

The Criminologist

The Official Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology

Vol. 35, #2

March/April 2010

Editors Note: Thanks to David Farrington for contributing this lead article. For the second article in our series on social institutions and crime, he describes key issues in research on the family. His essay illustrates that there is much work ahead to sort through measurement challenges, to elaborate the causal mechanisms that explain observed relationships between family factors and offending, and to identify the “active ingredients” that produce positive outcomes from family-based interventions. This article suggests the Presidential Panels on Crime and the Family at the November ASC conference will cover some fascinating terrain.

Cheryl Maxson, ASC Vice President

CRIME AND THE FAMILY

David P. Farrington, Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University

Many family factors are predictors and possible causes of children’s delinquency. And many family-based interventions are effective in preventing and reducing children’s delinquency.¹ However, establishing the truth of these two simple statements requires attention to many complicated issues.

Measuring Family Factors

The first issue is how to operationally define, measure, and classify family factors. The enormous *Handbook of Crime Correlates*² reviews knowledge about 35 family factors, from married versus unmarried to parental use of physical discipline. However, six categories of family factors have been commonly studied in criminology: (a) criminal and antisocial parents and siblings; (b) large family size; (c) child-rearing methods (poor supervision, inconsistent discipline, parental coldness and rejection, low parental involvement with the child); (d) abuse (physical or sexual) and neglect; (e) parental conflict and disrupted families; and (f) other parental features (especially young parents, substance abuse, stress, or depression of parents). These categories are not always clearly delimited; for example, physical neglect often coincides with emotional neglect (cold and rejecting parents). Nevertheless, they reflect the organization of topics within the field.

All of these factors predict children’s delinquency. For example, in a recent meta-analysis,³ the strongest family predictors of criminal or violent behavior were poor parental education, poor parental supervision, poor child rearing skills, parental conflict, and large family size. Notably weak predictors were young parents and broken homes (and low socioeconomic status, which I do not include as a family factor).

The best information about the extent to which family factors predict children’s offending can be obtained in prospective longitudinal surveys, especially community surveys of at least several hundred children, with frequent data collection from childhood to adulthood. For example, in the Pittsburgh Youth Study,⁴ three cohorts of Pittsburgh boys (originally in the first, fourth, and seventh grades) were followed up to ages 25-30, with 18 assessments of the youngest cohort and 16 assessments of the oldest cohort. An advantage of a prospective longitudinal survey is that causal order can be established; just as parenting may influence child behavior, so child behavior may influence parenting.

(Continued on page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE...

2010 ASC Election Slate.....6	Featured Articles.....22-25
2011 ASC Election Slate Call for Noms.....7	Obituaries.....30
2010 ASC Annual Meeting Info/CFP.....9-16	Position Announcements.....32-36
Teaching Tips.....18-19	Criminology Around the World.....37-38

2010 CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

For a complete listing see www.asc41.com/caw.html

10TH ANNUAL JERRY LEE CRIME PREVENTION SYMPOSIUM April 19-20, 2010 presented by the University of Maryland, the University of Pennsylvania, and George Mason University to be held in College Park, MD and Washington, DC. For more information email cebcp@gmu.edu or visit <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/JerryLee.html>

JUSTICE STUDIES ASSOCIATION 12TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, June 2-5, 2010, Knoxville, TN. For more information please visit <http://www.justicestudies.org/>

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE NINTH BIENNIAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, June 2 - 5, 2010, City of Marrakesh, Kingdom of Morocco, *Societies in Transition: Balancing Security, Social Justice and Tradition*

STOCKHOLM CRIMINOLOGY SYMPOSIUM AND PRIZE AWARD CEREMONY, June 14 -16, 2010, Stockholm, Sweden. For more information, visit <http://www.criminologyprize.com/extra/pod/>

EUROPEAN FORUM FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE 6TH BIENNIAL CONFERENCE, June 17 - 19, 2010, Bilbao, Spain. For more information, visit <http://www.euforumrj.org>

CRIME & JUSTICE SUMMER RESEARCH INSTITUTE: BROADENING PERSPECTIVES & PARTICIPATION, July 12-30, 2010, Ohio State University. For more info, please visit: <http://cjrc.osu.edu/rdcj-n/summerinstitute>

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR JUSTICE RESEARCH BIENNIAL CONFERENCE, August 21-24, 2010, Banff, Alberta, Canada. Please visit the conference website for details regarding the Intention to Submit, <http://wcmprod2.ucalgary.ca/isjr2010/>

BRITISH CRIME HISTORIANS SYMPOSIUM, September 2-3, 2010, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom. For further information, contact Paul Knepper, University of Sheffield, p.knepper@sheffield.ac.uk, or Heather Shore, Leeds Metropolitan University, h.shore@leedsmet.ac.uk.

POLICING IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE, September 22-24, 2010, Ljubljana, Slovenia. For more info, visit: www.fv.uni-lj.si/conf2010/

The Criminologist

The Official Newsletter of the
American Society of Criminology

THE CRIMINOLOGIST (ISSN 0164-0240) is published six times annually – in January, March, May, July, September, and November by the American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212-1156 and additional entries. Annual subscriptions to non-members: \$50.00; foreign subscriptions: \$60.00; single copy: \$10.00. **Postmaster:** Please send address changes to: The Criminologist, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212-1156. Periodicals postage paid at Toledo, Ohio.

