

WHO GETS THE INK? A PAGE-COVERAGE ANALYSIS OF THE MOST INFLUENTIAL SCHOLARS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE JOURNALS

Richard A. Wright, Arkansas State University
J. Mitchell Miller, University of South Carolina
Marjie Britz, The Citadel

Abstract

A study of criminology textbooks recently proposed an alternative to citation analysis as a measurement of the influence of scholars. Drawing on techniques developed in content analysis, the study used inches-of-print and pages devoted to scholars to assess their influence. This paper extends the page-coverage technique to an analysis of six leading criminology and criminal justice journals published from 1991 to 1995. The 100 most influential scholars in the journals are reported, as measured in page-coverage. A comparison of these findings to a recent study listing the most-cited scholars in the same journals for the same years showed some interesting differences in the rival procedures. Specifically, the citation analysis seemed to underestimate the influence of earlier theorists and scholars known mostly for one work, while perhaps overestimating the influence of prolific contemporary quantitative researchers. Because these findings are similar to the ones reported in the earlier comparison of citation and page-coverage techniques in textbooks, page-coverage measurement appears to be an important alternative to citations in evaluating the influence of scholars.

INTRODUCTION

During the past 25 years in the social sciences, citation analysis has emerged as one of the most venerable ways to judge the influence of different scholars, works, and academic departments and programs (Cole and Cole, 1973; Thomas, 1987). Although a handful of citation analysis studies were done years ago in criminology and criminal justice (see Cole, 1975; Shichor, 1982; Wolfgang, Figlio, and Thornberry, 1978), a steady stream of these studies has appeared in the last decade (see Cohn and Farrington, 1990, 1994a, 1994b, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Cohn, Farrington, and Wright, 1998; Wright, 1995a, 1996a, 1997a, 1997b, 1998; Wright and Carroll, 1994; Wright and Cohn, 1996; Wright and Friedrichs, 1998; Wright and Miller, 1998a; Wright and Rourke, 1998; Wright and Sheridan, 1997; Wright and Soma, 1996). This research uses simple counts of citations in various criminology and criminal justice publications (journals, research books and monographs, and textbooks) to measure the influence of particular scholars, works, and academic departments.

Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998) recently proposed an alternative procedure to measure the influence of scholars and

works, through the use of techniques developed in the content analysis of themes and topics in print media. Specifically, they examined the amount of coverage—in inches-of-print and pages—devoted to 2,076 scholars in 23 introductory criminology textbooks published from 1989 to 1993. Using page-coverage as a unit of analysis, they ranked the 100 most influential scholars in the textbooks. A comparison of the page coverage findings with an earlier citation analysis that ranked the 47 most-cited scholars in the same 23 criminology textbooks (Wright, 1995a) revealed some important differences in the results yielded by the two procedures.

This paper extends the page-coverage procedure to an analysis of “who gets the ink” in periodicals. Through an examination of the amount of coverage devoted to 2,011 scholars in all the articles and research notes appearing in six leading criminology and criminal justice journals published from 1991 to 1995, we report the 100 most influential scholars. A comparison of the page-coverage findings with a study listing the most-cited scholars in the same six journals for the same years (Cohn and Farrington, 1998b) again shows some interesting differences in the results pro-

duced by the rival procedures. Specifically, citation analysis seems to underestimate the influence of earlier theorists and scholars known mostly for one work, while perhaps overestimating the influence of prolific, contemporary quantitative researchers. We conclude with some thoughts about the relative merits of measuring the influence of scholars and works through the page-coverage procedures used here and traditional citation analysis.

UNITS OF CONTENT ANALYSIS

Despite the large number of citation analysis studies to appear in criminology and criminal justice in recent years, some commentators do not consider citation analysis to be a valid measure of the influence of scholars and works. Critics have argued that citation patterns: 1) may reflect the attempts by authors to curry favor with journal editors and reviewers; 2) might be influenced by authors who use citations to boost the careers of their friends and colleagues; 3) ignore whether the subsequent discussions of scholars and/or works are favorable, unfavorable, or neutral; and 4) may reflect past rather than current contributions to the field (Cohn, Farrington, and Wright, 1998; Cole and Cole, 1973; Green, 1997).

The defenders of citation analysis have countered that high citation counts are strongly correlated with other indicators of influence in a discipline, such as the receipt of prestigious awards and elections to offices in professional associations (Cohn, Farrington, and Wright, 1998). Cohn and Farrington (1994b:531) conclude that "large numbers of citations ... provide an imperfect but nevertheless reasonably valid measure of influence on a field."

Still, Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998) note that as a type of "manifest" (or quantitative) content analysis of print media (see Berelson, 1952; Budd, Thorp, and Donahew, 1967; Carney, 1979; Wright, 1988)¹, citation analysis relies on somewhat unusual units of analysis to measure and to tabulate influence. The key elements are names (in the analysis of

the influence of particular scholars) and titles (in the analysis of the influence of particular works) that are accompanied by references. One possible problem with these units of analysis is that they measure influence by how often scholars and works are cited, rather than by the amount of space that is devoted to the discussion of these scholars and works. Traditionally in the manifest content analysis of print media, length of coverage—measured in inches-of-print or in pages—is considered to be a superior unit of analysis when studying the importance of themes or topics (Berelson, 1952; Budd, Thorp, and Donahew, 1967; Carney, 1979; Wright, 1988).

