CJ score	TOTAL
1	1	1	1	5	38	Robert J. Sampson	338	283	621
2	2	16	–	–	–	Alex R. Piquero	235.5	302.5	538
3	4	3	2	4	3	David P. Farrington	207.5	265.5	473
4	3	4	3	18	7	Francis T. Cullen	174	297	471
5	6	2	13.5	–	–	John H. Laub	183	215	398
6	12	6	4	2	2	Travis Hirschi	170.5	200	370.5
7	5	8	–	–	–	Daniel S. Nagin	157.5	204.5	362
8	7	7	5	–	–	Terrie E. Moffitt	141.5	171	312.5
9	17	29.5	17	–	35	Rolf Loeber	165	140	305
10	27	–	–	–	–	Tom R. Tyler	96.5	185.5	282
11	8	–	–	–	–	Stephen W. Raudenbush	143.5	119	262.5
12.5	22	9	35.5	20	–	Don A. Andrews	61	192.5	253.5
12.5	20	11	27.5	3	5	Michael R. Gottfredson	96.5	157	253.5
14	18	5	31	–	–	James L. Bonta	49	190	239
15	–	40	–	21	–	Marcus Felson	145.5	64.5	210
16	–	–	–	13	8	Ronald V. Clarke	95	98.5	193.5
17	11	13	23.5	–	–	Raymond Paternoster	74	118.5	192.5
18	15	–	–	–	–	David L. Weisburd	145.5	44	189.5
19	10	–	–	–	–	Darrell J. Steffensmeier	59	102.5	161.5
20	–	–	–	–	–	Richard T. Wright	101	58	159
21	–	–	–	–	–	Travis C. Pratt	35.5	122.5	158
22	–	10	6	1	29.5	Lawrence W. Sherman	137	17.5	154.5
23	–	–	–	–	–	D. Wayne Osgood	69	84.5	153.5
24	–	–	–	–	–	John E. Eck	124.5	27	151.5
25	–	–	–	–	–	Mark Warr	64	85.5	149.5
26	–	–	11	0	0	Robert Agnew	35	110.5	145.5
27	–	–	–	–	–	Shadd Maruna	65	76	141
28	38.5	38	–	–	–	Avshalom Caspi	43	95.5	138.5
29	9	–	–	–	–	R. Karl Hanson	0	133	133
30	–	–	–	–	–	Terence P. Thornberry	88.5	38.5	127
31.5	–	–	–	–	–	Per-Olof H. Wikstrom	86.5	40	126.5
31.5	–	–	–	–	–	Bruce A. Jacobs	70.5	56	126.5
33	–	–	–	–	–	Matt DeLisi	10.5	111.5	122
34	32	17	20	–	–	Robert D. Hare	0	121.5	121.5
35	19	14	9	–	–	David Garland	73	47	120
36	–	–	–	–	–	Kevin M. Beaver	0	117.5	117.5
37	–	–	–	–	–	David Thornton	49.5	66	115.5
38	–	–	–	–	–	Tony Ward	0	110	110
39	–	–	39	36.5	–	Marvin D. Krohn	67.5	41.5	109
40.5	23	–	–	26	4	Alfred Blumstein	50.5	56	106.5
40.5	–	–	–	–	–	Scott H. Decker	64.5	42	106.5

Ranks up to 40 in prior years are shown. CRM = 10 criminology journals. CJ = 10 criminal justice journals

Table 8 examines the most-cited works of the most-cited scholars in 2015. Sampson, the top scholar, had his two most-cited works in the two areas of literature for which he is most known: social disorganization (with his 1997 article “Neighborhoods and violent

