General Exam Syllabus: Criminological Theory

Liv Mann
Examiner: Lynn Chancer
January 2021

Introduction

Course Overview

This is a 12-week course intended to introduce undergraduate Juniors and Seniors to a broad range of criminological theories. In exploring the varied explanations put forth for crime and criminality- from possession to capitalism- we will practice engaging with theory as critical consumers of knowledge. After an introduction to the meaning of theory, various empirical realities of crime, and essential methods in the field of criminology, we will spend each week exploring a body of theoretical work and appraising it through four guiding questions:

1. Where does crime originate?
2. What is the evidence for this theory?
3. What form should crime prevention take?
4. What is not included in this theory?

Each of these questions will help students engage with the course content on multiple levels. The first question will focus students' attention on the causal claims made by each theoretical perspective. The second question will focus their attention on the methods and evidence used to support each question and should generally be answered with some reference to the methods discussed in Week 2. The third question concerns policy applications and will require students to creatively apply each theoretical perspective to the real world. Finally, the fourth question is meant to help students evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each question by asking them to evaluate aspects of crime and criminal justice that are left out of the theory at hand.

The first theory section will focus on crime as it originates in individuals. We begin with deterrence and rational choice theories before complicating the rationality of criminal decision-making by assessing the role of biology and psychology in criminality. Then, in considering these internal forces, we are forced to reckon with external factors that shape individual criminal proclivities. This requires us to consider the criminal individual in interaction with others, which we do by examining the life course, learning, and labeling perspectives.

From there we move to a structural perspective, focusing on the ways in which places and structures produce crime. We begin with a look at the way classical strain theories understand the role of structure in producing crime, then transition to a narrowed focus on *place* as we follow human ecology in its evolution into contemporary theories of place and crime. From there we return to a broader structural perspective by considering contemporary strain theories. Here we also begin to explore cultural criminology, which gives us an important entry point to our discussions of critical criminologies.

In the final part of the course, we focus on criminological perspectives that explicitly engage with structures of privilege and oppression. First, we explore Marxist and critical criminologies that emphasize the role economic power plays in the production and definition of crime. In the

following week we turn to a traditional blind spot of Marxist perspectives by exploring gender, sexuality, and crime. Finally, we devote the final week of the course to critical race perspectives on crime and justice. While issues of racial inequality are woven throughout the course, this week offers us an opportunity to critically consider the future of criminal justice.

Learning Objectives

This course is centered on four key learning objectives:

1. Students will be able to explain most major theoretical perspectives on crime and criminality.

    We will meet this learning objective by reading and discussing a broad range of criminological theories, as outline above. Each week, students will read a selection of articles, book excerpts, and other items selected to introduce them to the essential tenets of the week's theoretical perspective.

    Students can demonstrate mastery of this learning objective by coming to class with a strong understanding of or thoughtful clarifying questions about the week's theory and by outlining the way each theory explains the existence of crime.

2. Students will be able to critically evaluate the strengths and limitations of each theory.

    We will meet this learning objective by reflecting on the strengths and limitations of each theory during in-class discussions and in weekly written assignments. We will focus on discussing the strengths of each theory both in terms of empirical support for the theory and theoretical completeness, and on discussing the limitations of each theory in terms of empirical support and theoretical blind spots.

    Students can demonstrate mastery of this learning objective by completing weekly written assignments that represent thoughtful assessment of the week's theory, as well as by actively participating in class discussions about theoretical strengths and limitations.

3. Students will be able to propose empirical tests of each theory.

    We will meet this learning objective by beginning the course with an introduction to essential methods in criminology. Students are not expected to become methodological experts but should have a basic understanding of how both quantitative and qualitative methods contribute to our knowledge about crime. They should be able to apply this knowledge by suggesting basic, logical empirical tests of each week's theory.

    Students can demonstrate mastery of this learning objective by completing weekly written assignments that propose at least one way researchers could to explore the week's theoretical perspective and by participating in class discussions about the methods used to assess each theory.

4. Students will be able to recommend crime prevention strategies based on each theory.

    We will meet this learning objective by discussing the policy implications of each week's theory in lecture and in-class discussions. Students are encouraged to focus on the way

each theoretical perspective explains the emergence of crime and to think creatively about how we can intervene in those processes to prevent crime.

Students can demonstrate mastery of this learning objective by completing weekly written assignments that propose at least one kind of intervention that could reduce crime based on the week's theoretical perspectives *or* that explain whether or not existing crime prevention strategies should succeed or fail to prevent crime if the week's theoretical perspective is empirically valid.

Course Outline

The following outline lists the topics for each week:

- Introduction to Crime and Theory
    - Week 1: Empirical Realities and Defining Theory
    - Week 2: Essential Research Methods in Criminology
- Crime Internalized: The Individual (in Interaction)
    - Biology, Psychology, and the Self-Control
    - Building on Psychology and Biology: Crime Over the Life Course
    - Learning, Labeling, and Social Control
- Structural Production: Institutions, Space, and Crime
    - Classical Strain Theories and Criminal Subcultures
    - From Human Ecology to Collective Efficacy
    - Contemporary Strain Theories and the Cultural Perspective
- Critical Criminologies
    - Capitalism and Crime: Marxist Perspectives
    - Gender, Sexuality, and Criminality
    - Critical Race Perspectives on Crime and Punishment

Requirements and Grading

This is a seminar course meeting once weekly. Students are expected to come to class with their readings completed and should be ready to actively participate in group discussions. Recommended readings are *not* required but may be of interest to students who find a particular week especially intriguing or who are considering graduate studies in criminology.

Additionally, students will be required to complete weekly written reflections for each theory week (Weeks 3-12). These reflections should:

- be at least one page, single-spaced, TNR 12pt. font
- be written in complete sentences with correct grammar and spelling
- answer the following four guiding questions with reference to the week's readings:
    - Where does crime originate?
    - How do we test this theory?
    - What is the evidence for this theory?
    - What is missing from this picture?

The most successful students will write their initial reflections prior to class, then make additions based on lecture and class discussion before submitting the reflection. Reflections that only regurgitate lecture content will not earn high grades.

Students will also complete a midterm and final assignment. For each of these assignments, students will have two options: writing a 5-page research proposal based on one of the topics covered in the previous six weeks of the course *or* writing a 5-page crime prevention proposal based on one of the topics covered in the previous six weeks of the course. More detailed instructions for each assignment will be distributed later in the semester.

Grading Distribution

Student's grades will be determined as follows:

- 10 weekly reading reflections 30 points (3 points each)
- Midterm assignment 30 points
- Final assignment 30 points
- Attendance and participation: 10 points

Letter grades will be based on the following cutoffs:

- A: 90.0 points and higher
- B: 80.0 to 89.9 points
- C: 70.0 to 79.9 points
- D: 60.0 to 69.9 points
- F: 59.9 points and lower

Final grades will be rounded to the nearest tenth (i.e. an 89.96 will be rounded to 90.0).

Week 1

Introduction to Crime and Theory: Empirical Realities and Defining Theory

Assigned Readings:[1]

Crime as Socially Produced:

Becker, Howard S. 1963. "Outsiders." Pp. 1-18. In *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. The Free Press.

Trends:

Snipes, Jeffrey B., Thomas J. Bernard, and Alexander L. Gerould, eds. 2019. "Theory and Crime" and "Theory and Policy in Context." Pp. 1-11; 14-33. In *Vold's Theoretical Criminology*. 8th. Oxford University Press.

Kohler-Hausmann, Issa. 2019. "The Rise of Mass Misdemeanors." Pp. 25-59. In *Misdemeanorland: Criminal Courts and Social Control in an Age of Broken Windows Policing*. Princeton University Press.

Race, Age, and Gender:

Hirschi, Travis, and Michael Gottfredson. 1983. "Age and the Explanation of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 89(3):552–84.

Steffensmeier, Darrell, Hua Zhong, Jeff Ackerman, Jennifer Schwartz, and Suzanne Agha. 2006. "Gender Gap Trends for Violent Crimes, 1980 to 2003: A UCR-NCVS Comparison." *Feminist Criminology* 1(1):72–98.

Bronner, Laura. 2020. "Why Statistics Don't Capture The Full Extent Of The Systemic Bias In Policing." FiveThirtyEight. Retrieved December 2, 2020 (https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-statistics-dont-capture-the-full-extent-of-the-systemic-bias-in-policing/).

Recommended Readings:

One or more articles linked in the FiveThirtyEight reading.

Gramlich, John. 2020. "What the Data Says (and Doesn't Say) about Crime in the United States." Pew Research Center. Retrieved December 2, 2020 (https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/11/20/facts-about-crime-in-the-u-s/).

Lee, James. 2017. "How to Read Academic Papers without Freaking Out." Medium. Retrieved December 2, 2020 (https://medium.com/ai-saturdays/how-to-read-academic-papers-without-freaking-out-3f7ef43a070f).

[1] Any work referenced in the "Rationale" sections of this syllabus that was not cited in that week's reading sections is cited at the end of this syllabus.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Critically consider the ways we define crime.
2. Identify key historical trends in crime, with a special focus on New York City, the crime decline, and Broken Windows Policing.
3. Describe key demographic trends in crime that reflect both actual rates of criminal activity and bias in the criminal justice system.

Readings:

We begin this week by briefly addressing the concept of crime itself. While the definition of crime is something we will complicate many times over throughout the semester, Becker's (1963) discussion of the social production of deviance serves as our first opportunity to understand crime as something more complex than an evil act or an intentional violation of the law. Of course, Becker's (1963) intention is specifically to set up the labelling theory of deviance (a topic we will cover later in the course). However, my intention with this reading is not to push students towards the labeling perspective. Rather, the Becker (1963) reading is an opportunity to shift students' analytical focus away from pre-existing, individualized, and stereotypical notions of the criminal person and towards a *sociological* understanding of crime as a complex process situated in a complicated social world. We will read Becker's (1963) argument that social groups create deviance by making and applying rules not as an entry point into the idea that labels can produce further criminality, but as a reminder that the laws that define criminality are themselves the products of social, historical, and political circumstances. In doing so, we will also gain our first entry point into the critical understandings of crime and justice I hope to weave in throughout the course. In the latter part of the chapter, Becker (1963) addresses the question of who sets rules. He makes it clear that the power to set rules comes from political and economic power- an argument that will lay our groundwork for future discussions of class, race, gender, and law.