To offer a hypothetical example of the potential differences between citations and length of coverage as measurements of influence, consider an article that cites two scholars. In this article, Scholar A has one study cited in a five-inch review of his/her work, while scholar B has five studies cited in a one-inch discussion of his/her work. Using citations as a unit of analysis, B would be ranked as more influential in this article than A; using inches-of-print as a unit of analysis, A would be ranked as much more influential than B. In this circumstance, length of coverage may offer a more realistic measure of the relative influence of these scholars.

Manifest content analysis researchers in the areas of deviance, criminology, and criminal justice have made extensive use of length of coverage measurements (for example, see Bollen and Phillips, 1981; Chermak, 1994, 1995, 1998; Phillips, 1979, 1980; Stack, 1987; Wright, 1987, 1988, 1992, 1994, 1995b, 1995c, 1995d, 1996a; Wright and Friedrichs, 1991; Wright and Miller, 1998b). For example, research relating crime, victim, and offender characteristics to coverage in print media has measured the amount of space devoted to crime stories in inches-of-print in newspapers (Chermak, 1994, 1995, 1998). Studies of major newspapers that have linked suicide stories to subsequent motor vehicle accidents (Bollen and Phillips, 1981; Phillips, 1979), or publicized executions to subsequent homicides

(Phillips, 1980; Stack, 1987), also have used inches-of-print in newspaper columns as the unit of analysis for measuring the amount of publicity devoted to news stories.

In a series of articles critical of introductory criminology textbooks, Wright and his associates used both inches-of-print and page-coverage to argue that textbooks devoted insufficient attention to biological theories and research (Wright and Miller, 1998b), career criminal studies (Wright, 1994), deterrence research (Wright, 1996b), the free will/determinism controversy (Wright, 1995c), white-collar crime (Wright and Friedrichs, 1991), and women and crime topics (Wright, 1987, 1988, 1992, 1995d). In these studies, Wright followed the standard convention in the manifest content analysis of print by assuming that the length of coverage devoted to a topic like deterrence is a more valid indicator of the importance of this research than the number of times that authors mention key words like deterrence (see Wright, 1996b). The same reasoning can be used to argue that length of coverage might be a more valid indicator than simple citations when measuring the influence of particular scholars and works.

To date, only one study—Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998)—has used length of coverage in publications as a unit of analysis to examine the influence of scholars. By converting inches-of-print into page coverage, these authors measured the amount of space devoted to 2,076 scholars in 23 introductory criminology textbooks published from 1989 to 1993. The total numbers of pages devoted to these scholars were tabulated to rank the 100 most influential scholars; these rankings were compared to a recent analysis (see Wright, 1995a) of the 47 most-cited scholars in the same 23 textbooks. Notable differences emerged when the results of the two studies were compared; in particular, the citation analysis appeared to underestimate the influence of earlier theorists and scholars known mostly for one celebrated work, while overestimating the influence of prodigious contem-

porary quantitative researchers. Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998:111) argue that it is important to determine if the differences found between page-coverage analysis and citation analysis: "are idiosyncratic to textbooks or also affect journals. The next step in evaluating the potential of page-coverage analysis as a technique for studying the influence of scholars is to extend this research to criminology and criminal justice journals."²

Here, we take this next step by measuring the page coverage devoted to 2,011 scholars in all the articles and research notes appearing in six criminology and criminal justice journals published from 1991 to 1995. After compiling a list of the 100 most influential scholars, we compare our page-coverage findings to Cohn and Farrington's (1998b) analysis of the 49 most-cited scholars in the same six journals for the same five years. Our findings show that the differences that Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998) observed when comparing page-coverage and citation techniques in criminology textbooks persist in the study of influential scholars in the journals.

RESEARCH DESIGN

We examined the amount of coverage devoted to various scholars in all the articles and research notes appearing in three leading criminology journals (*Criminology*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, and *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*) and three leading criminal justice journals (*Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, and *Justice Quarterly*) published from 1991 to 1995.³ For comparison purposes, the periodicals and time frame selected for the study were chosen to duplicate exactly the publications analyzed in Cohn and Farrington's (1998b) study of the most-cited scholars in recent leading criminology and criminal justice journals.

Inches-of-print and page coverage were the units of analysis used in the study. When a scholar⁴ was mentioned in an article/research note (either in sentences, in citations within the text, or in footnotes), careful records were kept of how much

coverage—in continuous inches-of-print—was devoted to the scholar.⁵ Because Cohn and Farrington's (1998b) analysis excluded the self-citations of authors, we followed this example by deleting self-discussions in our data collection. All scholars receiving at least one inch of print coverage in one article/research note (that they themselves did not write) were included in the study; scholars receiving peripheral attention (less than one inch of print coverage in at least one article/research note) were excluded. This research design required reading and analyzing a total of 773 articles/research notes, comprising a total of 15,210 pages.

