## Cyrus Tata

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/2889881/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

840776 940533 23 429 11 16 h-index citations g-index papers 24 24 24 146 times ranked all docs docs citations citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Risk, responsibility and reconfiguration. Punishment and Society, 2009, 11, 419-442.	2.0	117
2	Sentencing as Craftwork and the Binary Epistemologies of the Discretionary Decision Process. Social and Legal Studies, 2007, 16, 425-447.	1.3	68
3	Street‣evel Bureaucracy, Interprofessional Relations, and Coping Mechanisms: A Study of Criminal Justice Social Workers in the Sentencing Process. Law and Policy, 2009, 31, 405-428.	0.7	64
4	Conceptions and Representations of the Sentencing Decision Process. Journal of Law and Society, 1997, 24, 395-420.	0.7	33
5	In the Interests of Clients or Commerce? Legal Aid, Supply, Demand, and †Ethical Indeterminacy' in Criminal Defence Work. Journal of Law and Society, 2007, 34, 489-519.	0.7	23
6	Shadow Writing and Participant Observation: A Study of Criminal Justice Social Work Around Sentencing. Journal of Law and Society, 2008, 35, 189-213.	0.7	22
7	The Failure of Recall to Prison: Early Release, Front-Door and Back-Door Sentencing and the Revolving Prison Door in Scotland. European Journal of Probation, 2012, 4, 85-98.	0.9	17
8	'Ritual Individualization': Creative Genius at Sentencing, Mitigation, and Conviction. Journal of Law and Society, 2019, 46, 112-140.	0.7	15
9	What `Rules' in Sentencing? Consistency and Disparity in the Absence of `Rules'. International Journal of Law Crime and Justice, 1998, 26, 339-364.	0.8	13
10	Sentencing and Information Technology: Incidental Reform?. International Journal of Law and Information Technology, 1994, 2, 255-286.	1.1	11
11	Resolute Ambivalence: Why Judiciaries Do Not Institutionalize Their Decision Support Systems. International Review of Law, Computers and Technology, 2000, 14, 297-316.	1.2	11
12	Incentives, criminal defence lawyers and plea bargaining. International Review of Law and Economics, 2008, 28, 212-219.	0.8	6
13	Connecting legal and social justice in the neo-liberal world? The construction, interpretation and use of pre-sentence reports. Punishment and Society, 2010, 12, 235-238.	2.0	6
14	Reducing Prison Sentencing Through Preâ€Sentence Reports? Why the Quasiâ€Market Logic of †Selling Alternatives to Custody' Fails. Howard Journal of Crime and Justice, 2018, 57, 472-494.	0.6	6
15	To Plead or Not to Plead? "Guilt―is the Question 1. , 2019, , 208-234.		2
16	Humanising Punishment? Mitigation and "Case-Cleansing―Prior to Sentencing. Onati Socio-Legal Series, 2019, 9, 659-683.	0.4	1
17	The New International Network for the Study of Sentencing & Society (INSSS). Federal Sentencing Reporter, 1999, 12, 173-173.	0.0	0
18	Introduction: Why Study Judicial Decision Support Systems?. International Review of Law, Computers and Technology, 2000, 14, 279-282.	1.2	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Judicial Decision Support Systems as Tools to Transform Justice?. Information and Communications Technology Law, 2002, $11$ , $5$ - $13$ .	1.5	O
20	New Directions for Research and Policy. , 2020, , 145-172.		0
21	The Humanising Work of the Sentencing Professions: Individualising and Normalising. , 2020, , 93-117.		O
22	The Rise of Technology and the Demise of the Sentencing Professions?. , 2020, , 119-143.		0
23	The Work of the Sentencing Professions: Animating Autonomous Individualism. , 2020, , 75-92.		0