Editor: Cheryl Maxson
University of California, Irvine

Published by the American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212-1156. Printed by Leshar Printers.

Inquiries: Address all correspondence concerning newsletter materials and advertising to American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212-1156, (614) 292-9207, ncoldiron@asc41.com.

ASC President: RICHARD ROSENFELD
Criminology & Criminal Justice
University of Missouri-St. Louis
1 University Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63121

Membership: For information concerning ASC membership, contact the American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212-1156, (614) 292-9207; FAX (614) 292-6767; asc@asc41.com; <http://www.asc41.com>

HOW TO ACCESS CRIMINOLOGY, AND CPP ON-LINE

1. Go to the Wiley InterScience homepage - <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com>
2. Enter your login and password.
Login: Your email address
Password: If you are a current ASC member, you will have received this from Wiley; if not or if you have forgotten your password, contact Wiley at: cs-membership@wiley.com; 800-835-6770
3. Click on Journals under the Browse by Product Type heading.
4. Select the journal of interest from the A-Z list.

For easy access to Criminology and/or CPP, save them to your profile. From the journal homepage, please click on "save journal to My Profile".

If you require any further assistance, contact Wiley Customer Service at cs-membership@wiley.com; 800-835-6770

(Continued from page 1)

In many studies, there is a great problem of achieving valid and reliable measurement of family factors. While some factors such as parental criminality and family size can be measured reliably, there are no widely accepted yardsticks for factors such as parental supervision and discipline. Scales can be developed, but they usually depend on possibly biased reports from parents or children. An advantage of prospective longitudinal surveys is that reports of parenting can be collected before the development of the child's delinquency, thus minimizing the possibility of retrospective bias (where reports of early parenting may be biased by the knowledge that the child later became a delinquent). Systematic observations of parent-child interactions, such as those pioneered at the Oregon Social Learning Center,⁵ may be more valid, but it would be very expensive to include them in a large-scale community survey.

Risk Factors and Causes

A key issue is whether family variables act as risk factors or as promotive or protective factors. Whereas risk factors predict a high probability of offending, promotive factors predict a low probability of offending, and protective factors predict a low probability of offending in a high risk category. In the Pittsburgh Youth Study, some factors showed promotive but not risk effects (e.g. an older mother, low physical punishment), others showed risk but not promotive effects (e.g. large family size), and still others were linearly related to delinquency and showed both risk and promotive effects (e.g. parent antisocial attitude).⁶

Another key issue is whether family variables have causal effects on children's offending, and how any such effects might be explained as part of a larger theory. Important theories are attachment, social learning, and control theories, as well as developmental and life course theories.⁷ It is difficult to establish causal effects in nonexperimental research. For example, children cannot be assigned at random to experience poor parental supervision or not, although they can be assigned at random to receive a program designed to improve parenting (e.g. parent training: see later).

In nonexperimental research, the most convincing evidence about causality can be obtained in studies combining analysis of within-individual change with adequate control of covariates.⁸ In the Pittsburgh Youth Study, between-individual and within-individual predictions of offending were compared.⁹ The between-individual prediction investigated whether boys exposed to poor parental supervision (for example) were more delinquent than different boys exposed to good parental supervision. The within-individual prediction investigated whether, if a boy changed from good parental supervision to poor parental supervision, this predicted an increase in his delinquency. The within-individual information leads to more convincing conclusions about causality because most individual factors are held constant or controlled.

In the Pittsburgh Youth Study, poor parental supervision, low parental reinforcement, and low involvement of the boy in family activities predicted offending both between and within individuals. In contrast, peer delinquency was the strongest correlate of offending in between-individual correlations but did not predict offending within individuals. This suggests that the three family variables were possible causes of offending, whereas having delinquent peers was most likely to be an indicator (marker) of the boy's own offending (perhaps reflecting his co-offending with peers).

Another problem is to establish what are the most important underlying constructs. For example, broken homes or disrupted families (involving the loss of a biological mother or father) predict a child's delinquency, but homes broken by divorce or disharmony are more damaging than homes broken by death or hospitalization.¹⁰ Related constructs are single-parent families (in some cases where the father may have had no contact with the child, so there was no "break"), changes in parent figures, the presence of step-parents, parental conflict, and partner violence. Research is needed to establish, out of all these inter-related indicators and underlying constructs, which are the "active ingredients" in predicting or causing delinquency.

Unfortunately, family factors tend to be related not only to each other but also to other risk factors for delinquency such as low family income, poor housing, bad neighborhood, impulsiveness, and low school attainment. It is important to investigate which family factors predict delinquency independently of other family factors, independently of genetic or biological factors, and independently of other (e.g. individual, peer, school, neighborhood, and socioeconomic) factors. There may be sequential effects, for example where socioeconomic and neighborhood factors (e.g. poor housing) influence family factors (e.g. poor parental supervision), which in turn influence individual factors (e.g. impulsiveness), which in turn influence offending. Again, longitudinal surveys are needed to investigate these kinds of sequences.

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

While it is well established that many family risk factors predict delinquency, the causal mechanisms linking these risk factors and delinquency are more contentious. For example, large family size (the number of children in a family) is a strong and replicable predictor of children's delinquency, but there are many possible mediating processes. As the number of children in a family increases, the amount of parental attention that can be given to each child may decrease. Perhaps parents become more lax with each successive child. Also, the household tends to become more crowded, possibly leading to increases in frustration, irritation, and conflict. Larger families may cause economic stress and increase poverty as each successive child costs more money. And it is possible that more antisocial parents tend to have more children, so there are selection effects. More research is needed to establish which processes mediate the link between family risk factors and children's delinquency.