From there, we move on to the empirical realities of crime. There are certain empirical trends with which the various criminological theories we will cover must reckon, and one of my goals for this course is for students to be able to use empirical data to assess theoretical validity. We thus begin with a reading from *Vold's Theoretical Criminology* that defines theories as falsifiabe statements about the relationship between observable phenomena. This reading also introduces students to the notion that theories of crime can be sorted into three categories: individual, structural, and behavior-of-the-law theories. This tripartite structure is not totally divorced from the structure of the class- I label theories individual/interactional, institutional, and critical. Even so, I include this portion of the chapter not for the theoretical overview it offers but for the empirical assertions it lists in relation to each category of theories: for example, that masculine gender roles are associated with criminal behavior, that neighborhoods with high unemployment and residential mobility tend to have higher crime rates, and that criminal punishment may increase when the solidarity of a society is threatened.

The remaining readings each build on the first *Vold's* reading by establishing more general trends in crime to which students can return throughout the semester. The first three emphasize historical trends, while the latter three look to demographic trends. In the second *Vold's* reading, the authors track the wave of crime that began in the 1960s and peaked in the early 1990s, then discuss the subsequent and lasting decline in crime. For both trends, they discuss and assess several competing explanations. My goal here is not for students to recite those explanations- an entire class could be taught on the crime decline alone. Instead, these discussions serve as an introduction to some broad, important concepts and debates- the concept of 'superpredators,' debates over prison spending and expansion, and the effect of the economy on crime- and an example of how empirical evidence can be used to assess theoretical claims. The final section of the chapter focuses directly on New York City. Here, Kohler-Hausmann's (2019) chapter picks up the narrative thread. Kohler-Hausmann (2019) focuses primarily on Broken Windows policing and its effects on misdemeanor arrests. In the process, she outlines the differences between felony and misdemeanors, emphasizes the rising levels of legal system involvement that came with Broken Windows policing, and (importantly) shows that misdemeanor enforcement was unequally distributed across demographic groups. For the purposes of this class, her reading will help students understand the differences between misdemeanors and felonies, the importance of misdemeanors as a field of study, the distinctive history of policing in New York City, and the inequalities in criminal justice involvement that persist historically and nationally.

The remaining readings continue Kohler-Hausmann's (2019) emphasis on demographics. The piece by Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) makes and defends the argument that there is an invariant age trend in crime. Crime is highly concentrated in adolescence and young adulthood. Their rigorous defense of this claim makes the paper useful for introducing students to the age-crime trend, but it is also worth noting that Hirsch and Gottfredson (1983) specifically claim that the invariance of the age-crime trend makes it unnecessary for theories to explain the relationship between age and crime. Age simply has a direct effect on crime that we must take for granted. I disagree with this claim to an extent, as I believe assessing the ability of existing theories to explain the age-crime trend is a useful way of assessing theoretical value and the existence of a direct age-crime effect. Thus, I present age (along with race and gender) to students as a crime-relevant demographic characteristic that ought to be considered in evaluating theories.

Finally, we turn to gender and race. In the Steffensmeier et al. (2006) reading, the authors sought to compare trends in the male-female violence gap in both UCR and NCVS data. While we will discuss the differences in these datasets in more detail in Week 2, the authors do a good job of distinguishing between the types of information contained in each dataset and using those differences to argue that the gender gap in violence has persisted despite apparent increases in the number of females arrested for violent crime. This article thus serves as a brief introduction to the gender gap in crime. In contrast, the Bronner (2020) article outlines a racial gap in *policing.* I selected this article because the author draws on a literature too large for students to read in one week to show that Black citizens face unequal outcomes at every stage of the criminal justice process. In doing so, she demonstrates that the apparent racial gap in crime is not reflective of trends in who commits crime (as the gender gap is, based on victimization surveys), but rather reflects racial inequality in the criminal justice system.

Week 2

Introduction to Crime and Theory: Essential Research Methods in Criminology

Assigned Readings:

Gadd, David, Susanne Karstedt, and Steven Messner. 2012. "Editorial Introduction." Pp. 1-8. In *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Quantitative Methods:

Lauritsen, Janet L., Maribeth L. Rezey, and Karen Heimer. 2016. "When Choice of Data Matters: Analyses of U.S. Crime Trends, 1973–2012." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 32(3):335–55.

Strom, Kevin J., and Erica L. Smith. 2017. "The Future of Crime Data: The case for the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) as a primary data source for policy evaluation and crime analysis." *Criminology & Public Policy* 16(4):1027–48.

Eisner, Manuel, Tina Malti, and Denis Ribeaud. 2012. "Large-Scale Criminological Field Experiments." Pp. 410–24. In *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*, edited by D. Gadd, S. Karstedt, and S. F. Messner. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Qualitative Methods:

Goffman, Alice. 2014. "A Methodological Note." Pp. 213-263. In *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. The University of Chicago Press.

Contreras, Randol. 2013. "Preface" and "Introduction." Pp. xv-xix; 1-32. In *The Stickup Kids: Race, Drugs, Violence, and the American Dream.* The University of California Press.

Recommended Readings:

Berg, Mark T., and Janet L. Lauritsen. 2016. "Telling a Similar Story Twice? NCVS/UCR Convergence in Serious Violent Crime Rates in Rural, Suburban, and Urban Places (1973–2010)." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 32(1):61–87.

Chancer, Lynn, and Michael Jacobson. 2016. "From Darling to Demon: In and Beyond Goffman's 'On the Run'." *Sociological Forum* 31(1):241–49.

Mason, Gail, and Julie Stubbs. 2012. "Feminist Approaches to Criminological Research." Pp. 486–99. In *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*, edited by D. Gadd, S. Karstedt, and S. F. Messner. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Rios, Victor M. 2011. "Dreams Deferred" and "Appendix." Pp. 3-23; 169-174. *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York University Press.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Identify some of the key challenges in studying crime.
2. Compare and contrast quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of crime.
3. Describe the differences between and limitations of three major sources of crime data: the UCR, the NCVS, and NIBRS.
4. Discuss the complexity of studying crime through ethnographic methods.

Readings:

We begin this week with Gadd et al.'s (2012) introduction to *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods* for two reasons. First, the authors outline the importance of method in criminology by pointing out that

> "…criminology's subject matter–crime, criminality, victimization and social control–are currently all so densely political that criminologists who want their research to be taken seriously have always to be ready to explain in the public arena how they know what they claim to know, and why their claims to expertise are to be trusted more than those advanced by journalists, politicians or members of the public." (1)

The ensuing discussion emphasizes that criminologists face a high burden of truth due to the public's (and, likely, students' own) propensity for commonsensical analyses of crime. From here, they then set up the contradictory challenge that criminologists face: studying crime is difficult because it is by definition illicit activity, involves a dizzying range of behaviors and phenomena, necessitates attention to multiple levels of analysis, and (partially due to the previous three challenges) relies on inherently messy, often disorganized data. Thus, this reading sets up a tension we will see to unpack together. How do criminologists make claims to knowledge about a messy, complicated, politicized topic?

Teaching students the full range of research methods is beyond the scope of this class. So, to answer this question, we will discuss in lecture the difference between quantitative and qualitative methods and the various forms each can take. Our readings, meanwhile, focus on one topic in each category. For quantitative methods, we focus on analyses of official crime data taken from three major data sources: the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), and the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NBRS). In the first quantitative reading, Lauritsen, Rezey, and Heimer (2015) compare crime data from the UCR and NCVS over the period 1973-2012. They show that long-term trends in robbery, burglary, and motor vehicle theft are consistent across the two sources, but that the two diverge for serious violent crimes. In class, we will use this reading as the basis of a discussion about the different methods employed by the two data sources and the various reasons that self-report victimization surveys (like the NCVS) may be a better measure of certain crimes (especially rape) than official law enforcement data (like the UCR).

Strom and Smith (2017) then introduce a third data source: NIBRS. Unlike the UCR, which measures crime at the jurisdictional level and omits many important types of crime (crimes against children, firearm violence, etc.), NIBRS provide detailed data on *incidents* of crime. Incidents can be mapped to geographies without the aggregation/disaggregation challenges posed by jurisdictional reporting, and the level of detail contained in incident reports allows for more creative and detailed analyses of crime. However, the NIBRS is not yet universal and does not contain historical data- in class we will discuss the complexity of transitioning reporting systems and the implications for criminological research.

The third quantitative reading is intended to be a "best practices" guide to conducting large-scale field experiments (Eisner, Malti, Ribeaud 2012). The purpose of this reading is not to require students to learn these best practices. Instead, it will serve as the foundation for a brief discussion about the issue of causality in criminological research. We will discuss the difference between correlation and causation (first introduced in Week One's readings) and the reason experiments allow criminologists to make causal claims when observational data do not.[2] The goal of this conversation will be for students to understand that making specific causal claims in criminology is difficult (though not impossible), and that non-causal claims are acceptable but should be understood as persuasive or suggestive rather than determinative.

Next, we move to qualitative methods. In my experience, ethnography is an easy concept for students to intuitively grasp (though the actual doing of ethnography is usually more difficult and nuanced than they expect). The qualitative methods readings are intended to introduce students to some of the actual *doing* of ethnography and to the challenges ethnographers of crime face. Goffman's (2014) methodological note details her experiences gaining entrée to her field site with special attention to the way gender, perceived sexuality, and her status as a privileged white woman affected her negotiations and experiences. She also describes the various techniques she used in the field and adopts a remarkable honesty about the mistakes she made and challenges she stumbled over. In doing so, she makes ethnography intelligible as a difficult, learned practice rather than the mysterious, cool academic endeavor it sometimes looks like in the highly polished works we read. More importantly, however, Goffman's (2012) note exposes students to the emotional realities of doing ethnography with criminal and criminalized people. She writes about way traumas witnessed in the field affected her in academic settings, about the fear of white men she acquired from her informants, and about her (infamous, in sociological circles) experience riding along with an informant in search of revenge for a deadly shooting. These are uncomfortable realities of fieldwork that will provide us with an opportunity to discuss the ways in which research must try to balance their academic work with deep, intimate, emotional involvement in the field.