Table 6 Most-cited scholars in the Asian Journal of Criminology in 2015

Rank in 2015	Name	Country	Cites
1.5	Ken Pease	UK	12
1.5	Alex R. Piquero	USA	12
3	Rolf Loeber	USA	11
4	John H. Laub	USA	10
5	Byongook Moon	USA	9
8	Eric G. Lambert	USA	8
8	Paul Mazerolle	Australia	8
8	Merry Morash	USA	8
8	Raymond Paternoster	USA	8
8	Nicole L. Piquero	USA	8
11	Graham Farrell	UK	7
15.5	Bruce Baker	UK	6
15.5	Francis T. Cullen	USA	6
15.5	Christopher L. Gibson	USA	6
15.5	Trina L. Hope	USA	6
15.5	Sung Joon Jang	USA	6
15.5	Yoshio Matsumoto	Japan	6
15.5	Fumio Mugishima	Japan	6
15.5	Susan Trevaskes	Australia	6
24.5	Robert Agnew	USA	5
24.5	Wan-Ning Bao	USA	5
24.5	David H. Bayley	USA	5
24.5	Lisa M. Broidy	Australia	5
24.5	David P. Farrington	UK	5
24.5	Ain Haas	USA	5
24.5	John D. McCluskey	USA	5
24.5	Richard Rosenfeld	USA	5
24.5	Terence P. Thornberry	USA	5
24.5	Andromachi Tseloni	UK	5
40	Brent B. Benda	USA	4
40	Robert Brame	USA	4
40	Nicole W. T. Cheung	Hong Kong	4
40	Yuet W. Cheung	Hong Kong	4
40	Ronald V. Clarke	UK	4
40	Michael R. Gottfredson	USA	4
40	Vincent Hoffman	USA	4
40	Eui-Gab Hwang	USA	4
40	Carl B. Klockars	USA	4
40	Wen-Hsu Lin	Taiwan	4
40	Jianhong Liu	Macau	4
40	Terance D. Miethe	USA	4
40	Terrie E. Moffitt	USA	4
40	Daniel S. Nagin	USA	4
40	Robert J. Sampson	USA	4
40	Gretchen M. Spreitzer	USA	4
40	Marc L. Swatt	USA	4
40	Charles R. Tittle	USA	4
40	Per-Olof Wikström	UK	4
40	Richard K. Wortley	UK	4
40	Jihong Zhao	USA	4

Terrie E. Moffitt also has a position in the UK

crime”) and life-course criminology (his 1993 text “Crime in the making”), with 53 and 49 cites, respectively. Piquero, on the other hand, was more widely known for his sheer number of works rather than for any single notable work. His two most-cited articles were the 1998 article “Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients” (with 16 cites) and the 2011 article “New frontiers in criminal careers

Table 7 Comparison of 20 journals in 2015 and nine journals in 2011–2015

Twenty journals in 2015		Nine journals in 2011–15	
Rank	Scholar	Rank	Scholar
1	Robert J. Sampson	1	Robert J. Sampson
2	Alex R. Piquero	2	David P. Farrington
3	David P. Farrington	3	Alex R. Piquero
4	Francis T. Cullen	4	Francis T. Cullen
5	John H. Laub	5	John H. Laub
6	Travis Hirschi	6	Daniel S. Nagin
7	Daniel S. Nagin	7	Stephen W. Raudenbush
8	Terrie E. Moffitt	8	Terrie E. Moffitt
9	Rolf Loeber	9	Travis Hirschi
10	Tom R. Tyler	10	Michael R. Gottfredson
11	Stephen W. Raudenbush	11	Rolf Loeber
12.5	Don A. Andrews	12	Marcus Felson
12.5	Michael R. Gottfredson	13.5	David L. Weisburd
14	James L. Bonta	13.5	Lawrence W. Sherman
15	Marcus Felson	15	Tom R. Tyler
16	Ronald V. Clarke	16	Raymond Paternoster
17	Raymond Paternoster	17	Robert Agnew
18	David L. Weisburd	18	Alfred Blumstein
19	Darrell J. Steffensmeier	19	Steven F. Messner
20	Richard T. Wright	20	Scott H. Decker

The nine journals were CRIM, JQC, JRCD, JQ, JCJ, CJB, BJC, CJC, and ANZ

research, 2000–2011” (with 12 cites). Of the top 10, Sampson, Piquero, Farrington, Laub, Nagin, Moffitt, and Loeber all tended to be most-cited for their works in developmental and life-course criminology, showing the dominance of this area in contemporary criminology.

Table 9 reports the prevalence and frequency of the top scholars in 2015. Sampson, with a total of 536 citations across 297 articles, had an average of 1.80 citations per article. Piquero, ranked 2, had 420 total citations across 171 different articles, and an average of 2.46 citations per article. These numbers suggest that Sampson and Piquero are highly cited primarily because of their quantity of work, rather than for any one particular work. In contrast, Tom R. Tyler, ranked 10, had 191 citations across 47 different articles, and an average of 4.06 citations per article, suggesting that he was more likely to have multiple citations to a smaller number of works.