Records were kept of how many inches-of-print each journal included on a typical page. Once the data were collected on the inches-of-print coverage for every scholar, these measurements were reconfigured so that page-lengths were the reported units of analysis for ranking the most influential scholars (for additional examples of the use of these procedures in manifest content analysis, see Wright, 1994, 1996b; Wright and Miller, 1998b).

FINDINGS

Altogether, 2,011 different scholars were covered in at least one inch of print in one of the 733 articles/research notes that we analyzed. Most of these scholars, though, received minimal attention; when inches-of-print measurements were reconfigured into coverage in total pages, only 209 scholars (or 10.39%) were discussed in one or more pages.

Table 1 reports the 100 most influential scholars in the six journals that were analyzed, ranked by how much page-coverage each received. Travis Hirschi (1st place) and Michael R. Gottfredson (2nd) were at the top of the rankings, largely due to the intense theoretical and research interest generated by the self-control perspective, proposed in *A General Theory of Crime* (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Hirschi and Gottfredson impressively outdistanced other scholars who ranked high in the study: over ten pages of coverage separated Gottfredson from Cesare Beccaria in third place. This difference is

especially noteworthy, considering that only five scholars in Table 1—Hirschi, Gottfredson, Beccaria, Delbert S. Elliott (4th), and Alfred Blumstein (5th)—received more than ten pages of coverage in the journals. David Huizinga (6th), Lawrence W. Sherman (7th), Jacqueline Cohen (8th), Robert J. Sampson (9th), and Marvin E. Wolfgang (10th) were the other scholars who ranked among the top ten in page-coverage.

There is considerable intellectual diversity in the 100 scholars ranked in Table 1. Besides Hirschi and Michael R. Gottfredson, other authors who are closely associated with particular theoretical perspectives are John L. Hagan (12th), Austin Turk (32nd), and Jurgen Habermas (37.5th) for conflict/critical approaches, Sampson, David P. Farrington (41st), Terrie E. Moffitt (41st), and John H. Laub (52nd) for developmental/life course theories, Beccaria, Kirk R. Williams (26th), and Richard Hawkins (28th) for rational choice/deterrence arguments, Lawrence E. Cohen (30.5th) and Marcus Felson (45th) for the routine-activities approach, Edwin H. Sutherland (13.5th) and Ronald L. Akers (46th) for social learning perspectives, and Richard Rosenfeld (25th), Robert K. Merton (27th), Steven F. Messner (47th), and Robert Agnew (53rd) for strain theory. Scholars in Table 1 who are prominent criminal justice systems analysts and policy researchers rather than theorists include Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, Sherman, Marcia Chaiken (13.5th), Jan M. Chaiken (16th), and Joan Petersilia (30.5th).

Other indicators of intellectual diversity are the varied methodological orientations and educational backgrounds of the influential scholars. Although most authors listed in Table 1 are renowned for quantitative research, some are known mostly for qualitative/ethnographic studies (e.g., Jack Katz, 34th; Martin Sanchez Jankowski, 41st; Malcolm W. Klein, 49th; and Elijah Anderson, 68.5th). Most scholars ranked in Table 1 were trained as sociologists, but a number are associated with other disciplines, including philosophers Beccaria and Habermas, political scientists James

TABLE 1. THE 100 MOST INFLUENTIAL SCHOLARS IN MAJOR AMERICAN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE JOURNALS, 1991 TO 1995, MEASURED IN PAGE COVERAGE

Rank	Scholar	Pages Devoted to the Scholar
1	Travis Hirschi	35.65
2	Michael R. Gottfredson	29.50
3	Cesare Beccaria	19.26
4	Delbert S. Elliott	10.79
5	Alfred Blumstein	10.17
6	David Huizinga	8.09
7	Lawrence W. Sherman	7.22
8	Jacqueline Cohen	6.98
9	Robert J. Sampson	6.35
10	Marvin E. Wolfgang	6.19
11	Wesley G. Skogan	5.58
12	John L. Hagan	5.05
13.5	Marcia Chaiken	4.95
13.5	Edwin L. Sutherland	4.95
15	Mark Warr	4.86
16	Jan M. Chaiken	4.80
18	Suzanne S. Ageton	4.50
18	Mark Stafford	4.50
18	Charles R. Tittle	4.50
20	Kenneth C. Land	4.47
21	Thorsten J. Sellin	4.43
22	Eric D. Poole	4.24
23.5	David F. Greenberg	4.23
23.5	Christy A. Visher	4.23
25	Richard Rosenfeld	4.14
26	Kirk R. Williams	4.13
27	Robert K. Merton	4.00
28	Richard Hawkins	3.99
29	Bruce J. Arneklev	3.96
30.5	Lawrence E. Cohen	3.90
30.5	Joan Petersilia	3.90
32	Austin Turk	3.74
33	Robert M. Figlio	3.71
34	Jack Katz	3.68
35	Scott Menard	3.66
36	James Q. Wilson	3.65
37.5	Robert J. Bursik	3.53
37.5	Jurgen Habermas	3.53
39	Harold G. Grasmick	3.37
41	David P. Farrington	3.13
41	Martin Sanchez Jankowski	3.13
41	Terrie E. Moffitt	3.13
43.5	Richard A. Berk	3.09
43.5	H. Laurence Ross	3.09
45	Marcus Felson	3.02
46	Ronald L. Akers	3.01
47	Steven F. Messner	2.98
48	Lloyd E. Ohlin	2.83
49	Malcolm W. Klein	2.82