After Goffman (2012), Contreras (2013) offers a different perspective on ethnographies of crime. Unlike Goffman, Contreras is an 'insider.' The men he studies are childhood friends and acquaintances of his, and in the preface to his book he writes about his own experiences trying to sell crack as a young man. Like Goffman, Contreras (2013) offers some insight into the doing of

[2] There are certain identification strategies that can be used to make causal claims in criminology, including the use of natural experiments. However, these methods are beyond the scope of an undergraduate theory course.

fieldwork. He writes, for example, about the social role his recorder took on during his fieldwork (13). The greater contribution of this reading, however, is his grappling with difficult decisions. He writes about the challenges, ethical and academic, of depicting violence and humanizing those who perpetrate it, in balancing structural explanations for crime with the brutal reality of *joloperos.* He describes his struggles with in-the-field desensitization to violence and after-the-fact horror at the torture his respondents bragged about. Like Goffman's experiences with trauma and emotion, these are difficult realities with which ethnographers of crime must grapple. They provide a valuable opportunity for students to discuss the ethical duties of an ethnographer to their audience and to their informants.

Finally, Contreras (2013) also offers important insight into the doing of ethnography as a member of marginalized populations. In writing about his fears for his career, his "standpoint crisis" (19), he both introduces students to the challenge of objectivity that ethnographers face and the reality that the very notion of objectivity is racialized and rooted in privilege in ways that threaten marginalized academics. This is a perspective rarely considered in introductions to ethnography, but I consider it imperative to help students understand that the white/male experience of ethnography is not universal.

Crime Internalized: The Individual (in Interaction)
Week 3

Rationalizing Crime: Deterrence, Rational Choice, and Routine Activities

Assigned Readings:

Deterrence and Rational Choice:

Beccaria, Cesare. 1801. *An Essay on Crimes and Punishments with the Commentary by Voltaire*. 5th ed. London: E. Hodson.

Selections:

- "Of the Origin of Punishments," "Of the Right to Punish," "Consequences of the foregoing Principles," "Of the Interpretation of Laws," "Of the Proportion between Crimes and Punishments" Pp.1-25.
- "Of the Intent of Punishments" Pp. 41-42.
- "Of the Advantage of immediate Punishment" Pp. 72-76.
- "Of the Mildness of Punishments," "Of the Punishment of Death" Pp. 94-112.
- "Of the Means of preventing Crimes" Pp. 155-158.

Becker, Gary S. 1968. "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach." Pp. 13–68. In *The economic dimensions of crime*. London: Palgrave Macmillian.

Nagin, Daniel S. 2013. "Deterrence: A Review of the Evidence by a Criminologist for Economists." *Annual Review of Economics* 5(1):83–105.

Fratello, Jennifer, Andres F. Rengifo, and Jennifer Trone. 2013. "Overview" and "Findings." Pp. 8-21. In *Coming of Age with Stop and Frisk: Experiences, Self-Perceptions, and Public Safety Implications*. Vera Institute of Justice.

Routine Activities:

Felson, Marcus, and Rachel Boba. 2010. "Chemistry for Crime," "Crime Decisions." Pp. 25-48; 49-65. In *Crime and Everyday Life*. 4th ed. SAGE.

Recommended Readings:

Cohen, Lawrence E., and Marcus Felson. 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44(4):588. doi: 10.2307/2094589.

Felson, Marcus, and Rachel Boba. 2010. "Situational Crime Prevention." Pp. 177-201. In *Crime and Everyday Life*. 4th ed. SAGE.

Jacob, Anupama. 2011. "Economic Theories of Crime and Delinquency." *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 21(3):270–83.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Discuss theories that frame crime as a rational choice made by weighing some anticipated benefit against perceived risk and severity of punishment.
2. Understand the concept of deterrence and the ways it differs from retributive justice.
3. Use the routine activities framework to consider forms of deterrence that target elements of crime *other* than the offender's cost-benefit analysis.

Readings:

Deterrence is the overarching theme of this week. In exploring the concept of deterrence, we will engage with both rational choice theories of criminal offending and the routine activities perspective- itself a rational choice perspective, but one that identifies opportunities for deterrence that go beyond the criminal offender themselves. We begin with Beccaria's (1801) writings on crime and the meaning of punishment. In the selections assigned, Beccaria (1801) argues, philosophically and theoretically, that the right to punish extends only to punishment-as-crime-prevention. Punishment should serve as deterrence rather than retribution. In doing so, he lays out two key prescriptions for deterrence that continue to have theoretical relevance today. First, laws and the punishments associated with their violation should be known. Second, the deterrent power of a punishment depends on that punishment's swiftness, severity, and certainty. Third, punishments should be only as harsh as is needed to achieve deterrence. The selection on the death penalty, included in our assigned readings, illustrates these positions in a way that should help students understand the key differences between Beccaria's perspective and more retributive understandings of punishment.

Beccaria's (1801) theory of deterrence implicitly rests on the assumption that criminals are rational people. Therefore, we move from his writing to Becker's (1968) analysis of crime. This article is a classic example of hyper-rationalized criminological theory. In it, the criminal is considered to be a strictly rational being who decides to commit a given criminal act (or not) based on a cost-benefit analysis that weighs the anticipated (economic) benefits of that act against the likelihood and cost of punishment. In lecture, I will supplement this example with a review of the softening of the economic-rational perspective. Jacob's (2011) review (recommended but not required) points out that economists have built on Becker's (1968) work by taking into consideration complicating factors like present-versus-future orientation or the social conditions (relative deprivation, political context, etc.) that may shape or constrain the decision-making process. Ultimately, however, students should understand that even these more-sophisticated economic perspectives assume criminality is fundamentally a rational choice that takes into account the possibility and cost of punishment.

This assumed rationality returns us to the issue of deterrence. Nagin's (2013) review offers insight into the actual effectiveness of various forms of deterrence and does so by working within a theoretical framework that draws directly on Beccaria's (1801) elements of deterrence (swiftness, severity, and certainty) and Becker's (1968) economic theory. He concludes that evidence for the deterrent effect of prisons is mixed and there is no evidence for a deterrent

effect from the death penalty. Police presence does appear to have a real deterrent effect, but Nagin (2013) complicates this finding by pointing out that the literature offers no real insight into how police presence mitigates crime. Is the mechanism sheer presence, or a specific practice? We further complicated this finding by turning to the Fratello et al.'s (2013) report for the Vera Institute, which highlights the fact that certain high-presence police practices (stop-and-frisk) unfairly target minority men and youth and ultimately dissuade targeted populations from going to the police to report crime in the future.

We turn last to the routine activities perspective (Cohen and Boba 2010; Cohen and Felson 1979). In their original article (recommended by not required), Cohen and Felson (1979) focused specifically on the structural level of analysis. They argued that crime increased in the post-WWII period despite increasing quality of life because the bulk of human activity moved outside the household. This increased the co-presence of three necessary components of crime: a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of capable guardians. While this framework can be useful in assessing other theories of crime, Cohen and Boba (2010) assume that criminal offenders are rational actors making rational (from the perspective of the offender in a specific moment of action) choices. In fact, the rationality assumption is implicit to the entire perspective, given its sensitivity to the presence of capable guardians. Thus, the assigned readings offer additional rational choice-based theoretical understandings of crime. However, in adding to the rational offender the necessary elements of a suitable target and absent capable guardian, the authors turn our attention to other ways in which crime can be deterred. While the previous readings focused us on the ways punishment can change the balance of rational criminal offenders' cost-benefit analyses, the routine activities perspective will help students consider the ways we can adopt deterrence-based policies that focus on reducing the co-presence of the motivated offender with a target or an absent guardian. In lecture, we will draw examples of such deterrence-based approaches from the "Situational Crime Prevention" chapter (recommended but not required.

Crime Internalized: The Individual (in Interaction)
Week 4

Biology, Psychology, and the Self-Control

Assigned Readings:

Biology:

Fishbein, Diana. 2001. Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. Pp. 19-78. *Biobehavioral Perspectives in Criminology*. Wadsworth.

Psychology:

Wortley, Richard. 2011. Chapter 5 and Chapter 8. Pp.90-114; 162-184. In: Psychological Criminology: An Integrative Approach. Willan Publishing.

Gadd, David, and Tony Jefferson. 2007. "Feminism, Ambivalence, and Date Rape," and "Vulnerability, Violence and Serial Murder: The Case of Jeffrey Dahmer." Pp. 69-104. In: *Psychosocial Criminology*. Sage Publications.

- Focus on the case studies in each chapter

Self-Control:

Gottfredson, Michael R., and Travis Hirschi. 1990. "The Nature of Criminality: Low Self-Control." Pp. 85-120. In: *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford University Press.

Burt, Callie H. 2020. "Self-Control and Crime: Beyond Gottfredson & Hirschi's Theory." *Annual Review of Criminology* 3(1):43–73.

Recommended Readings:

Fishbein, Diana. 2001. Chapter 6. Pp. 79-95. In *Biobehavioral Perspectives in Criminology*. Wadsworth.

Raine, Adrian. 2013. "The Future: Where Will Neurocriminology Take Us?." Pp. 329-73. In: *The Anatomy of Violence: The Biological Roots of Crime.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Pratt, Travis C., and Francis T. Cullen. 2000. "The Empirical Status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime: A Meta-Analysis." *Criminology* 38(3):931–64.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Review (at a broad level) biological and psychological perspectives on criminology, with attention to the intersections of the two and the influence of environment on both.

2. Discuss the interaction between social and structural conditions and psychological and/or biological variables.
3. Understand Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of self-control as originally written and as it currently stands in the literature.

Readings:

Psychological and biological perspectives on crime are difficult to cover as succinctly as other theories of crime because the literature that comprises each of these subfields is extensive, methodologically diverse, and requires familiarity with scientific principles in biology and psychology. As a result, this week we are not relying on original research as much as we will in other weeks. Instead, we draw on two well-written and comprehensive textbooks to introduce us to the psychological and biological perspectives. Due to the considerable overlap between psychological and biological perspectives (at the level of neurology), I have selected chapters from each book with the aim of reducing the amount of repeated material.

Biology is, in many ways, the root of psychology. Because biological perspectives on crime pay attention to neurological processes and patterns that psychologists build on, we start this week's readings with the biological perspective. Fishbein's (2001) textbook is useful because the chapters selected cover three clearly delineated and important areas of biological research on crime: evolution and genetics, brain chemistry and function, and the interaction of biological and socio-environmental variables. The first assigned chapter begins with evolutionary theories, and Fishbein (2001) connects each theory to outcomes and traits associated with criminality. The bulk of the chapter, however, is devoted to genetics and the heritability of personality traits or biological patterns conducive to criminality. The next chapter focuses on brain chemistry and functioning, with special attention paid to neurotransmitters, hormones, and their ability to 'nudge' people towards antisocial behaviors. After a similar discussion of the central nervous system as a whole, we transition to the chapter on socio-environmental contexts. Here, Fishbein's (2001) important claim is that biological research on crime has moved well beyond the nature *vs* nurture debate and generally accepts that nature and nurture work in concert to shape human behavior. Her emphasis on this nature *and* nurture perspective will help students build a more nuanced understanding of biology and crime.