To further address this point, Table 10 examines the specialization and versatility of scholars in 2015. Specialized scholars are those with a relatively small number of cited works and a relatively large number of citations per work, whereas versatile scholars tend to have a relatively large number of cited works and a relatively small number of citations per work. Specialized scholars will tend to have a relatively large fraction of their citations accruing to a small number of works, whereas versatile scholars will tend to have a small fraction of their citations accounted for by their most-cited works. For Sampson, his two most-cited works only accounted for 19% of his citations, while Piquero’s two most-cited works only accounted for 7% of his total number. Sampson and Piquero, therefore, are versatile scholars. Comparatively, for Hirschi, who is best known for his seminal work on causes of crime and the general theory of crime, his most-cited two works accounted for 63% of his citations, making him a specialized scholar. Generally, however, the top

Table 8 Most-cited works of the most-cited scholars in 2015

Rank	Author/work	Number of Citations
1	Robert J. Sampson (92 different works cited) Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. E. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. <i>Science</i> , 277, 918–924. Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). <i>Crime in the making</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.	53 49
2	Alex R. Piquero (167 different works cited) Patemoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P. J., & Piquero, A. R. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. <i>Criminology</i> , 36, 859–866. DeLisi, M. & Piquero, A.R. (2011). New frontiers in criminal careers research, 2000–2011: A state-of-the-art review. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice</i> , 39, 289–301.	16 12
3	David P. Farrington (168 different works cited) Piquero, A. R., Farrington, D. P., & Blumstein, A. (2003). The criminal career paradigm. In M. Tonry (Ed.), <i>Crime and justice</i> (Vol. 30, pp. 359–506). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Farrington, D.P. (1986) Age and crime. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.) <i>Crime and Justice</i> (Vol 7, pp. 189–250). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	16 13
4	Francis T. Cullen (115 different works cited) Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. <i>Criminology</i> , 38, 931–964. Andrews, D. et al. (1990). Does correctional treatment work: A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. <i>Criminology</i> , 28, 369–404.	30 15
5	John H. Laub (44 different works cited) Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). <i>Crime in the making</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Laub, J.H. & Sampson, R.J. (2003). <i>Shared beginnings, divergent lives</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.	49 32
6	Travis Hirschi (25 different works cited) Gottfredson, M. & Hirschi, T. (1990). <i>A general theory of crime</i> . Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Hirschi, T. (1969). <i>Causes of delinquency</i> . Berkeley: University of California Press.	92 49
7	Daniel S. Nagin (68 different works cited) Laub, J.H., Nagin, D.S., & Sampson, R.J. (1998). Trajectories of change in criminal offending: Good marriages and the desistance process. <i>American Sociological Review</i> 63: 225–239. (3 works tied for second place with 11 citations each)	14
8	Terrie E. Moffitt (92 different works cited) Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. <i>Psychological Review</i> , 100, 674–701. Moffitt, T. E, Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). <i>Sex differences in antisocial behavior</i> . Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.	54 10
9	Rolf Loeber (120 different works cited) Wikstrom, P-O.H. & Loeber, R. (2000). Do disadvantaged neighborhoods cause well-adjusted children to become adolescent delinquents? <i>Criminology</i> , 38: 1109–1142. Loeber, R. & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986). Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.) <i>Crime and Justice</i> (Vol 7, pp. 29–149). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	7 7
10	Tom R. Tyler (59 different works cited) Tyler, T. (1990). <i>Why people obey the law</i> . New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Sunshine, J. & Tyler, T.R. (2003). The role of procedural justice in shaping public support for policing. <i>Law and Society Review</i> , 37: 513–548.	28 15

scholars tended to be highly cited because of the versatile nature of their work, reflecting their high productivity.

Table 9 Prevalence and frequency in 2015

Rank	Author	Total citations	No. of different articles	Citations/article
1	Robert J. Sampson	536	297	1.80
2	Alex R. Piquero	420	171	2.46
3	David P. Farrington	326	128	2.55
4	Francis T. Cullen	319	175	1.82
5	John H. Laub	239	119	2.01
6	Travis Hirschi	225	132	1.70
7	Daniel S. Nagin	222	108	2.06
8	Terrie E. Moffitt	270	114	2.37
9	Rolf Loeber	200	88	2.27
10	Tom R. Tyler	191	47	4.06

This shows the number of different articles in the 20 journals (out of a total of 887) in which the author was cited

Conclusion

Across 20 American and international criminology and criminal justice journals in 2015, the most-cited scholars tended to be those who carried out research on developmental and life-course criminology; among the top 9 on our measure were Sampson, Piquero, Farrington, Laub, Nagin, Moffitt, and Loeber. Only Cullen and Hirschi were not clearly developmental and life-course criminology researchers. Furthermore, seven of the top nine scholars were among the most-cited scholars in the majority of previous years studied from 1990 to 2010: Sampson, Farrington, Cullen, Laub, Hirschi, Moffitt, and Loeber. This shows great consistency in the most-cited scholars and therefore the persistence of scholarly influence. Only Piquero and Nagin were relatively recent entries, from 2005 onwards.