TABLE 1. CONTINUED

Rank	Scholar	Pages Devoted to the Scholar
50	David Matza	2.81
51	Darrell J. Steffensmeier	2.73
52	John H. Laub	2.65
53	Robert Agnew	2.64
54	Richard B. McCleary	2.49
55	Francis T. Cullen	2.39
56.5	Donald J. Black	2.31
56.5	John J. DiIulio, Jr.	2.31
58.5	John Braithwaite	2.28
58.5	Cathy Spatz Widom	2.28
60	David McDowall	2.19
61	Murray A. Straus	2.18
62	Herman Goldstein	2.17
63.5	Soumyo D. Moitra	2.14
63.5	Karl-Dieter Opp	2.14
65	Michael J. Hindelang	2.13
68.5	Elijah Anderson	2.00
68.5	Bruce Levin	2.00
68.5	Ross L. Matsueda	2.00
68.5	Douglas A. Smith	2.00
68.5	S. S. Tomkins	2.00
68.5	Gerald S. Weinstein	2.00
72	Hans Toch	1.97
73	Gary D. Hill	1.96
74	Albert J. Reiss, Jr.	1.89
78.5	Judith V. Becker	1.86
78.5	Denise C. Gottfredson	1.86
78.5	Gary D. Gottfredson	1.86
78.5	J. Thomas Grisso	1.86
78.5	Y. Lavee	1.86
78.5	David H. Olson	1.86
78.5	J. Portner	1.86
78.5	Vernon L. Quinsey	1.86
83	Richard A. Cloward	1.84
84	Raymond Paternoster	1.82
85	Mercer L. Sullivan	1.81
86.5	David Cantor	1.76
86.5	Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier	1.76
89	Gerben J. N. Bruinsma	1.71
89	James Heckman	1.71
89	A. Tomkins	1.71
91	D. Wayne Osgood	1.69
93	Jerald G. Bachman	1.68
93	Richard A. Hay, Jr.	1.68
93	Terance D. Miethe	1.68
95	Irving A. Spergel	1.65
96	Irving Piliavin	1.64
97	John M. Hagedorn	1.61
98	Susan Ehrlich Martin	1.60
99.5	David Weisburd	1.58
99.5	Helene Raskin White	1.58

Q. Wilson (36th) and John J. DiIulio, Jr. (56.5th), psychologists Farrington, Moffitt, and Judith V. Becker (78.5th), and statisticians Bruce Levin (68.5th) and Gerald S. Weinstein (68.5th).

There is less gender, generational, and cultural diversity among the names appearing in Table 1. For example, only twelve women ranked among the 100 most influential scholars in page-coverage: Jacqueline Cohen, Marcia Chaiken, Suzanne S. Ageton (18th place), Christy A. Visser (23.5th), Petersilia, Moffitt, Cathy Spatz Widom (58.5th), Becker, Denise C. Gottfredson (78.5th), Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier (86.5th), Susan Ehrlich Martin (98th), and Helene Raskin White (99.5th). Furthermore, most of the scholars listed in Table 1 are contemporary researchers, and only six are deceased: Beccaria, Wolfgang, Sutherland, Thorsten J. Sellin (21st), H. Laurence Ross (43.5th), and Michael J. Hindelang (65th). Finally, virtually all of the most influential scholars in page-coverage were from the United States: Exceptions are Beccaria from Italy, Habermas and Karl-Opp Dieter (63.5th) from Germany, Farrington from England, John Braithwaite (58.5th) from Australia, and Gerben J. N. Bruinsma (89th) from the Netherlands.

Table 2 reports the 50 most influential scholars in our page-coverage analysis of six leading criminology and criminal justice journals published from 1991 to 1995, alongside the list of the 49 most-cited scholars from Cohn and Farrington's (1998) study of the same journals during the same period.⁶ This table permits a direct comparison of the results produced by the rival citation and page-coverage procedures.

In their studies, Cohn and Farrington (1994a, 1994b, 1996, 1998) found that leading journals in criminology and criminal justice vary conspicuously in the average number of references listed in articles/research notes. In particular, publications in criminology journals tend to have more references than those appearing in criminal justice journals. To assign equal importance to the citations in different periodicals, Cohn and Farrington (1994a,

1994b) devised a weighting procedure, where the 50 most-cited scholars are compiled for each journal before aggregating these data for all journals. This weighting system involves reversing the rankings for the 50 most-cited scholars in each journal (so that the author ranked first in citations receives a score of 50, the author ranked second in citations receives a score of 49, and so on). The weighted scores are then added for every author who appeared as one of the 50 most-cited scholars in at least one of the journals; the authors with the highest scores are ranked as the most-cited scholars (see Cohn and Farrington, 1994b, 1998).⁷

Because Cohn and Farrington (1998) only report citation rankings based on weighted scores, we were forced to copy this procedure. We recoded our page-coverage data to tabulate the 50 most influential scholars in each of the six journals, in order to calculate aggregate, weighted rankings. For the most influential scholars, Table 2 reports Cohn and Farrington's (1998) weighted citation rankings (column 1), our weighted page-coverage rankings (column 2), and from Table 1, the unweighted page-coverage rankings (column 3).