It is also important to investigate moderating factors. For example, family factors may have different effects on boys and girls, on children of different ages, on African American and Caucasian children, in different neighborhoods, and in different times and places. There is a good deal of research on these topics. Gender differences in delinquency seem to be driven more by boys having a greater level of risk than by gender-specific relationships between family risk factors and delinquency.¹¹ The strength of relationships between risk factors and delinquency was generally similar in London in the 1960s and in Pittsburgh in the 1990s, although the prevalence of some factors (e.g. large family size, broken families) changed dramatically.¹² However, parental physical punishment was much more important in London, in turn because it was more predictive of delinquency in Caucasian families than in African-American families.¹³

A related question focusses on interaction effects, which are rarely investigated. For example, separation from a parent may predict a decreased probability of children's delinquency if that parent is a criminal whereas separation from a noncriminal parent may predict an increased probability of delinquency. Interactions between family and other factors should also be studied. In the Dunedin project, it was found that child maltreatment predicted later convictions for violence more strongly among boys who had a gene that caused low monoamine oxidase A activity (which is linked to neurotransmitters in the brain such as serotonin), compared with boys who had the high activity MAOA variant.¹⁴

There are also cumulative effects of family (and other) risk factors. In the Pittsburgh Youth Study, multiple risk factors predicted multiple types of antisocial behavior, and the relationships were general rather than specific.¹⁵ Many types of risk factors predicted many types of problems, and the number of risk factors predicted the number of problems, rather than specific risk factors predicting specific problems.

While I have concentrated in this article on the effects of family factors on child delinquency, there is quite a lot of research focussing on effects on adult offending. For example, in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, getting married was followed by a decrease in offending for men.¹⁶ This was a within-individual analysis in which men were followed up before and after marriage, and propensity score matching was used to match married and unmarried men on their prior probability of getting married. This method attempts to deal with selection effects by mimicking random assignment of men to marriage or not (which of course is not possible in practice).

Interventions

Since many family risk factors are known to predict children's delinquency, many family-based interventions have been devised to target these risk factors in an attempt to prevent children's delinquency. Among the most important of these interventions is parent training, which was pioneered by Gerald Patterson at the Oregon Social Learning Center.¹⁷ Patterson carefully observed parent-child interactions and found that parents of antisocial children failed to tell their children how they were expected to behave, failed to monitor the children's behavior to ensure that it was desirable, and failed to enforce rules promptly using consistent and contingent rewards and penalties. He therefore trained parents to notice what children were doing, to monitor child behavior over long periods, to clearly state house rules, to make rewards and penalties consistent and contingent on child behavior, and to negotiate disagreements so that conflicts and crises did not escalate. His treatment was shown to be effective in reducing child stealing and antisocial behavior.

General parent education, as pioneered by David Olds,¹⁸ is another important family-based intervention. Typically, mothers are visited by nurses during pregnancy and the first two years of the child's life. The home visitors give advice about child rearing, about prenatal and postnatal care of the child, about infant development, and about the importance of proper nutrition and avoiding smoking, drinking, and drug use during pregnancy. This treatment was also effective. By the age of 15, the treated children had incurred only half as many arrests as their control counterparts.

(Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 4)

Systematic reviews show that family-based interventions are effective in reducing later delinquency. For example, one review of 55 evaluations of family/parent training programs administered in the first five years of a child's life concluded that they were generally effective.¹⁹ The weighted mean effect size of 0.23 to 0.45 corresponded to a reduction in recidivism from 50% to between 39% and 28%. Most programs also save much more money than they cost. While intervention experiments can in principle provide valuable information about causal effects, intervention programs are usually too heterogeneous to allow this. Consequently, it is not always clear what are the active ingredients.

In conclusion, a great deal is known, from prospective longitudinal surveys, about family risk factors that predict children's delinquency. The most important predictors are usually criminal or antisocial parents, large family size, poor parental supervision, parental conflict, and disrupted families. More longitudinal research is needed on causal mechanisms and theories that explain the link between risk factors to delinquency, on promotive and protective factors, and on independent, interactive, cumulative, and sequential effects of risk factors. A great deal is also known about effective family-based intervention programs, but more experimental research is needed to identify the active ingredients and to maximize benefit to cost ratios.

Acknowledgements

For helpful comments, I am very grateful to Rolf Loeber, Terrie Moffitt, Alex Piquero, and Brandon Welsh.