The most-cited scholars in 10 criminology journals in 2015 were remarkably similar to the most-cited scholars in 10 criminal justice journals: Sampson, Piquero, Farrington, Laub, Cullen, Hirschi, and Nagin featured in both lists. Five of the top eight scholars in criminology journals were highly ranked in the majority of previous years, and five of the top eight scholars in criminal justice journals were highly ranked in the majority of previous years. The most-cited scholars in 10 American journals in 2015 were remarkably similar to the most-cited scholars in 10 international journals: Sampson, Piquero, Farrington, Cullen, and Laub featured

Table 10 Specialization and versatility in 2015

Rank	Author	No. of different works	Citations/work	% accounted for by top two
1	Robert J. Sampson	92	5.83	19.03
2	Alex R. Piquero	167	2.51	6.67
3	David P. Farrington	168	1.94	8.90
4	Francis T. Cullen	115	2.77	14.11
5	John H. Laub	44	5.43	33.89
6	Travis Hirschi	25	9.00	62.67
7	Daniel S. Nagin	68	3.26	21.17*
8	Terrie E. Moffitt	92	2.93	23.70
9	Rolf Loeber	120	1.67	7.00
10	Tom R. Tyler	59	3.24	22.51

This shows the number of different works by an author that were cited in the twenty journals, and the percentage of total cites that were accounted for by the two most-cited works of that author

*Nagin includes top four most-cited works, as there were 3 works tied for second place

in both lists. Seven of the top nine scholars in American journals were highly ranked in the majority of previous years, but only four of the top nine scholars in international journals were highly ranked in the majority of previous years. Therefore, there was more stability over time of citations in American journals than of citations in international journals.

Remarkably, eight of the most-cited nine scholars in all 20 journals were among the most-cited in AJC: Sampson, Piquero, Farrington, Cullen, Laub, Nagin, Moffitt, and Loeber. This was also true of seven of the top 10 scholars in 10 criminology journals, six of the top 10 scholars in 10 criminal justice journals, eight of the top 10 scholars in 10 American journals, and six of the top 10 scholars in 10 international journals. Therefore, AJC citations generally identify the same highly cited scholars as in other criminology and criminal justice journals.

In conclusion, a large number of American and international criminology and criminal justice journals, as well as AJC, identify the same highly cited scholars, most of whom are highly cited for their work in developmental and life-course criminology. We conclude that there is considerable agreement in American, Asian, and international criminology and criminal justice on the most-cited, and therefore most influential, scholars.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of Interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Research Involving Human Participants and/or Animals This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Informed Consent Informed consent was not applicable to the data obtained for analysis in this article.

References

- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1990). Differences between British and American criminology: an analysis of citations. *British Journal of Criminology*, *30*, 467–482.
- Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (1999). Changes in the most-cited scholars in 20 criminology and criminal justice journals between 1990 and 1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *27*, 345–359.
- 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. (2012). Scholarly influence in criminology and criminal justice journals in 1990–2005. *Criminal Justice Review*, *37*, 360–383.
- Cohn, E. G., Farrington, D. P., & Iratzoqui, A. (2014). *Most-cited scholars in criminology and criminal justice, 1986–2010*. New York: Springer.
- Cohn, E. G., Farrington, D. P., & Wright, R. A. (1998). *Evaluating criminology and criminal justice*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Farrington, D. P., Cohn, E. G., & Iratzoqui, A. (2019). Who are the most-cited scholars in Asian criminology compared to Australia, New Zealand, North America, and Europe? *Asian Journal of Criminology*, *14*, 61–76.
- Iratzoqui, A., Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2019). Thirty years of scholarly influence in international journals, and its relation to the most-cited scholars in Asian criminology. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, *14*, 179–200.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.