When comparing the data in Table 2, there are some agreements among the lists of influential scholars. Twenty-seven of the 49 most-cited scholars appeared in the weighted page-coverage rankings ($r = .55$); 26 of the 49 most-cited scholars placed in the unweighted page-coverage rankings ($r = .53$).⁸ The weighted correlation is identical to the association that Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998) observed when they first compared the results of citation and page-coverage techniques in criminology textbooks; these authors reported 26 matches in lists of 47 prominent scholars ($r = .55$). This suggests that the two techniques for measuring the influence of scholars produce roughly equivalent results.

Still, Cohn, Farrington, and Wright's (1998) study of textbooks noted some important differences in the results of the two techniques: Earlier theorists and scholars primarily known for one renowned work

TABLE 2. A COMPARISON OF THE MOST INFLUENTIAL SCHOLARS IN MAJOR AMERICAN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE JOURNALS, 1991 TO 1995, AS MEASURED IN CITATIONS AND PAGE-COVERAGE

Rank in Citations ^a	Rank in Page Coverage		Scholar
	Weighted ^b	Unweighted ^c	
1	1	1	Travis Hirschi
2	2	2	Michael R. Gottfredson
3	7	9	Robert J. Sampson
4	3	5	Alfred Blumstein
5	35	30.5	Lawrence E. Cohen
6	48	41	David P. Farrington
7	5	6	David Huizinga
8	14	12	John L. Hagan
9	4	4	Delbert S. Elliott
10	9	10	Marvin E. Wolfgang
11	8	8	Jacqueline Cohen
12	23	36	James Q. Wilson
13	—	—	Michael J. Hindelang
14	20	—	Francis T. Cullen
15	6	7	Lawrence W. Sherman
16	—	—	Douglas A. Smith
17	11	30.5	Joan Petersilia
18	—	46	Ronald L. Akers
19	19	18	Suzanne S. Ageton
20	—	45	Marcus Felson
21	17	23.5	Christy A. Visher
22	—	—	Marvin D. Krohn
23	—	—	Raymond Paternoster
24	—	—	Murray A. Straus
25	27	11	Wesley G. Skogan
26	22	43.5	Richard A. Berk
27	—	—	Daniel S. Nagin
28	21	18	Charles R. Tittle
29	25	37.5	Robert J. Bursik
30	—	—	Rolf Loeber
31	33	39	Harold G. Grasmick
32	10	20	Kenneth C. Land
33	—	—	Albert J. Reiss, Jr.
34	—	—	Terence P. Thornberry
35	47	23.5	David F. Greenberg
36	—	—	John H. Laub
37	—	—	Jeffrey A. Fagan
38	—	—	Don A. Andrews
39	—	—	Michael H. Tonry
40	—	—	William L. Marshall
41	13	13.5	Edwin H. Sutherland
42	39.5	—	Vernon L. Quinsey
43	—	—	Paul Gendreau
44	—	—	Howard E. Barbaree
45	—	—	Martha A. Myers
46	39.5	—	Judith V. Becker

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

Rank in Citations ^a	Rank in Page Coverage		Scholar
	Weighted ^b	Unweighted ^c	
47	—	—	Hans Toch
48.5	—	—	Gene G. Abel
48.5	—	—	Dante V. Cicchetti
—	12	16	Jan M. Chaiken
—	15	13.5	Marcia Chaiken
—	16	32	Austin Turk
—	18	41	Terrie E. Moffitt
—	24	49	Malcolm W. Klein
—	26	15	Mark Warr
—	30	29	Bruce J. Arneklev
—	30	3	Cesare Beccaria
—	30	37.5	Jurgen Habermas
—	30	—	Darrell J. Steffensmeier
—	30	—	S. S. Tomkins
—	34	27	Robert K. Merton
—	36	22	Eric D. Poole
—	39.5	—	J. Thomas Grisso
—	39.5	—	Y. Lavee
—	39.5	—	David H. Olson
—	39.5	—	J. Portner
—	43.5	25	Richard Rosenfeld
—	43.5	—	Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier
—	45.5	34	Jack Katz
—	45.5	—	Karl-Dieter Opp
—	49.5	—	John J. DiIulio, Jr.
—	49.5	—	Soumyo D. Moitra
—	—	21	Thorsten J. Sellin
—	—	33	Robert M. Figlio
—	—	35	Scott Menard
—	—	41	Martin Sanchez Jankowski
—	—	43.5	H. Laurence Ross
—	—	47	Steven F. Messner
—	—	48	Lloyd E. Ohlin
—	—	50	David Matza

^a From Cohn and Farrington (1998). Ranks in citations were weighted to give equal representation to each of the six journals analyzed in the study.

^b Weighted page-coverage ranks assigned equal representation to each of the six journals analyzed in the study.