Notes

1. For reviews of risk factors and interventions, see Farrington, D. P. and Welsh, B. C. (2007) *Saving Children from a Life of Crime: Early Risk Factors and Effective Interventions*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
2. Ellis, L., Beaver, K. and Wright, J. (2009) *Handbook of Crime Correlates*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
3. Derzon, J. (2010) The correspondence of family features with problem, aggressive, criminal, and violent behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, in press.
4. Loeber, R., Farrington, D. P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., and White, H. R. (2008) *Violence and Serious Theft: Development and Prediction from Childhood to Adulthood*. New York: Routledge.
5. Patterson, G.R. (1982) *Coercive Family Process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
6. Loeber et al., note 4.
7. Farrington, D. P. (2005, Ed.) *Integrated Developmental and Life-Course Theories of Offending*. (*Advances in Criminological Theory*, vol. 14.) New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
8. Murray, J., Farrington, D. P. and Eisner, M. P. (2009) Drawing conclusions about causes from systematic reviews of risk factors: The Cambridge Quality Checklists. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5, 1-23.
9. Farrington, D.P., Loeber, R., Yin, Y. and Anderson, S.J. (2002) Are within-individual causes of delinquency the same as between-individual causes? *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 12, 53-68.
10. Farrington and Welsh, note 1.
11. Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., and Silva, P. A. (2001) *Sex Differences in Antisocial Behaviour*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
12. Farrington, D. P. and Loeber, R. (1999) Transatlantic replicability of risk factors in the development of delinquency. In Cohen, P., Slomkowski, C., and Robins, L. N. (Eds.) *Historical and Geographical Influences on Psychopathology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum (pp. 299-329).
13. Farrington, D.P., Loeber, R., and Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (2003) How can the relationship between race and violence be explained? In Hawkins, D.F. (Ed.) *Violent Crime: Assessing Race and Ethnic Differences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 213-237).

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

14. Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J., Martin, J., Craig, I. W., Taylor, A., and Poulton, R. (2002) Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science*, 297, 851-854. See also Taylor, A. and Kim-Cohen, J. (2007) Meta-analysis of gene-environment interactions in developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 19, 1029-1037.
15. Loeber, R., Farrington, D. P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., and van Kammen, W. B. (1998) Multiple risk factors for multi--problem boys: Co-occurrence of delinquency, substance use, attention deficit, conduct problems, physical aggression, covert behavior, depressed mood, and shy/withdrawn behavior. In Jessor, R. (Ed.) *New Perspectives on Adolescent Risk Behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press (pp. 90-149).
16. Theobald, D. and Farrington, D. P. (2009) Effects of getting married on offending: Results from a prospective longitudinal survey of males. *European Journal of Criminology*, 6, 496-516.
17. Patterson, note 5.
18. Olds, D. L., Henderson, C. R., Cole, R., Eckenrode, J., Kitzman, H., Luckey, D., Pettitt, L., Sidora, K., Morris, P., and Powers, J. (1998) Long-term effects of nurse home visitation on children's criminal and antisocial behavior: 15-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 280, 1238-1244.
19. Piquero, A., Farrington, D. P., Welsh, B. C., Tremblay, R. E., and Jennings, W. G. (2009) Effects of early family/parent training programs on antisocial behavior and delinquency. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5, 83-120.

2010 ELECTION SLATE FOR 2011-2012 ASC OFFICERS

The following slate of officers, as proposed by the Nominations Committee, was approved by the ASC Executive Board for the 2010 election:

President-Elect

Daniel Nagin, Carnegie Mellon University
Robert Sampson, Harvard University

Vice President-Elect

Ross Matsueda, University of Washington
Leslie Kennedy, Rutgers University

Executive Counselor

Deborah Baskin, California State University, Los Angeles
Lisa Broidy, University of New Mexico
Charis Kubrin, George Washington University
Matthew R. Lee, Louisiana State University
Colin Loftin, University at Albany
Susan Sharp, University of Oklahoma

Additional candidates for each office may be added to the ballot via petition. To be added to the ballot, a candidate needs 50 signed nominations from current, non-student ASC members. If a candidate receives the requisite number of verified, signed nominations, their name will be placed on the ballot.

Fax or mail a hard copy of the signed nominations by **Friday, March 26, 2010** (postmark date) to the address noted below. Email nominations will NOT be accepted.

American Society of Criminology
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212
Columbus, Ohio 43212-1156
614-292-9207 (Ph)
614-292-6767 (Fax)

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR 2011 ELECTION SLATE OF 2012-2013 OFFICERS

The ASC Nominations Committee is seeking nominations for the positions of President, Vice-President and Executive Counselor. Nominees must be current members of the ASC. Send the names of nominees, position for which they are being nominated, and if possible, a current c.v. to Stephen Mastrofski, Chair, Nominations Committee, at the address below (e-mail strongly preferred). Nominations must be received by **September 15, 2010** to be considered by the Committee.

Stephen Mastrofski
Department of Administration of Justice
George Mason University
10900 University Blvd., MS 4F4
Manassas, VA 20110-2203
Email: smastrof@gmu.edu

ADVANCE YOUR
CAREER IN
CRIMINOLOGY.
EARN YOUR
MASTER'S DEGREE.

- ▶ Prepare yourself for administrative and management positions in the criminal justice system and related fields and for doctoral education.
- ▶ Complete your program in three semesters by taking classes full time.
- ▶ Prepare to work in a variety of areas, including federal, state, and local levels of law enforcement and corrections.