The chapters from Wortley (2011) were selected for their clear and thorough discussion of personality and cognition research. While they are not detailed literature reviews, they offer an accessible summary of the chief concerns and claims made by psychologists studying crime. The personality chapter builds up from research on biological predispositions to traits to the study of human attributes and crime. This reading is extremely useful for students of criminology because Wortley (2011) reviews issues in psychology like the definition and stability of personality and methodologies for identifying key traits. He then reviews research that takes two approaches to exploring the relationships between personality and crime: the single-trait approach Eysenck's super-trat theory. Finally, he devotes the end of the chapter to a discussion of anti-social personality disorder and crime.

In the chapter on cognition, Wortley (2011) once again grounds the topic in psychological research more generally and offers a summary of cognitive psychology's development and key concepts. He then returns to the issue of offender cognition. He begins here with rational choice perspectives that hearken back to the previous week's topics. However, the psychological perspective also complicates the rational choice perspective by adding attention to human cognitive processes like reliance on schemas and scripts. Wortley (2011) focuses mostly on the notion of a criminal script, but his summary of schema theory will be useful for discussing psychology's complicating of the rational choice perspective in class discussions.

To supplement Wortley's (2011) chapters, I also assign two chapters from Gadd and Jefferson's (2007) *Psychosocial Criminology*. The psychosocial perspective is not particularly intuitive for students to grasp, and Gadd and Jefferson (2007) do the novice reader no favors in their introductory justification of psychosocial criminology. Rather than force students to slog through high-level theoretical justifications, I have assigned two of the case studies that Gadd and Jefferson (2007) review in their book: the case study on rape and the case study on Dahmer. My hope is that seeing psychosocial analyses in action will help students come to understand that the psychosocial perspective is sensitized to criminal offenders' inner worlds as shaped by social discourses and past experiences. Conflict, threat, or tension in those inner worlds may result in criminal offending. We will try to reach this conclusion through discussion of the case studies in class.

Finally, we turn to Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) self-control theory of crime. This perspective fits neatly into the week on biology and psychology for two reasons. First, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) present self-control as a stable, individual attribute. As such, their perspective shares much in common with the thinking of personality psychologists. Second, they emphasize that self-control is not solely a predictor of crime. Instead, it predicts a range of behaviors that includes crime. These behaviors also include smoking, drinking, and similar activities. In this way, the theory's treatment of crime is similar to the treatment of crime in biological and psychological research.

Students should take three key points from the Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) reading. First, the concept of self-control was developed to distinguish criminals and non-criminals. As such, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) outline the characteristics of crime and argue that the only key difference between criminals and non-criminals is, basically, susceptibility to the temptations of crime. They label this susceptibility self-control. Second, students should understand that (as discussed in the previous paragraph) low self-control is related to more outcomes than merely crime. This is one of the key aspects of the theory that prevent its logic from becoming totally circular. Finally, students should be able to identify some of the childhood factors Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) believe affect self-control, including aspects of the child-rearing and educational processes.

Self-control theory has been extremely influential in criminology and has generated extensive research in the thirty years since it was published. In light of this, the final assigned reading is Burt's (2020) review of self-control theory. Burt (2020) acknowledges the dominance of self-control theory in criminology, but also draws on self-control research in other disciplines to

argue that the time has come for criminologists to embrace further theoretical development. Her review thus offers two useful elements for our purposes. The first is her review of self-control theory research in the past thirty years. It is an admittedly critical review, but I believe the critical perspective is important precisely because of self-control theory's dominance. Burt (2020) admits, for example, that there is strong empirical support for the correlation between self-control and crime, but points out that the when, how, and why of that association remain unknown. She also points out that certain assumptions of self-control theory are untenable, including the assumptions of invariant motivation and unplanned crime. She recommends that criminologists address these flaws by integrating modern psychological self-control research. This critique and recommendation should help students understand the modern standing and potential of self-control theory.

Crime Internalized: The Individual (in Interaction)
Week 5

Building on Psychology and Biology: Crime Over the Life Course

Assigned Readings:

Moffitt, Terrie E. 1993. "Adolescence-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Antisocial Behavior: A Developmental Taxonomy." *Psychological Review* 100(4):674–701.

Sampson, Robert J., and John H. Laub. 1993. "Toward an Age-graded Theory of Informal Social Control" and "Adult Social Bonds and Change in Criminal Behavior." Pp. 5-24; 139-178. In: *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Harvard University Press.

Laub, John H., and Robert J. Sampson. 2003. "Why Some Offenders Stop" **OR** "Why Some Offenders Persist." Pp. 114-195. In: *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Harvard University Press.

Maruna, Shadd. 2001. "Introduction" and "Making good: The rhetoric of redemption." Pp. 1-19; 85-108. In: *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. American Psychological Association.

Recommended Readings:

Sampson, Robert J., and John H. Laub. 1993. "The Family Context of Juvenile Delinquency" and "The Role of School, Peers, and Siblings." Pp. 64-122. In: *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Harvard University Press.

Laub, John H., and Robert J. Sampson. 2003. "Zigzag Criminal Careers." Pp. 196-249. In: *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Harvard University Press.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Describe the stability of criminality and antisocial behavior through the life course.
2. Analyze the role that social bonds play in criminal desistance and/or persistence.
3. Analyze the role personal narratives play in criminal desistance and/or persistence.
4. Compare and contrast biological/psychological and social or phenomenological theories of criminal persistence/desistance.

Readings:

This week marks the beginning of a shift in the course from exploring crime as something that originates within the individual (in their choices, biology, or psychology) to understanding crime as a phenomenon shaped by social structure. Our focus remains primarily on the individual for this week and next week, but instead of studying the individual in near-isolation we will explore

how individuals' *interactions* with the social world shape their propensity for crime. The life course perspective provides a natural bridge between theories already covered and later, more structural perspectives because it directly links psychological and biological perspectives with social perspectives.

We start with Moffitt's (1993) discussion of adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent offenders. This article presents students with a key contradiction in criminological research on crime and age: adult offenders show remarkable stability in their offending (and other antisocial behavior) over time, but crime is extremely common in delinquency. According to Moffitt (1993), this suggests that a significant body of criminal offenders commit crimes only in adolescence, while a small group of offenders continues to commit crimes throughout the life course. The former group is labeled adolescence-limited offenders. The latter is labeled life-course-persistent. Moffitt (1993) argues that adolescent offending is explained by the mismatch between adolescents' biological maturity and social immaturity and by the influence of delinquent peers. As adult roles become available to adolescents the pressures of the biological-social maturity gap lessen. Most teens then desist from crime. Life-course-persistent offenders, on the other hand, suffer from neuropsychological deficits and childhood experiences in criminogenic environments. The combination of these factors sets them on self-reinforcing criminal life course.

Sampson and Laub (1993), however, argue that the stability and inevitability of adulthood antisocial behavior and criminality are overstated in the life course literature. Adult desistance *is* possible and can in fact be explained by mechanisms that also explain adolescent desistance. According to Sampson and Laub (1993), desistance is driven by social bonds to institutions of informal and formal social control. For children, institutions like school and family impose social control. Adults, on the other hand, form (or fail to form) bonds to institutions like work, marriage, or family. The formation of new bonds, like a new job, new marriage, or new family, can serve as turning points that shift adult criminal trajectories. (Note that the emphasis on bonds to social institutions is a fundamental shift away from Moffitt's biological/neurobiological framework.) They further and refine this argument in their later work (Laub and Sampson 2003), where they examine offender life histories to identify turning points that encouraged desistance or life conditions that enabled persistence. The two chapters assigned from that work do not offer major developments in the theory proposed in their earlier work, but will be highly illustrative for students thanks to their focus on qualitative research backed by quantitative analysis.

At the meta-level, these two readings should be seen a pivot in the course. While environmental factors played a role in biological and psychological theories of crime, Sampson and Laub's (1993; 2003) work on adulthood desistance is the first work reviewed in the course that turns our attention to institutions in a meaningful way. In considering the likelihood of and opportunities for desistance, we start to engage with issues like the availability of work or marriage partners. Our focus remains on the individual- the determinant of criminal behavior in this theory is individual circumstance- but later we will look at these institutional factors at the level of neighborhoods and communities.

Finally, we build on Sampson and Laub's (1993; 2003) work by turning to Maruna's (2001) work on *narratives* of desistance. Maruna's (2001) arguments are generally consistent with what we have read so far: access and connections to stabilizing institutions do matter for criminal desistance. Yet not every criminal offender who gets married, gets a job, or otherwise experiences a turning point will successfully desist. Maruna (2001) argues that offenders' life narratives help determine whether or not their desistance will 'stick.' Successful desistance depends on criminal offenders engaging in cognitive distortions that produce affirming life-narratives. In other words, successful desistance depends on the story that offenders can tell themselves and others about their move away from crime. This phenomenological analysis helps to explain variability in offenders' experiences with turning points. It also helps to establish what will be a recurring theme in the course: while criminologists often discuss criminal propensity in terms of objective, easy-to-measure *factors*, people's subjective experiences and meaning-making practices matter a great deal as well. We will return to this point several times in later weeks.

Crime Internalized: The Individual (in Interaction)
Week 6
Learning, Labeling, and Social Control

Assigned Readings:

Social Bonds:

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. "A Control Theory of Delinquency." Pp. 16-34. In: *Causes of Delinquency*. University of California Press.

Learning Theory:

Sutherland, Edwin. H., Donald R. Cressey, and David Luckenbill. 1995. "The theory of differential association." Pp. 64-68. In: *Deviance: A symbolic interactionist approach*.

Burgess, Robert L., and Ronald L. Akers. 1966. "A Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior." *Social Problems* 14(2):128–47.

Sykes, Gresham M., and David Matza. 1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22(6):664–70.

Becker, Howard S. 1963. "Becoming a Marihuana User." Pp. 41-58. In: *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. The Free Press.

Labeling Theory:

Goffman, Erving. 1963. "Stigma and Social Identity." Pp. 1-40. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. J. Aronson.