^c From Table 1.

ranked higher in page-coverage; prolific modern quantitative researchers ranked higher in citations. On closer inspection, these same differences are apparent when comparing the citation rankings with the weighted and unweighted page-coverage rankings in the journals (see Table 2).

Four established theorists—Austin Turk (16th place), Cesare Beccaria (30th), Jurgen Habermas (30th), and Robert K. Merton (34th)—appeared among the most influential scholars in the weighted page-coverage rankings, but not in the citation rankings. In addition, Edwin H. Sutherland ranked considerably higher in page-coverage (13th) than in citations (41st). Although these scholars were cited only occasionally, their works were extensively discussed when they were cited. This supports Cohn, Farrington, and Wright's (1998) conclusion that citation analysis disfavors established theorists.

Several authors known mostly for one famous work in criminology and criminal justice—including Beccaria ([1764] 1963), Merton (1938), Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier (Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1980) in 43.5th place, and Jack Katz (1988) in 45.5th place—also appeared in the weighted page-coverage rankings, but not among the most-cited scholars. For example, Merton parsimoniously articulated strain theory in one famous early article ("Social Structure and Anomie"; Merton, 1938); he seldom returned to the analysis of crime in his subsequent illustrious career as a sociologist. Although a number of journal articles/research notes in our study extensively discussed strain theory, and the authors of these publications dutifully cited Merton's acclaimed article, these citations were insufficient for Merton to rank as one of the 49 most-cited scholars. Apparently, citation rankings disadvantage authors renowned mostly for one work, regardless of the influence of this work.

While citation analysis may underestimate the influence of earlier theorists and scholars known mostly for one celebrated work, it may overestimate the influence of modern, quantitative researchers who are more prolific. Some contemporary quan-

titative scholars who ranked among the 30 most-cited scholars, but failed to rank among the 50 page-coverage influentials (weighted and unweighted, see Table 2), include Michael J. Hindelang, Marvin D. Krohn, Rolf Loeber, Daniel S. Nagin, Raymond Paternoster, Douglas A. Smith, and Murray A. Straus. In addition, Lawrence E. Cohen (respectively, 5th in citations and 35th in weighted page-coverage) and David P. Farrington (6th and 48th) ranked much higher in citations.⁹ These researchers were widely cited in recent journals, but their works were discussed only briefly.

In general, Tables 1 and 2 seem to support Cohn, Farrington, and Wright's (1998) claim that citation analysis as a measure of the influence of scholars has certain disadvantages that may not be shared by the page-coverage technique. Our page-coverage analysis of recent leading criminology and criminal justice journals suggests that a content analysis of the same publications (Cohn and Farrington, 1998) slighted the influence of established theorists and scholars known mostly for one famous work, but perhaps exaggerated the influence of more prolific contemporary quantitative researchers. The data reported here confirm that page-coverage is a promising alternative to citations for measuring the influence of scholars.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Citation analysis has emerged as an important way to measure the influence of scholars and works in criminology and criminal justice, despite some persistent doubts about the validity of these studies. Recently, Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998) proposed another procedure to measure the influence of scholars that relies on units of analysis other than citations: inches-of-print and page-coverage. They compared the findings from a citation analysis of influential scholars in 23 introductory criminology textbooks published from 1989 to 1993 (Wright, 1995a) to a page-coverage analysis of "who gets the ink" in the same books. The authors reported that page-coverage analysis corrected for certain citation analysis short-

comings. Nevertheless, Cohn, Farrington, and Wright (1998) were cautious in their endorsement of the page-coverage approach. Noting that these findings might be idiosyncratic to textbooks, they strongly recommended comparing the page-coverage procedure and citation analysis in a study of journals.

Here, we extended page-coverage research to an examination of the most influential scholars in six leading criminology and criminal justice journals published from 1991 to 1995—the same journals studied in a recent citation analysis conducted by Cohn and Farrington (1998). A list of the 100 most influential scholars, as measured in page-coverage, was compiled from the journals. These scholars were characterized by much intellectual diversity (in theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches, and disciplinary backgrounds), but by less cultural diversity (most were contemporary, male scholars from the United States).

More importantly, a comparison of the page-coverage and citation analysis findings from the journals supported the earlier conclusions in Cohn, Farrington, and Wright's (1998) study of textbooks. Specifically, the page-coverage technique seemed to compensate for the tendencies in the citation analysis to underestimate the influence of certain established theorists and scholars known mostly for one renowned work, while overestimating the influence of some recent prodigious quantitative researchers. These findings support the continued use of the page-coverage procedure as an alternative to citation analysis in the study of the influence of scholars.

It is important to conclude by noting that the page-coverage technique for measuring the influence of scholars certainly offers no quick and easy solutions to problems in citation analysis.

The chief drawback is the immense commitment of time and effort needed to conduct a page-coverage analysis. The current study demanded the tedious and painstaking tracking of the coverage of 2,011 scholars in 15,210 pages of text; coding the accumulated data alone took over two

months. Our estimate is that the analysis reported here required approximately 650 hours of research time. Any researcher who considers pursuing a similar study must be warned about the arduous task ahead.