For more information:
E-mail crim-gradinfo@iup.edu
Call 724-357-2720
Visit www.iup.edu/criminology



Indiana University of Pennsylvania



GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Master of Science Program
Distance Learning Master of Science Program
Ph.D. Program

Main Areas of Specialization:
Corrections, Crime Prevention, Criminology, Policing

For information, contact: www.uc.edu/criminaljustice

The Faculty

Steven C. Beck (University of Cincinnati) Organizational Theory; Personnel Selection and Development; Domestic Violence

Michael L. Benson (University of Illinois) White-Collar Crime; Criminological Theory; Life-Course Criminology

Susan Bourke (University of Cincinnati) Corrections; Undergraduate Retention; Teaching Effectiveness

Sandra Lee Browning (University of Cincinnati) Race, Class, Gender and Crime; Law and Social Control; Drugs and Crime

Mitchell B. Chamlin (University at Albany, SUNY) Macro-Criminology; Structural Sociology; Time-Series Analysis

Francis T. Cullen (Columbia University) Criminological Theory; Correctional Policy; White-Collar Crime

John E. Eck (University of Maryland) Crime Prevention; Problem-Oriented Policing; Crime Pattern Formation

Robin S. Engel (University at Albany, SUNY) Policing; Criminal Justice Theory; Criminal Justice Administration

Bonnie S. Fisher (Northwestern University) Victimology/Sexual Victimization; Public Opinion; Methodology/Measurement

James Frank (Michigan State University) Policing; Legal Issues in Criminal Justice; Program Evaluation

Paul Gendreau (Queens University, Visiting Scholar) Correctional Rehabilitation; Organization of Knowledge; Program Evaluation

Edward J. Latessa (The Ohio State University) Correctional Rehabilitation; Offender/Program Assessment; Community Corrections

Paula Smith (University of New Brunswick) Correctional Interventions; Offender/Program Assessment; Meta Analysis

Christopher J. Sullivan (Rutgers University) Developmental Criminology, Juvenile Prevention Policy, Research Methods

Lawrence F. Travis, III (University at Albany, SUNY) Policing; Criminal Justice Policy; Sentencing

Patricia Van Voorhis (University at Albany, SUNY) Correctional Rehabilitation and Classification; Psychological Theories of Crime; Women and Crime

Pamela Wilcox (Duke University) Criminal Opportunity Theory; Schools, Communities, and Crime, Victimization/Fear of Crime

John D. Wooldredge (University of Illinois) Institutional Corrections; Sentencing; Research Methods

John Paul Wright (University of Cincinnati) Life-Course Theories of Crime; Biosocial Criminology; Longitudinal Methods

Roger Wright (Chase College of Law) Criminal Law and Procedure; Policing; Teaching Effectiveness

AROUND THE ASC

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University (MSU) recently launched the Anti-Counterfeiting and Product Protection Program (A-CAPPP), which focuses on all products from luxury and consumer goods—such as clothing and electronics—to potentially dangerous ingestible and manufactured goods—such as food, pharmaceuticals, and auto parts. The A-CAPPP aims to become an international hub for information and resources on evidence-based anti-counterfeit strategy. An interdisciplinary program that draws on the intellectual contributions of the entire MSU community, the A-CAPPP incorporates a broad research portfolio, graduate education and executive training, and outreach. For more information visit <http://www.a-cappp.msu.edu/index.html>.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Rutgers University President Richard L. McCormick has announced the appointment of the distinguished criminal justice scholar and former Rutgers professor Todd Clear, Ph.D., as dean of the School of Criminal Justice at Rutgers University in Newark. Clear, currently professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, will assume the deanship at Rutgers in March. Dr. Bonita Veysey, who has served as acting dean since June 2009, will be returning to the faculty.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

The School of Sociology and Criminal Justice is pleased to announce the addition of *Ryan Randa* and *Trina Rose* to its faculty. Both young scholars joined the criminal justice faculty in August 2009. Professor Randa (Ph.D. 2009, University of Cincinnati) specializes in environmental criminology and Professor Rose (Ph.D. 2009, University of Nebraska-Lincoln) specializes in social networking among juveniles.

NOTES REGARDING THE ANNUAL MEETING

November 17-20, 2010 in San Francisco, California

- The deadline for Presidential panels, author meets critics panels, all other panels, and individual paper abstracts has now passed.
- The deadline for Posters, roundtable abstracts, and presidential panel essays is **Friday, May 14, 2010**.
- The Call for Papers, link to the submission site, and other Meeting information can be found on the ASC website, www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm.
- Please direct all questions regarding the Program to the Program Committee email address, asc2010@iupui.edu.
- Meeting Registration forms will be available on the ASC website in April 2010.
- Please see page 10 of this issue for a set of guidelines for Session Chairs, Presenters, and Poster Sessions. This information can also be found on the Annual Meeting page of the ASC website as listed above.

GUIDELINES FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING

Instructions for Session Chairs

The following are suggestions to session chairs:

- Arrive at the meeting room a few minutes early and meet briefly with the presenters.
- The session is 80 minutes long. Allow at least 10 minutes for questions and comments from the audience. Divide the time evenly between the presenters and inform them of the amount of time available to them.
- Convene the session promptly at the announced time.
- Introduce each presenter with a title and institutional affiliation.
- Politely inform the presenters when their time limit is approaching. Many chairs pass a note to the presenter as they are approaching the end of their allocated time.
- When the announced presentations have been completed, invite questions and comments from the audience. Some chairs invite speakers from the audience to identify themselves by name and institutional affiliation.
- Adjourn the session promptly at the announced time.

Instructions for Presenters

- Screens and LCD projectors will be available in all meeting rooms (except roundtables and posters). Overhead projectors, computers, monitors, the internet, VCRs/DVDs are not provided.
- If your session includes a discussant, send her/him a copy of the paper at least a month before the meeting.
- After you pick up your registration materials at the meeting, you may want to spend a few minutes locating the room in which your session will be held.
- Please plan a brief presentation. Sessions are scheduled for one hour and twenty minutes (80 minutes). Divide by the number of people participating in your session to figure out how long you have to speak. Leave some time for audience participation.
- Have a watch and keep presentations to their allotted time.