Becker, Howard S. 1963. "Kinds of Deviance: A Sequential Model." Pp. 19-40. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. The Free Press.

Lemert, Edwin M. 1967. "The Concept of Secondary Deviation." Pp. 40-66. In: *Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5):937–75.

Recommended Readings:

Braithwaite, John. 1989. *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.

Rios, Victor M. 2011. "The Labeling Hype: Coming of Age in the Era of Mass Incarceration." Pp. 43-73. In: *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York University Press.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Describe the social control theory.
2. Discuss learning and labelling theories in the context of social control theory. How do these theoretical perspectives claim that people escape social control?
3. Analyze the implications of a criminal label.

Readings:

I have assigned fewer readings (in terms of page count) this week than in other weeks because this week covers a substantial amount of theoretical ground. As such, I want to begin by summarizing the reason I put these three theoretical perspectives together. The control perspective assumes that impulses towards criminality are normal, but that the average person rarely acts on those impulses because of their bonds to ordered society. Learning and labelling theories of crime, meanwhile, are really about the circumstances that free someone from social control and make criminality permissible. Unlike subcultural theories we will cover later in the course, this freeing does not necessarily involve a wholesale substitution of the moral order. In fact, Sykes and Matza's (1967) theory of neutralization assumes that deviant actors *accept* the moral order and thus require neutralizations to justify and permit their actions. Similarly, the labelling perspective does not assume that criminal actors substitute a new moral order. Instead, they internalize the notion that they are a person who violates that order and act accordingly. Overall, then, the three theoretical perspectives discussed this week are joined by a common theme: they are concerned with the circumstances that prompt violations of an *accepted* moral order.

With that framework in mind, we can turn to the readings for the week. We begin with Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory. Instead of asking why people commit crimes, social control theorists ask why non-criminals do *not* commit crimes. For Hirschi (1969) delinquent acts occur when an actor's bonds to conventional society are weak or broken. He defines bonds as composed of attachment, involvement, and belief, and offers a detailed analysis of the two, but the main takeaway for students from this reading is that connections to the normal social order theoretically motivate people to avoid crime. In many ways, this reading serves as a useful bridge from the week prior. During the life course week, we discussed the ways bonds to social institutions enable desistance from crime. The social control perspective (which we will return to in our later discussions of collective efficacy) explores the way bonds to the social order prevent crime entirely.

Next we turn to learning theories of crime. How does someone who defaults to non-criminality, someone with solid bonds to a social order, become a criminal actor? The learning theory perspective argues that crime must be learned. The first two readings outline the learning process. Sutherland et al. (1995) argue that crime is learned through the same psychological mechanisms as any other activity. What makes this theoretical perspective distinct is the focus on differential association and definitions- according to Sutherland (1995), people exposed to more crime-positive definitions (or beliefs) than crime-negative beliefs will engage in criminal acts. Burgess and Akers (1966) refine Sutherland's theory. They argue that crime is specifically learned through operant conditioning, that criminal behaviors are reinforced by the responses of

relevant peer groups, and that it is crime-positive and crime-negative *norms* that people learn (rather than 'definitions.' a vague and undefined concept).

Sykes and Matza (1957) add to our understanding of the issue of norms/definitions. Their key contribution to learning theories of crime is to clarify what kinds of beliefs potential deviants learn to make delinquency permissible. Remember: learning theory does not necessarily assume that criminal actors learn an entirely new set of values. Instead, according to Sykes and Matza (1957), criminal actors acknowledge the 'wrongness' of their actions. They therefore must rely on learned scripts or 'neutralizations' that justify their actions. Sykes and Matza (1957) identify some of these scripts.

The final reading in the learning section is a brief selection from Becker (1963). This reading is intended to shed additional light on a second aspect of learning theories: the concept that the skills and techniques of criminal behavior must be learned. I selected this particular reading because it shows how a relatively common deviant act (indeed, one that is neither deviant nor even illegal in many places today) involves the learning of techniques, responses, and beliefs. It is worth noting here that, contrary to the points made earlier in this summary, Becker (1963) does discuss the ability of deviant communities to substitute the accepted moral order for a new one (see, for example, Becker 1963:78) for their own. We will be covering this notion of substituted values in our week on subcultures, so for now I have chosen to omit those elements of Becker's (1963) work in order to keep students focused on learning, labelling, and social control.

We turn next to labelling theory. Here, I begin with Goffman's (1963) classic work on stigma. Understanding the concept of stigma is essential to an adequate understanding of labelling, and Goffman's (1963) work is especially useful for his identification of the people who control stigma (such as professionals who make real and remind a person of their stigma) and secondary others whom stigma may affect (such as family members and spouses). To return our focus to crime, I use Becker (1963) and Lemert (1967) to outline labelling theory. Becker (1963) argues that being caught in a deviant act may result in a person being labelled, by themselves or others, as a deviant *person*. This labelling "exposes a person to the likelihood that he will be regarded as deviant or undesirable in other respects" (33) and creates a self-fulfilling prophecy through the mechanisms of social isolation and barriers to non-deviant success. Lemert (1967) offers a slight clarification of this process by identifying deviant acts as 'primary' or 'secondary.' Primary deviance may have various origins but does not necessarily have a profound impact on personal identity. This form of deviance, however, *can* lead to the application of stigmatizing labels. *Secondary* deviance results in response to societal reactions to primary deviance. Secondary deviance may be adaptive, as Becker (1963) argues, but Lemert (1967) also claims that labelling can produce a profound shift in self-identity. The labelled deviant sees themselves as a deviant person. He also draws on the learning perspective to argue that the consequences of labelling, such as imprisonment or ostracization from non-criminal groups, may lead to the learning of new criminal skills.

The final reading offers a look at labelling-in-action. Pager's (2003) landmark study on criminal records, race, and employment clearly demonstrates the power of criminal record 'labels.'

Perhaps more importantly, however, she also returns our attention to the issue of race. In her findings, Black job applicants labelled with a criminal record were the less likely than no-record Black applicants, no-record white applicants, *and* white applicants *with* a criminal record to be selected for employment. Examined in light of labelling theory, this study demonstrates the ways formal criminal labels excluded labelled people from participation in mainstream routes to success.

Structural Production: Institutions, Space, and Crime
Week 7

Classical Strain Theories and Criminal Subcultures

Assigned Readings:

Classical Strain Theories:

Durkheim, Emile. 1951. "Anomic Suicide." Pp. 241-276. In: *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. The Free Press.

Merton, Robert K. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3(5):672–82.

Cloward, Richard A. 1959. "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior." *American Sociological Review* 24(2):164–76.

Criminal Subcultures:

Cohen, Albert K. 1955. "Growing Up in a Class System" and "What the Delinquent Subculture Has to Offer." Pp. 73-137. In: *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. New York: The Free Press.

Cloward, Richard A., and Lloyd E. Ohlin. 1960. "The Evolution of Delinquent Subcultures," and "Illegitimate Means and Delinquent Subcultures." Pp. 108-160. In: *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: The Free Press.

Ethnographic Insights:

Anderson, Elijah. 1999. "Decent and Street Families." Pp 35-65. In: *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. W. W. Norton & Company.

OR

Rios, Victor M. 2011. "'Dummy Smart'" Misrecognition, Acting Out, and 'Going Dumb'." Pp. 97-123. In: *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York University Press.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Summarize early strain theories in the Mertonian tradition.
2. Describe the reasons youth form delinquent subcultures, according to the strain perspective.
3. Distinguish among early strain theories in terms of the values delinquent youth are presumed to hold.

Readings:

This week we begin looking at criminological theories that are primarily concerned with social structure over individual experience. Students should keep in mind as we move forward that these theories are not totally unconcerned with the individual. In fact, as we will see when we turn to contemporary strain theories, individuals still matter a great deal. However, the theories covered in the second third of the course consider structural and spatial factors to play a primary role in the genesis of crime. Rather than focusing on individuals moving through and building connections to the world, these theories tend to imagine the individual as buffeted by social forces beyond their control. This week we are primarily tracing the historical development of these perspectives.

We begin with what classical strain theories. The first reading for this week introduces the concept of *anomie* (Durkheim 1951). I begin with this reading rather than Merton (1938) for two reasons. First, understanding anomie as posited by Durkheim makes it easier to understand the way the concept has been build upon and defined in various later theories. More importantly, however, Durkheim's focus on suicide introduces a key theme for this section of the course: the emotional experience of structural conditions. It is easy for structural theories of crime to be misinterpreted as totally deterministic, but we will find in each of our three weeks on structural theories that emotions play a key role in the genesis of crime. We will see that structural exclusion is frustrating or defeating, that the fear of crime breaks down community bonds, and that anger or humiliation resulting from structural inequality are powerful potential motivators of crime.

From Durkheim (1951) we move on to Merton's (1938) theory of crime and deviance. Merton (1938) presents what I refer to as the classical strain theory of crime. People living in a society are exposed to culturally valued goals and culturally accepted means of achieving those goals. However, Merton (1938) points out that structural inequality distributes acceptable means unevenly across society. People who are blocked from standard pathways to success may respond by accepting or rejecting cultural goals and acceptable means. Those who accept cultural goals but reject acceptable means are innovators. According to Merton (1938), many criminal actors fall into this subgroup. This theory is subject to several well-known weaknesses, including its failure to account for crime among elites without considerable expansion and its inability to account for noneconomic crimes. The best-known early developments on this theory, however, did not move to resolve these issues. Instead, important early work bridged Merton's (1938) theory with other theoretical perspectives.

Cloward (1959), for example, linked Merton's theory of deviance to work in the learning tradition on the acquisition of criminal values and skills. Cloward (1959) argues that people can only adapt to structural exclusion from legitimate means by adopting illegitimate means *if those means are available to them*. He thus calls our attention to "illegal opportunity structure," which he argues "tend to emerge in lower-class areas only when stable patterns of accommodation and integration arise between the carriers of conventional and deviant values" (Cloward 1959:172). In other words, people must be able to learn crime and are only likely to have the opportunity to do so when local values are patterned to expose them to criminal learning opportunities.

Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) connect classical strain theory to the emergence of criminal youth subcultures. Both of the assigned readings share a similar core argument: young boys feel pressure to attain certain culturally defined standards of success, but not all boys are able to meet those standards. Some of those who are unable to meet those standards respond by forming delinquent subcultures that *reject* mainstream values and replace them with new, delinquent values. The key difference between these two readings is that Cohen (1955) has a more restrictive definition of the failure boys face than do Cloward and Ohlin (1960). Cohen (1955) argues that working-class boys face the pressure of middle-class values but are blocked from attaining those values by their class position. For Cloward and Ohlin (1960), on the other hand, the drive towards delinquency is located in a more Mertonian disjuncture between accepted goals and available means. They also continue Cloward's (1959) argument by emphasizing that the availability of illegitimate means varies throughout the social structure and therefore increases the probability of delinquent subcultures emerging in lower-class communities.

A key concept in the readings on subcultures is the substitution of new values for old ones. Criminal subcultures are assumed to have rejected mainstream values and embraced criminal ones entirely. Ethnographic research, however, complicates this claim considerably. Ethnographers consistently find an acceptance of mainstream goals among criminal subcultures (Anderson 1999; Bourgois 1995; Contreras 2013; Rios 2011). The last reading, a choice between Rios (2011) and Anderson (1999) is meant to help expose students to the complex reality of subcultural adaptations to exclusion. Anderson's (1999) work sorts families into 'decent' and 'street' orientations, but throughout the work he undermines his own dichotomy by pointing out that 'street' youth may nonetheless retain 'decent' values at home. 'Street' attitudes are a necessary adaptation for the avoidance of violence. Rios (2011) does not offer a typology of urban morality but does outline the way that youth adopt what could be called 'street' strategies out of self-defense. Participation in gangs is not a replacement of values among the youth Rios follows. It is a survival strategy. It is can also be an act of resistance an act of resistance. Both of these works thus complicate the theories of criminal subcultures put forth by Cohen (1955) and by Cloward and Ohlin (1960).

Structural Production: Institutions, Space, and Crime
Week 8

From Human Ecology to Collective Efficacy

Assigned Readings:

Evolving Perspectives on Neighborhood Effects:

Sampson, Robert J. 2012. "Neighborhood Effects: The Evolution of an Idea." Pp 31-49. In: *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, Clifford R., and Henry D. McKay. 1969. "Conclusion." Pp 315-326. In: *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Revised. The University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, William J. 1987. "Social Change and Social Dislocations in the Inner City." Pp. 20-62. In: *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. The University of Chicago Press.

Broken Windows and Collective Efficacy:

Wilson, James Q., and George R. Kelling. 1982. "Broken Windows: The Police And Neighborhood Safety." *The Atlantic*.

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277(5328):918–24.

Sampson, Robert J. 2012. "'Broken Windows' and the Meanings of Disorder" and "The Theory of Collective Efficacy." Pp. 121-178. In: *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. University of Chicago Press.

Sharkey, Patrick. 2018. "The Transformation of Urban Space." Pp. 72-99. In: *Uneasy Peace: The Great Crime Decline, the Renewal of City Life, and the Next War on Violence*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Recommended Readings:

Human Ecology:

Burgess, Ernest W. 1928. "Residential Segregation in American Cities." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 140(1):105–15.

Park, Robert E. 1936. "Succession, an Ecological Concept." *American Sociological Review* 1(2):171–79.

Concentrated Disadvantage:

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Harvard University Press.

Sharkey, Patrick. 2013. *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress Toward Racial Equality*. The University of Chicago Press.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Identify some of the key causes of the spatial concentration of crime.
2. Describe three stages in the development of spatial theories of crime: human ecology, social disorganization, and collective efficacy.
3. Discuss the way collective efficacy builds on broken windows theory.

Readings:

This week we examine spatial perspectives on crime.[3] My aim is to present students with a sort of chronological history of spatial perspectives, beginning with early human ecology perspectives and concluding with modern work on collective efficacy. As such, I begin with a chapter by Sampson (2012) that offers a useful and detailed history of the Chicago School of research. I chose this chapter for two reasons. First, and most importantly, it provides a sort of outline or framework that I reproduce in our readings. Sampson (2012) begins with the human ecology perspective, moves into theories of social disorganization, discusses the concentration of disadvantage, and ends by touching on contemporary research on collective efficacy. Second, his discussion of human ecology is clear enough that I can omit original human ecology research from the reading list. While it is important that students understand human ecology's historical importance in founding contemporary spatial research on crime, there are better ways to use their assigned readings than to have them read that original work.

I do have students read Shaw and McKay's (1969) work on social disorganization theory, wherein they lay out the argument that poverty and ethnic/cultural heterogeneity produces contexts where youth are exposed to competing value systems- including delinquent values- and may be blocked from attaining culturally determined goals. In this context of social disorganization, crime becomes a possible resolution to value conflict. We read this original work because the themes of heterogeneity and change will be relevant to our discussions of collective efficacy. Community diversity, along with the themes of concentrated disadvantage, disinvestment, and fear of violence that will appear in other readings this week, stands to shape the collective efficacy and social control capacity of communities.

We next turn to Wilson's (1996) analysis of the concentration of disadvantage in inner cities Wilson's (1996) work shines a clearer spotlight on macro-level factors influencing crime and disadvantage than almost any other assigned work this semester. While his work does not directly contradict Shaw and McKay's, he shows clearly that historical and macroeconomic conditions play a key role in shaping inner city communities where disadvantage, social

[3] I generally use the term spatial rather than neighborhoods despite the general use of the latter in the literature because I believe that spatial research on crime has generally been subject to urbancentric bias and should be expanded to include a better focus on non-urban spaces.

disorganization, and/or collective efficacy play out. In doing so, he lays an important foundation for the next four readings.

The next four readings are linked by a focus on experiences of communities. Wilson and Kelling's (1982) piece outlines the way a new policing program in New Jersey fundamentally changed peoples' perceptions of safety in their communities. In class we will discuss the way this research led to the adoption of Broken Windows policing and all of that policy's failings and oppressive implications. We will also, however, pay special attention to the actual findings of Wilson and Kelling's (1982) work: they did not find actual decreases in crime. They merely found increases in perceptions of safety.

Sampson et al. (1997) and Sampson (2012) continue Wilson and Kelling's (1982) focus on intra-community dynamics by outlining the concept of collective efficacy. Collective efficacy captures residents' trust in their neighbors and willingness to intervene for the good of the neighborhood. It thus captures a community's capacity for social control and crime prevention. The reason we read this work alongside Wilson and Kelling's (1982) research becomes clear in the Sampson (2012) chapter on Broken Windows and collective efficacy. Here, Sampson (2012) argues that perceptions of safety play a key role in permitting or inhibiting collective efficacy. This means that the policy recommendation we take from Wilson and Kelling's (1982) work should not be a prescription for more police- especially considering the racist implementation of Broken Windows policing in New York City. Instead, we should explore the importance of perceptions of safety and opportunities to increase feelings of safety and community collective efficacy. The final reading lays out what policy in this form might look like. Sharkey (2018) offers a review of research on community-led public safety work and its impacts on community crime. In doing so, he demonstrates that grassroots community organizing may be a means of transforming urban spaces into safer places.

Structural Production: Institutions, Space, and Crime
Week 9

Contemporary Strain Theories and the Cultural Perspective

Assigned Readings:

Contemporary Strain Theories:

Agnew, Robert. 1992. "Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30(1):47–88.

Agnew, Robert. 2001. "Building on the Foundation of General Strain Theory: Specifying the Types of Strain Most Likely to Lead to Crime and Delinquency." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(4):319–61.

Messner, Steven F., and Richard Rosenfeld. 2007. "Culture, Institutional Structure, and Crime." Pp. 66-100. *Crime and the American Dream*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

The Cultural Perspective:

Katz, Jack. 1988. "Sneaky Thrills." Pp. 52-79. In: *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil*. Basic Books.

Young, Jock. 2007. *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. Sage Publications.

- "The disembededness of everyday life" through "The vertigo of late modernity" Pp. 3-14.
- "Blurring the boundaries" through "The focus on the underclass" Pp. 21-36.
- "Toward a criminology of transgression" through "Edgework, ontological insecurity, and utopia" Pp. 46-56.

Ferrell, Jeff. 2013. "Cultural Criminology and the Politics of Meaning." *Critical Criminology* 21(3):257–71. **(Skip the section "Cultural Criminology, Critical Criminology, and the Politics of Meaning")**

Recommended Readings:

Contemporary Strain Theories:

Agnew, Robert. 1999. "A General Strain Theory of Community Differences in Crime Rates." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36(2):123–55.

The Cultural Perspective:

Katz, Jack. 1988. "Righteous Slaughter." Pp. 12-51. In: *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil*. Basic Books.

Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. The Macmillian Press Ltd.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Outline contemporary perspectives on strain theory.
2. Analyze the way class structure and other axes of power generate crime in the strain perspective.
3. Describe the chief concerns of the cultural perspective, including:
    a. The experience and meaning of crime
    b. The cultural definitions of crime and their determinants

Readings:

This week's readings cover considerable ground. As instructor, my overarching goals for the week are three-fold. First, I want to make sure students understand two contemporary versions of strain theory: general strain theory (Agnew 1992; 2001) and institutional anomie theory (Messner and Rosenfeld 2007). Second, I want to explore the ways cultural criminology build on Mertonian strain theory by reintegrating special attention to the phenomenology of crime. Third, I want to use the cultural perspective as a gateway to critical theories of crime (and specifically Marxist perspectives, which we will cover in the following week). This week can thus be seen as an overview of contemporary developments in or on strain theory, but will focus primarily on cultural criminology.

The first set of readings is meant to introduce students to general strain theory (GST) and institutional anomie theory (IAT). The two readings by Agnew (1992; 2001) are perhaps the two most important pieces on the development of GST. The 1992 piece lays out GST's basic precepts: strain, which can take various forms, produces an emotional response, with which people may cope under certain circumstances by turning to strain. The 2001 reading expands on the 1992 reading by exploring the kinds of strain that are most likely to produce criminal responses. From the Agnew (1992; 2001) readings, students should take away an understanding of the theoretical mechanisms though which strain can be translated into crime. Additionally, they should pay special attention to the role of emotion in the strain process. We will return to the importance of emotion in the readings on cultural criminology.

Where Agnew (1992; 2001) provides inside into the individual-level processes that translate strain into crime, Messner and Rosenfeld (2007) return us to a Mertonian focus on social structure. They argue that the American cultural emphasis on economic success at any costs provides motive and rationale for criminality, and that institutions which might otherwise instill anti-crime values are unable to do so successfully because they are dominated by the institution of America's capitalist economy. Students should see this perspective as complementary to Agnew's (1992; 2001) work. If Agnew (1992; 2001) describes how people respond to crime,

Messner and Rosenfeld (2007) offer insight into the ways that social structure and institutional arrangements produce strain.