NOTES

1. The other general type of content analysis is called "latent" (or qualitative). Latent content analysis "requires the researcher to draw inferences regarding deeper, contextual meanings," while manifest content analysis simply counts "surface meanings" (e.g., names, words, sentences, paragraphs, and/or pages; Wright, 1988:41; also, see Berelson, 1952; Budd, Thorp, and Donahew, 1967; Carney, 1979).

2. Special problems may affect the validity of citation studies of textbooks as measures of scholarly influence (Wright and Miller, 1998a). Allen (1983) and Green (1997) argue that publishers and reviewers may pressure textbook authors into deleting "cutting edge" citations to recent, important studies written by lesser-known researchers, in favor of standard citations to well-established scholars. Because these factors also could jeopardize Cohn, Farrington, and Wright's (1998) page-coverage study of textbooks, it is especially important to extend this technique to the analysis of leading criminology and criminal justice journals.

3. Cohn and Farrington (1998b) selected these six periodicals for analysis because various studies that rank the prestige of journals suggested that these were the leading journals in criminology and criminal justice (see Cohn, Farrington, and Wright, 1998). Because Cohn and Farrington's (1998b) analysis included comments and replies published in the journals, these also were examined in our study. Like Cohn and Farrington, we excluded book review essays, book reviews, journal editor's comments, and miscellaneous other items (e.g., obituaries and notes).

4. Names of nonacademics (e.g., novelists, politicians, and criminals) were excluded from the study.

5. Any discussion of scholars, including critical assessments and biographical treatments, were included in the data analysis.

We assumed *prima facie* that these were important indicators of the influence of scholars.

6. Apparently because there were ties for 50th place, Cohn and Farrington (1998) only reported the 49 most-cited scholars in their citation analysis of six leading criminology and criminal justice journals.

7. In a study of six journals, the maximum weighted score that an author could receive is 300 (if he/she ranked as the most-cited scholar in every journal). The minimum score that a scholar could receive is 1 (if he/she ranked 50th, as the most-cited scholar in only one journal).

8. Thirty-six of the 49 most-cited scholars appeared in the unweighted rankings of the 100 most influential scholars in page-coverage ($r = .43$; cf., Tables 1 and 2). In this study, we used a special formula devised by North et al. (1963) to calculate correlations on interval-level, non-linear data. Because this formula violates the conventional assumptions associated with correlation, we chose a cautious interpretation of our coefficients, foregoing the usual *F* tests of statistical significance used in correlation (see Cohn, Farrington, and Wright, 1998).

9. There are a few notable exceptions to the claim that prolific, contemporary quantitative researchers ranked higher in citations than in page-coverage (see Table 2). These exceptions are Jan M. Chaiken (12th place in the weighted page-coverage rankings), Terrie E. Moffitt (18th), and Mark Warr (26th), all of whom were unranked in Cohn and Farrington's (1998) citation study.

REFERENCES

- Allen, H. E. (1983). Comment: A reaction to "An analysis of citations in introductory criminology textbooks." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 11:177-78.
- Beccaria, C. ([1764] 1963). *On crimes and punishments*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Bollen, K. A., and Phillips, D. P. (1981). Suicidal motor vehicle fatalities in Detroit: A replication. *American Journal of Sociology* 87:404-12.
- Budd, R. W., Thorp, R. K., and Donahew, L. (1967). *Content analysis of communications*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Carney, T. F. (1979). *Content analysis: A technique for systematic inference from communications*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Chermak, S. M. (1994). Body count news: How crime is presented in the news media. *Justice Quarterly* 11:561-82.
- Chermak, S. M. (1995). *Victims in the news: Crime and the American news media*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Chermak, S. M. (1998). Predicting crime story salience: The effects of crime, victim, and defendant characteristics. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 26:61-70.
- Cohn, E. G., and Farrington, D. P. (1990). Differences between British and American criminology: An analysis of citations. *British Journal of Criminology* 30:467-82.
- Cohn, E. G., and Farrington, D. P. (1994a). Who are the most influential criminologists in the English-speaking world? *British Journal of Criminology* 34:204-25.
- Cohn, E. G., and Farrington, D. P. (1994b). Who are the most-cited scholars in major American criminology and criminal justice journals? *Journal of Criminal Justice* 22:517-34.
- Cohn, E. G., and Farrington, D. P. (1996). *Crime and justice and the criminology and criminal justice literature*. In *Crime and justice: A review of research*, vol. 20, ed. M. Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cohn, E. G., and Farrington, D. P. (1998a). 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., and Farrington, D. P. (1998b). Changes in the most-cited scholars in major American criminology and criminal justice journals between 1986-1990 and 1991-1995. *Journal of*