Instructions for Poster Sessions

- Poster sessions are intended to present research in a format that is easy to scan and absorb quickly. This session is designed to facilitate more in-depth discussion of the research than is typically possible in a symposium format.
 - The Poster Session will be held on the Thursday of the week of the meeting.
 - ASC will not provide AV equipment for this session and there are no electrical outlets for user-supplied equipment.
 - Arrive early to set up and remove materials promptly at the end of the session. At least one author is in attendance at the poster for the entire duration of the panel session.
 - The poster board is 3 feet high and 5 feet wide. Each presentation should fit on one poster. Push-pins will be provided. Each poster will be identified with a number. This number corresponds to the number printed in the program for your presentation.
 - The success of the poster session depends on the ability of the viewers to understand the material readily. Observe the following guidelines in the preparation of your poster:
 - ◆ Prepare all poster material ahead of time.
 - ◆ Keep the presentation simple.
 - ◆ Do not mount materials on heavy board because these may be difficult to keep in position on the poster board.
 - ◆ Prepare a visual summary of the research with enough information to stimulate interested viewers rather than a written research paper. Use bulleted phrases rather than narrative text.
 - ◆ Prepare distinct panels on the poster to correspond to the major parts of the presentation. For example, consider including a panel for each of the following: Introduction, methods, results, conclusions, and references.
 - ◆ Number each panel so that the reader can follow along in the order intended.
 - ◆ Ensure that all poster materials can be read from three feet away. We suggest an Arial font with bold characters. Titles and headings should be at least 1 inch high. DO NOT use a 12 point font.
 - ◆ Prepare a title board for the top of the poster space indicating the title and author(s). The lettering for this title should be no less than 1.5 inches high.
-



AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

CALL FOR PAPERS

Annual Meeting 2010
San Francisco, California
November 17th – 20th, 2010
San Francisco Marriott

CRIME & SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Program Co-Chairs:

KENNA QUINET

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

CRYSTAL A. GARCIA

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

asc2010@iupui.edu

ASC President:

RICHARD ROSENFELD

University of Missouri-St. Louis

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

Presidential panel and individual paper abstracts, and author meets critics panels due:

Friday March 12th, 2010

Posters, roundtable abstracts, and presidential panel essays due:

Friday May 14th, 2010

SUBMISSION DETAILS:

All abstracts must be submitted on-line through the ASC website at www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm. On the site you will be asked to indicate the type of submission you wish to make. Please note that this call for papers is different than the call for papers for the 2009 meetings. We will not be including policy papers this year. Instead we are seeking submissions for "**Presidential Panel Papers.**" Presidential panel papers are explained in detail in the box below. The submission choices available for the 2010 meetings include: (1) Presidential Panel Paper, (2) Complete Thematic Panel, (3) Individual Paper Presentation, (4) Poster Presentation, (5) Roundtable Submission, or (6) Author Meets Critics Session.

Presidential Panels

During the 2010 annual conference, the ASC will host a small number of Presidential Panels focusing on crime and social institutions (economy, family, education, polity and religion). Authors participating in these sessions should present and defend a proposition on the relationship between crime and one or more institutions and summarize the relevant prior research. Papers presenting new research findings are also welcome. One paper will be presented during each of these sessions and two discussants (selected by the area chair) will respond to the presentation.

These Presidential Panels will be limited in number and will be specially designated as such in the program. Paper submissions, which should not exceed 20 pages, will be peer-reviewed by the relevant program area chair. If interested in presenting a paper in a Presidential Panel, please submit an abstract in the most appropriate of the five crime and social institution subareas (e.g., economy, polity, family, education, religion). You will then need to submit a draft of your full essay by May 14th to the area chair listed below. *Please be sure to check for any updates with the area chairs listed on the ASC website before submitting your essay.

- **PRESIDENTIAL PANEL ABSTRACT SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday March 12, 2010

- **PRESIDENTIAL PANEL PAPER SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday, May 14, 2010

- **NOTIFICATION AS TO ACCEPTANCE:**
Friday, July 2, 2010

AREA I: Presidential Panels – Crime and Social Institutions

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1. Crime and the Economy | Shawn Bushway | SBushway@uamail.albany.edu |
| 2. Crime and the Family | David Farrington | dpf1@cam.ac.uk |
| 3. Crime and Education | Allison Payne | allison.payne@villanova.edu |
| 4. Crime and the Polity | Katherine Beckett | kbeckett@u.washington.edu |
| 5. Crime and Religion | Ronald Akers | rlakers@ufl.edu |

Complete Thematic Panel: For a thematic panel, you must submit titles, abstracts and author information for all papers together. Each panel should contain between three and four papers and one discussant. We encourage panel submissions organized by individuals, ASC Divisions and other working groups.

- **PANEL SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday, March 12th, 2010

Individual Paper Presentations: Submissions for a regular session presentation must include a title and abstract (of no more than 200 words), along with author information. Please note that these presentations are intended for individuals to discuss work that has been completed or where substantial progress has been made. Presentations about work that has yet to begin or is only in the formative stage are not appropriate here and may be more suitable for roundtable discussion (see below).