This interplay between the institutional and the individual is a key theme in cultural criminology. Before we turn to explicitly cultural readings, however, we begin with a chapter from Katz' (1988) phenomenological analysis of crime. Katz runs directly counter to strain and cultural perspectives by explicitly reject (repeatedly) the idea that structural conditions cause criminality. Instead, he locates the cause of crime in the immediate, foreground experience of the criminal act He emphasizes the thrill and emotional satisfaction of criminality. From this reading, students should understand that crime is not only driven by the frustrating and anger-inducing experience of structural strains. The criminal act itself also can provide a deep emotional satisfaction.

Thus we have a groundwork laid for our turn to Young. Because Young's (2007) larger project is to situate crime in the context of advanced capitalism and late modernity, it is difficult to assign full chapters in his book without losing students to the confusion of defining and describing modernity. Because of this, I have selected a limited series of chapter sections for students to read. These sections should communicate three concepts to students. First, the state of modern capitalist society ('late modernity') is such that people experience ontological insecurity and a sense of relative deprivation. Second, the structure of contemporary society is that large segments of the population are incorporated into cultural expectations and constantly exposed to goals they feel they ought to aspire to while simultaneously being excluded from the ability to achieve those goals. This 'bulimia' creates a sense of frustration and deep humiliation. Third, these structural realities produce a context in which criminality can be a deeply satisfying means of asserting a stable sense of the self and defying the humiliations of the bulimic society. If nothing else, students should understand from these selections what Young (2007) means when he writes that his theory of crime is "Merton with energy" and "Katz with structure" (54).

Young's (2007) work, though compelling, is not fully representative of the field of cultural criminology. It does provide a crucial foundation for the field, which is why it receives such attention in this syllabus. We turn next, however, to Ferrell's (2013) review of cultural criminology as a field concerned with the politics of the meaning of crime. Ferrell's (2013) discussion of the politics of meaning is useful because he both outlines the broad concerns of cultural criminology- subcultures and the experiences of crime, cultural definitions of criminality, crime in media- and links those concerns by pointing out that they are all fundamentally projects in understanding the meaning of crime. Thus, Ferrell's (2013) work should give students a strong sense of what the subfield of cultural criminology studies.

One of the most important readings in cultural criminology was recommended by not assigned this week. In lecture, I will walk students through Hall et al.'s (1978) analysis of mugging in the UK in order to demonstrate the cultural criminology perspective in action. This piece is useful for that purpose because it emphasizes the way cultural fears become translated into moral panics and define new forms of crime with serious repercussions for vulnerable communities. It is effectively an analysis of the 'hidden' meanings of crime. But it also has a secondary utility: because Hall and colleagues (1978) demonstrate the way the defining of crime can serve useful political purposes and offer detailed insight into how fear and politics shapes what we consider

criminal, they offer us a useful entry point into the critical perspectives on crime we will cover in the remaining three weeks.

Critical Criminologies
Week 10

Capitalism and Crime: Marxist Perspectives

Assigned Readings:

Chambliss, William J., and Robert B. Seidman. 1971. "A model of law and society" and "Poverty and the criminal process." Pp. 5-14; 473-483. In: *Law, Order, and Power*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Quinney, Richard. 1970. "A Theory of Crime." Pp. 3-28. In: *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Reiman, Jeffrey. 2007. "A Crime by Any Other Name…" and "…And the Poor Get Prison." Pp. 60-157. *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison*. 8th ed. Pearson.

Spitzer, Steven. 1975. "Toward a Marxian Theory of Deviance." *Social Problems* 22(5):638–51.

Wacquant, Loic. 2009. "Social Insecurity and the Punitive Upsurge." Pp. 1-40. In: *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Duke University Press

Recommended Readings:

Crossman, Ashley. 2018. "What Is Marxist Sociology?" *ThoughtCo*. Retrieved December 20, 2020 (https://www.thoughtco.com/marxist-sociology-3026397).

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Describe the key arguments of Marxist perspectives on criminology.
2. Identify the ways class shapes definitions of crime.
3. Identify the ways class shapes experiences within the criminal justice system.
4. Debate whether or not the criminal justice as a whole operates to the benefit of the rich.

Readings:

The focus of this week is class and crime. While most of our readings are explicitly Marxist, my aim is to convince students to think broadly about the way class shapes definitions of criminality and experiences in the American criminal justice system. The readings for this week proceed in three parts. The first two address the ways money shapes law. The second two explore the ways that the criminal justice system operates in favor of (or, arguably, in service to) the rich. Finally, Wacquant's (2009) reading represents a more contemporary perspective on class and crime that is certainly critical but considerably more nuanced than the Marxist perspectives embraced by the other authors. In class, our discussions will be prefaced by a brief lecture on the Marxist

perspective intended to remind students that Marxist *analysis* is not the same as Marxist *politics.* During this lecture, I will also emphasize the fact that one of the failings of Marxist analysis is its inattention to other dimensions of inequality.

The readings by Chambliss and Seidman (1971) and Quinney (1970) outline the ways that class interests stand to shape criminal law. We start with Chambliss and Seidman (1971), who lay out a model of the law as a *single* value system meant to respond to the demands of the public, mediated by the structural constraints. Right away, this model should suggest to students that equitable representation of all citizens' interests is not possible unless the values of all citizens are perfectly unified. By this point in the course, and particularly following the Becker (1963) reading we opened the course with, students should hopefully understand that perfectly unified values are not a reality. If students do not agree on that point, we can easily have an in-class discussion about marijuana legalization to quickly demonstrate the diversity of citizens' opinions about what ought to be law. Quinney (1970), despite predating Chambliss and Seidman (1971) is a natural next step for our purposes because he elaborates on the ability of the rich and powerful to shape criminal law in ways that suit their needs and desires. He does this by emphasizing the fact that criminal law is not merely a system that responds automatically and robotically to popular demand. Instead, laws are written by the powerful. Together, these two readings should establish for students the theoretical possibility that the law is shaped by class through the mechanism of economic power.

The next two readings build on this point. Reiman (2007) extensively lays out the ways that definitions of crime fail to encapsulate the harmful actions of the rich and the ways the rich are advantaged over the poor at each stage of the criminal justice system. The strength of this reading is the empirical evidence he musters (something lacking in the previous two readings). Additionally, Reiman (2007) musters a theory of the persistence of criminal justice's failures to 'solve' crime. He argues that the association of criminality with the poor benefits the rich by stabilizing their social status. This is one way we can imagine the criminal justice system serving the interests of the rich. Spitzer (1975) offers a slightly different theoretical perspective. Spitzer (1975) argues that criminal justice systems serve the rich by giving them a way to deal with the problematic surplus populations produced by capitalist systems of production.

Spitzer's (1975) arguments are echoed in Wacquant's (2009) work. In the assigned chapter, Wacquant (2009) argues that globalization and economic deregulation have produced intense economic insecurity and instability. The upswing in incarceration in American, which he calls prisonfare, is one means of controlling the unrest that could be produced by these social conditions. Prisonfare ascribes the criminal consequences of structural strain to individual failings and produces new bodies of knowledge that legitimate further state expansion. By individualizing structural problems and justifying its own existence, mass incarceration prevents pushback against late-stage capitalist economic structures. Wacquant's work is a more empirically based reading than Spitzer's (1975) and a better articulated and more convincing theoretical reading than Reiman's (2007), making it a useful end point for this week's assigned readings.

Before transitioning to next week, I should note that a key failing of pure Marxist analysis is reproduced in the Reiman (2007) reading. Reiman (2007) explicitly argues that class explains racial inequalities in criminal justice. Here, we see the supremacy of class in Marxist analysis in action. By now, students should be able to recognize the flaws in Reiman's (2007) claims. Nonetheless, I will close class for the week by using readings from earlier in the course (Pager 2003; Bronner 2020) to remind students that class does not sufficiently explain racial inequality. I will point out that traditional Marxist perspectives also fail to consider issues of gender. In doing so, I will lay the groundwork for the final two weeks of the course.

Critical Criminologies
Week 11
Gender, Sexuality, and Criminality

Assigned Readings:

Introducing Feminist and Queer Theory:

Daly, Kathleen, and Meda Chesney-Lind. 1988. "Feminism and Criminology." *Justice Quarterly* 5(4):497–538.

Woods, Jordan Blair. 2014. "'Queering Criminology': Overview of the State of the Field." Pp. 15–41. In: *Handbook of LGBT Communities, Crime, and Justice*, edited by D. Peterson and V. R. Panfil. New York, NY: Springer New York.

Feminist Research:

Heimer, Karen, and Stacy De Coster. 1999. "The Gendering of Violent Delinquency." *Criminology* 37(2):277–318.

DeKeseredy, Walter S., Martin D. Schwartz, Danielle Fagen, and Mandy Hall. 2006. "Separation/Divorce Sexual Assault: The Contribution of Male Support." *Feminist Criminology* 1(3):228–50.

Easterling, Beth A., Ben Feldmeyer, and Lois Presser. 2019. "Narrating Mother Identities From Prison." *Feminist Criminology* 14(5):519–39.

Queer Research:

Frederick, Brian Jay. 2014. "'Delinquent Boys': Toward a New Understanding of 'Deviant' and Transgressive Behavior in Gay Men." *Critical Criminology* 22(1):139–49.

Frederick, Tyler. 2014. "Diversity at the Margins: The Interconnections Between Homelessness, Sex Work, Mental Health, and Substance Use in the Lives of Sexual Minority Homeless Young People." Pp. 473-502. In: *Handbook of LGBT Communites, Crime, and Justice*, edited by D. Peterson and V. Panfil. Springer.

Dwyer, Angela. 2014. "Pleasures, Perversities, and Partnerships: The Historical Emergence of LGBT-Police Relationships." Pp. 149–64. In: *Handbook of LGBT Communites, Crime, and Justice*, edited by D. Peterson and V. Panfil. Springer.

Recommended Readings:

Adler, Freda. 1975. *Sisters in Crime*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Buist, Carrie L., and Emily Lenning. 2016. *Queer Criminology*. Routledge.