- Criminal Justice* 26:99-116.
- Cohn, E. G., and Farrington, D. P. (1998c). Changes in the most-cited scholars in major international journals between 1986-1990 and 1991-1995. *British Journal of Criminology* 38:153-67.
- Cohn, E. G., Farrington, D. P., and Wright, R. A. (1998). *Evaluating criminology and criminal justice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Cole, J. R., and Cole, S. (1973). *Social stratification in science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole, S. (1975). The growth of scientific knowledge: Theories of deviance as a case study. In *The idea of social structure: Papers in honor of Robert K. Merton*, ed. L. A. Coser. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Gottfredson, M. R., and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Green, G. S. (1997). Using citation counts in criminology as measures of intellectual influence: A comment on Wright and Soma, myself, and others. *Journal of Crime and Justice* 20:179-86.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action. Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action. Volume 2: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime: Moral and sensual attractions in doing evil*. New York: Basic Books.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3:672-82.
- North, R. C., Holsti, O., Zaninovich, M. G., and Zinnes, D. A. (1963). *Content analysis: A Handbook with applications for the study of international crisis*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Phillips, D. P. (1979). Suicide, motor vehicle fatalities, and the mass media: Evidence toward a theory of suggestion. *American Journal of Sociology* 84:1150-74.
- Phillips, D. P. (1980). The deterrent effect of capital punishment: New evidence on a old controversy. *American Journal of Sociology* 86:139-48.
- Shichor, D. (1982). An analysis of citations in introductory criminology textbooks: A research note. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 10:231-37.
- Stack, S. (1987). Publicized executions and homicide, 1950-1980. *American Sociological Review* 52:532-40.
- Steffensmeier, D. J., and Steffensmeier, R. H. (1980). Trends in female delinquency: An examination of arrest, juvenile court, self-report, and field data. *Criminology* 18:62-85.
- Thomas, C. W. (1987). The utility of citation-based quality assessments. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 15:165-71.
- Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., and Thornberry, T. P. (1978). *Evaluating criminology*. New York: Elsevier.
- Wright, R. A. (1987). Are "sisters in crime" finally being booked? The coverage of women and crime in journals and textbooks. *Teaching Sociology* 15:418-22.
- Wright, R. A. (1988). "Victim" and "resister" conceptualizations of oppression: An assessment through a content analysis of the depiction of women in criminology textbooks. Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Wright, R. A. (1992). From vamps and tramps to teases and flirts: Stereotypes of women in criminology textbooks, 1956 to 1965 and 1981 to 1990. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 3:223-36.
- Wright, R. A. (1994). Stopped for questioning, but not booked: The coverage of career criminals in criminology journals and textbooks, 1983 to 1992. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 5:205-15.
- Wright, R. A. (1995a). The most-cited scholars in criminology: A comparison of textbooks and journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 23:303-11.
- Wright, R. A. (1995b). Rehabilitation affirmed, rejected, and reaffirmed: Assessments of the effectiveness of offender treatment programs in criminology textbooks, 1956 to 1965 and 1983

- to 1992. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 6:21-39.
- Wright, R. A. (1995c). Where there's a will, there's no way: The treatment of the choice debate in criminology textbooks, 1956 to 1965 and 1983 to 1992. *Teaching Sociology* 23:8-15.
- Wright, R. A. (1995d). Women as "victims" and as "resisters": Depictions of the oppression of women in criminology textbooks. *Teaching Sociology* 23:111-21.
- Wright, R. A. (1996a). Do introductory criminology textbooks cite the most influential criminologists? Estimating the "match" between what journals report and what textbooks discuss. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 20:225-36.
- Wright, R. A. (1996b). The missing or misperceived effects of punishment: The coverage of deterrence in criminology textbooks, 1956 to 1965 and 1984 to 1993. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 7:1-22.
- Wright, R. A. (1997a). Do introductory criminal justice textbooks cite the most influential criminal justices? Further estimations of the "match" between what journals report and what textbooks discuss. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 8:81-90.
- Wright, R. A. (1997b). The most-cited scholars in criminology and criminal justice textbooks, 1989 to 1993. *The Justice Professional* 10:199-213.
- Wright, R. A. (1998). From luminary to lesser-known: The declining influence of criminology textbook authors on scholarship. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 9:104-15.
- Wright, R. A., and Carroll, K. (1994). From vanguard to vanished: The declining influence of criminology textbooks on scholarship. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 22:559-67.
- Wright, R. A., and Cohn, E. G. (1996). The most-cited scholars in criminal justice textbooks, 1989 to 1993. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 24:459-67.
- Wright, R. A., and Friedrichs, D. O. (1991). White-collar crime in the criminal justice curriculum. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 2:95-121.
- Wright, R. A., and Friedrichs, D. O. (1998). The most-cited scholars and works in critical criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 9:
- Wright, R. A., and Miller, J. M. (1998a). The most-cited scholars and works in police studies. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*.
- Wright, R. A., and Miller, J. M. (1998b). Taboo until today? The coverage of biological arguments in criminology textbooks, 1961 to 1970 and 1987 to 1996. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 26:1-19.
- Wright, R. A., and Rourke, J. (1999). The most-cited scholars and works in criminological theory. In *Advances in criminological theory*, vol. 8, eds. W. S. Laufer and F. Adler. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Wright, R. A., and Sheridan, C. (1997). The most-cited scholars and works in women and crime publications. *Women and Criminal Justice* 9:41-60.
- Wright, R. A., and Soma, C. (1996). The most-cited scholars in criminology textbooks, 1963 to 1968, 1976 to 1980, and 1989 to 1993. *Journal of Crime and Justice* 19:45-60.



Visit *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology* on the World Wide Web at:

www.ou.edu/special/freeinq