- **INDIVIDUAL PAPER SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday, March 12th, 2010

Poster Presentations: Submissions for poster presentations require only a title and abstract (of no more than 200 words), along with author information. Posters should display theoretical work or methods, data, policy analyses, or findings in a visually appealing poster format that will encourage questions and discussion about the material.

- **POSTER SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday, May 14th, 2010

Roundtable Sessions: These sessions consist of three to six presenters discussing related topics. Roundtable sessions are generally less formal than panels. Thus, ASC provides no AV equipment for these sessions.

- **ROUNDTABLE SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday May 14th, 2010

Author Meets Critics: These sessions, organized by an author or critic, consist of one author and three to four critics discussing and critiquing a recently published book relevant to the ASC. Submit the author's name and title of the book and the names of the three to four persons who have agreed to comment on the book.

- **AUTHOR MEETS CRITICS SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**
Friday, March 12, 2010

APPEARANCES ON PROGRAM

You may submit **ONLY ONE FIRST AUTHOR PRESENTATION** and make only one other appearance as either a chair or discussant on a panel. Appearances on the program as a co-author, a poster presenter, or a roundtable participant are unlimited. **Only original papers that have not been published or presented elsewhere may be submitted to the program committee.**

The meetings are Wednesday, November 17, through Saturday, November 20, and submissions may be placed at any time during the program. ASC cannot honor personal preferences for day and time of presentations. All program participants are expected to register for the meeting. We encourage everyone to pre-register before October 1st to avoid paying a higher registration fee and the possibility of long lines at the onsite registration desk at the meeting. You can go on the ASC website at www.asc41.com under Annual Meeting Info to register online or print off a printer friendly form to fax or mail in. Pre-registration materials will be sent to you by September 1, 2010.

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

- **Friday March 12th, 2010** is the **absolute** deadline for presidential panel abstracts, thematic panels, regular panel presentations, and author meets critics.
- **Friday May 14th, 2010** is the **absolute** deadline for the submission of the full presidential panel essays, poster roundtable sessions.

ABSTRACTS

All submissions must include an abstract of no more than 200 words. They should describe the general theme of the presentation and where relevant, the methods and results. **Please note that due to the large volume of submissions, no late submissions will be accepted.**

EQUIPMENT

LCD projectors will be available for all panel and paper presentations to enable computer-based presentations. However, presenters will need to bring their own personal computers or arrange for someone on the panel to bring a personal computer. Additionally, all meeting rooms for paper and panel sessions will include overhead projectors. **Please note that ASC does not provide either LCD or overhead projectors for roundtable sessions.**

GUIDELINES FOR ONLINE SUBMISSIONS

When submitting an abstract or complete panel at the ASC website, you should select a single sub-area (1 through 50) in one of 12 broader areas listed below. Please select the area, and sub-area if relevant, most appropriate for your presentation and only submit your abstract once. If you are submitting an abstract for a roundtable, poster session or author meets critic panel, you only need to select the broader area (i.e., Areas 10, 11 or 12), no sub-area is offered. Your choice of area and sub-area (when appropriate) will be important in determining the panel for your presentation and will assist the program chairs in avoiding time conflicts for panels on similar topics.

- Tips for choosing appropriate areas and sub-areas:
 - Review the entire list before making a selection.
 - Choose the most appropriate area first and then identify the sub-area that is most relevant to your paper.

The area and/or sub-area you choose should be based on the aspect of your paper that you would describe as the primary focus of the paper. For example, if your paper deals with the process by which juveniles are transferred to adult court in a particular jurisdiction, you would likely choose Area VII, sub-area 38.

Area I Presidential Plenaries

1	Crime and the Economy	Shawn Bushway	SBushway@uamail.albany.edu
2	Crime and the Family	David Farrington	dpf1@cam.ac.uk
3	Crime and Education	Allison Payne	allison.payne@villanova.edu
4	Crime and the Polity	Katherine Beckett	kbeckett@u.washington.edu
5	Crime and Religion	Ronald Akers	rlakers@ufl.edu

Area II Crime and Social Institutions

6	Crime and the Economy	Shawn Bushway	SBushway@uamail.albany.edu
7	Crime and the Family	David Farrington	dpf1@cam.ac.uk
8	Crime and Education	Allison Payne	allison.payne@villanova.edu
9	Crime and the Polity	Katherine Beckett	kbeckett@u.washington.edu
10	Crime and Religion	Ronald Akers	rlakers@ufl.edu

Area III Causes of Crime and Criminal Behavior

11	Biological, Bio-social, Psychological Perspectives	Diana Fishbein	dfishbein@rti.org
12	Micro-social Perspectives (Learning, Control, Strain, Rational Choice)	Lee Ann Slocum	slocuml@umsl.edu
13	Macro-social Perspectives (Cultural, Disorganization, Anomie)	Jukka Savolainen	jsavolainen@unomaha.edu
14	Routine Activities and Situational Perspectives	John Eck	john.eck@uc.edu
15	Developmental, Integrated and Life Course Theories	Alex Piquero	apiquero@crim.umd.edu
16	Critical, Conflict and Feminist Perspectives	Walter DeKeseredy	walter.dekeseredy@uoit.ca