Messerschmidt, James W. 1993. *Masculinities and Crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Simon, Rita J. 1975. *Women and Crime*. Lexington Books.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Identify the limitations in past criminological research that produced a need for feminist and queer research in the discipline.
2. Analyze the way considering gender and/or queer identity shapes understandings of criminality based in previously covered theoretical perspectives.
3. Describe at least two areas of research in feminist and queer criminology beyond the causes of offending and explain why these are topics of interest in the feminist and queer perspectives.

Readings:

This class is primarily about the causes of crime. Feminist criminology, an essential subfield of criminological theory, and queer criminology, an emerging subfield, both have the capacity to inform the way we think about crime's origins. At the same time, however, both subfields are concerned with issues much broader than the origins of crime: oppression, victimization, experiences within the legal system, and more. Thus, the challenge this week is to provide a useful overview of feminist and queer criminological research without shifting the class too far from its main learning objectives. To try and meet this challenge, I have taken a slightly different approach to assigning readings this week. Instead of taking students on a tour through the main ideas and major developments in a body of theory, we start with two readings that identify the problems each perspective emerged to resolve and outlining the breadth of the subfield's concerns. I then assign a series of six readings that demonstrate some of the broad areas of focus within feminist and queer research: offending, victimization and vulnerability, and law enforcement systems.

The first two readings are both deeply theoretical and critical. Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988) critique criminology's overreliance on male samples and lack of reflection on the gender-specific nature of its resulting theories. As a resolution to this challenge, they argue that feminist theory can be incorporated into criminological research to both increase methodological attention to women (an 'add women and stir' approach) and to make gender a central focus of crime research. Their article is particularly useful for criminology students who may be unfamiliar with feminism in general, as they offer a review of feminist theory and a discussion of some myths of feminist analysis (such as the 'lack of objectivity'). Over 25 years later, Woods levels similar critiques against heteronormative criminological research. He argues that criminologists have omitted queer populations from their research and failed to muster real theoretical engagement with sexual orientation and gender identity. The solution, he claims, is to bring queer identities and experiences to the forefront of criminological research and to consistently interrogate hidden assumptions about gender and sexuality. Students should note that in both articles, the demand is not merely for diversity in research participants. While that is a necessary step, both authors argue for direct theoretical attention to and analysis of gender and sexuality.

The remaining six readings are sorted into feminist and queer criminological works. Each section follows a rough parallel structure. The first readings concerns offending by gender and sexual minorities. Heimer and DeCoster (1999) join gender theory with the differential association perspective to argue that differences in boys' and girls' violent offending may be the result of gender-differentiated relationships to and interactions with peers and family. Frederick (2014) draws on the cultural criminology perspective to argue that rule-breaking by gay men, including social drug use, may serve as a form of resistance to heteronormativity (and, where inclusion is becoming a new norm, 'respectable' homonormativity). The second readings are about marginalization, or the disadvantaged social position and attendant victimization risk gender and sexual minorities face. DeKeseredy and colleagues (2006) outline how male peer networks in rural places conceal and enable the sexual abuse of women. Frederick (2014), meanwhile, describes the various risks that queer homeless youth face- including turns to drug use and sex work- while simultaneously pointing out that the streets often serve as refuges and sources of community and inclusion for youth expelled from their homes. The third readings analyze the experiences of gender and sexual minorities with criminal justice systems. Easterling, Feldmeyer, and Presser (2019) explore the ways incarcerated women negotiate their identities as mothers, while Dwyer (2014) traces the evolution of police-queer community relationships from criminalization to fraught (and sometimes failing) cooperation. These three topics are by no means an exhaustive list of the concerns of feminist and queer criminologies. In fact, I have explicitly omitted feminist works that emphasize the role criminal justice systems play in upholding patriarchal power (Chesney-Lind 2006). While readings like these are extremely necessary, helping students engage with radical feminist ideas is a pedagogical challenge that requires more time and focus than this course allows for.

This approach to assigning readings has a significant drawback. I have ultimately omitted some widely-taught texts. However, I will use a brief in-class lecture to share with students the 'big ideas' in some key historical works. For example, I will compare and contrast the work of Adler (1975) and Simon (1975). Both authors offer a liberal feminist analysis of crime that assumes equality with men is attainable through a law-based evening of the playing field. Adler (1975), however, argued that women's crime would increase overall as they gained a level of access to public life the level enjoyed by men. Simon (1975), meanwhile, argued that only women's property crime rates would increase. Violent crime rates would decrease as women experienced less role strain and enjoyed greater inclusion. Introducing students to these big ideas in lecture should give them some understanding of key historical arguments. Their assigned readings, meanwhile, will give them the opportunity to explore the breadth and richness of contemporary feminist and queer research.

Critical Criminologies
Week 12

Centering Race: Perspectives on Crime and Punishment

Assigned Readings:

Historicizing Criminal Justice Inequality:

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. "The Rebirth of Caste." Pp. 20-58. In: *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. Revised. The New Press.

Muller, Christopher. 2018. "Freedom and Convict Leasing in the Postbellum South." *American Journal of Sociology* 124(2):367–405.

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. "The Color of Justice," and "The New Jim Crow." Pp. 97-139; 178-220. In: *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness.* Revised. The New Press.

Opportunities for Change:

The Sentencing Project. 2018. "Report of The Sentencing Project to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance: Regarding Racial Disparities in the United States Criminal Justice System."

Bell, Monica. 2019. "The Community in Criminal Justice: Subordination, Consumption, Resistance, and Transformation." *Du Bois Review* 16(1):197–220.

Davis, Angela. 2003. "Abolitionist Alternatives." Pp. 105–15 in *Are Prisons Obsolete?* NY: Seven Stories Press.

Recommended Readings:

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. Revised. The New Press.

Wacquant, Loic. 2009. "The Prison as Surrogate Ghetto: Encaging Black Subproletarians." Pp. 195-208. In: *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Duke University Press.

Coates, Ta-Nehisi. 2015. "The Black Family in the Age of Mass Incarceration." *The Atlantic.* October.

Lay, Jackie, Bruce Western, Kasia Cieplak-Mayr von Baldegg, and Ta-Nehisi Coates. 2015. "Mass Incarceration, Visualized." *The Atlantic*, September 11.

Rationale:

Goals:

1. Outline existing racial inequality in the criminal justice system and the mechanisms that reproduce it.
2. Analyze the role mass incarceration plays in the continuing subjugation of Black Americans, including whether or not the contemporary criminal justice system functions as a "new Jim Crow."
3. Identify and debate opportunities for reform in the criminal justice system.

Readings:

I have tried to weave attention to race throughout the course. This week it is the sole topic. For this week, my aim is for students to understand how deeply racial inequality is embedded in the criminal justice systems, the ways it that inequality persists in a supposedly 'colorblind' justice system, and the ways contemporary inequality extends a long history of racial oppression.

The first set of readings focuses on historicizing mass incarceration. The first chapter from Alexander (2015) offers a useful history of racial caste in America. She begins with slavery and traces its evolution through Jim Crow, then follows the civil rights movement and the ways that political actors adjusted to a post-Civil Rights world by adopting racist policies (to satisfy Southern electorates and maintain political coalitions) veiled in non-racist language. This history is an essential starting point for two reasons. First, it will introduce students to the history of racial oppression that mass incarceration continues. Second, Alexander (2015) does an excellent job of arguing that policymakers can (and often does) have racist intentions even if their policies are presented as race-neutral. Convincing students of this point, of the idea that racism can be hidden and covert, is essential to making sure students understand the racism at play in today's criminal justice system.

The next two assigned readings offer a more detailed look at how the criminal justice system replaced older forms of racial oppression. We start with Muller's (2018) analysis of convict-leasing in the post-bellum South. Muller (2018) finds that Black men black men's incarceration rates were higher in Southern counties where white landowners did not reconstitute a post-slavery agricultural labor force and where Black Americans acquired the most landholdings. I include this analysis because it demonstrates the immediacy with which the South turned to the criminal justice system to reconstitute the dependent labor force formerly provided by slavery. We then turn to Alexander's (2015) analyses of mass incarceration as a new Jim Crow. The two assigned chapters outline the mechanisms through which racial inequality persists in a supposedly colorblind criminal justice system and offer a detailed and thoughtful analytical comparison of mass incarceration to Jim Crow oppression. While Alexander's (2015) key overarching argument is that the War on Drugs was the specific policy mechanism through which mass incarceration was implemented as a tool of racial oppression, I would like students to focus their analytical attention on the oppressive power of mass incarceration. Debates over the causes of mass incarceration can come in a later class. For now, students should focus on the idea that mass incarceration is a direct continuation of past racial oppression.

The remaining three readings were selected to spark conversations about criminal justice reform. The Sentencing Project's (2018) report starts us off with a list of clear and focused policy

recommendations like ending mandatory minimum sentencing laws, funding indigent defense, and training criminal justice system actors to reduce racial bias. Bell (2019), meanwhile, pushes us to consider criminal justice reform through a more critical eye. The focus of her paper is a typology of marginalized communities' engagement with the criminal justice system, but in the latter half of the paper she includes a critical discussion about what it means to *transform* policing. Transformative engagement could be adversarial, but can it also involve diversifying police departments? Is that sufficient change for true reform? Students should read Bell's (2019) paper through the lens of criminal justice reform. Finally, Davis (2003) introduces students to one of the most radical perspectives on reform: prison abolition. In the assigned chapter, Davis (2003) describes the ways alternative systems can be built to replace the prison industrial complex. She argues not for the overnight closure of prisons, but for the reimagining of our approach to the crime problem and the building of new institutions that can slowly crowd out prisons. While prison abolition is controversial, and can be a tricky topic for students to engage with, students should be prepared to read Davis' (2003) chapter with both a critical eye and an open mind.

Additional Works Cited

Becker, Howard S. 1963. “Outsiders.” Pp. 1-18. In *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. The Free Press.

Bourgois, Phillipe. 1995. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press.

Bronner, Laura. 2020. “Why Statistics Don’t Capture The Full Extent Of The Systemic Bias In Policing.” FiveThirtyEight. Retrieved December 2, 2020 (https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-statistics-dont-capture-the-full-extent-of-the-systemic-bias-in-policing/).

Chesney-Lind, Meda. 2006. “Patriarchy, Crime, and Justice: Feminist Criminology in an Era of Backlash.” *Feminist Criminology* 1(1):6–26.

Contreras, Randol. 2013. *The Stickup Kids: Race, Drugs, Violence, and the American Dream*. University of California Press.

Pager, Devah. 2003. “The Mark of a Criminal Record.” *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5):937–75.