Area IV Types of Offending

17	Violent Crime	Jay Corzine	hcorzine@mail.ucf.edu
18	Property Crime	Heith Copes	jhopes@uab.edu
19	Family and Domestic Violence	Richard Gelles	gelles@sp2.upenn.edu
20	Sex Crimes	Lisa Sample	lsample@mail.unomaha.edu
21	Public Order Crimes	Wesley Skogan	skogan@northwestern.edu
22	White Collar, Occupational and Organizational Crime	Henry Pontell	pontell@uci.edu
23	Organized Crime	Howard Abadinsky	abadinsh@stjohns.edu
24	Hate Crime	Valerie Jenness	jenness@uci.edu
25	Terrorism	Brent Smith	bls@uark.edu

Area V Correlates of Crime

26	Gangs, Peers, and Co-offending	T.J. Taylor	taylorjt@umsl.edu
27	Substance Abuse	Lana Harrison	lharriso@udel.edu
28	Firearms	Anthony Braga	anthony_braga@harvard.edu
29	Mental Health	Cathy Spatz-Widom	cathy.widom@gmail.com

Area VI Victimology

30	Victimization Patterns and Trends	Kristen Carbone Lopez	carbonelopezk@umsl.edu
31	Victimization Policy and Prevention	Pamela Wilcox	pamela.wilcox@uc.edu

Area VII Social Responses to Crime

32	Crime policy and Prevention	Susan Turner	sfturner@uci.edu
33	Policing and Law Enforcement	Stephen Mastrofski	smastrof@gmu.edu
34	Prosecution, Courts and Sentencing	Brian Johnson	bjohnson@crim.umd.edu
35	Prisons and Jails	Beth Huebner	huebnerb@@umsl.edu
36	Community Corrections	Terry Baumer	tebaumer@iupui.edu
37	Prisoner Reentry	Christy Visher	visher@udel.edu
38	Juvenile Justice System	William Barton	wbarton@iupui.edu
39	Capital Punishment	Jeff Fagan	jfagan@law.columbia.edu
40	Fear of Crime and Perceived Risk	Jodi Lane	jlane@ufl.edu
41	Media and the Social Construction of Crime	Ray Surrette	surette@mail.ucf.edu

Area VIII Comparative Perspectives

42	Gender, Crime and Justice	Jody Miller	jodymiller@umsl.edu
43	Race, Ethnicity and Justice	Eric Stewart	estewart2@fsu.edu
44	Immigration and Transnational Crime and Justice	William Pridemore	wpridemo@indiana.edu
45	Convict Criminology	Stephen Richards	richarsc@uwosh.edu

Area IX Innovative Methods in Research and Teaching

46	Advances in Quantitative Research	David McDowall	mcdowall@albany.edu
47	Advances in Qualitative Research	Richard Wright	surfer@umsl.edu
48	Advances in Evaluation Research	Finn Esbensen	esbensen@umsl.edu
49	Advances in Experimental Methods	Lawrence Sherman	lws@sas.upenn.edu
50	Advances in Teaching Methods	Tim Maher	MaherT@msx.umsl.edu

Area X Roundtable Sessions

Tom Stucky tstucky@iupui.edu

Area XI Poster Sessions

Mark Berg markberg1@gmail.com

Area XII Author Meets Critics

Bonnie Fisher bonnie.fisher@uc.edu

CALL FOR BOOK PROPOSALS

Announcing a New Book Series Solving Social Problems



Series Editor: **Bonnie Berry**, Director of the Social Problems Research Group, USA

Solving Social Problems provides a forum for the description and measurement of social problems, with a keen focus on the concrete remedies proposed for their solution. The series takes an international perspective, exploring social problems in various parts of the world, with the central concern being always their possible remedy. Work is welcomed on subjects as diverse as environmental damage, terrorism, economic disparities and economic devastation, poverty, inequalities, domestic assaults and sexual abuse, health care, natural disasters, labour inequality, animal abuse, crime, and mental illness and its treatment. In addition to recommending solutions to social problems, the books in this series are theoretically sophisticated, exploring previous discussions of the issues in question, examining other attempts to resolve them, and adopting and discussing methodologies that are commonly used to measure social problems. Proposed solutions may be framed as changes in policy or practice, or more broadly as social change and social movement. Solutions may be reflective of ideology, but are always pragmatic and detailed, explaining the means by which the suggested solutions might be achieved.

If you would like to submit a proposal for this series, please email:

the Series Editor, **Bonnie Berry**: solving@socialproblems.org

or the Commissioning Editor, **Neil Jordan**: njordan@ashgatepublishing.com

www.ashgate.com/sociology

TEACHING TIPS COLUMN CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Edited by Candice Batton
University of Nebraska at Omaha
cbatton@unomaha.edu

The ASC Teaching Committee is responsible for the “Teaching Tips” column, which is geared toward sharing ideas that will help improve teaching in both undergraduate and graduate level criminology and criminal justice courses. Tips can consist of:

- Pedagogical or curriculum resources (e.g., helpful books, websites, agencies)
- In-class, small group exercises
- Ideas for stimulating and leading discussion on difficult, challenging, or controversial topics
- Innovative teaching techniques (e.g., using music, videos, clickers, television dramas, or newspapers in the classroom)
- Examples of service learning, experiential learning, or problem-based learning activities
- Examples of writing assignments that help students understand theories, concepts, and/or processes related to the field
- Tips for making teaching more manageable and enjoyable (e.g., time savers, topics that generate discussion, ways for engaging students)

Please send submissions for “Teaching Tips” to Candice Batton at cbatton@unomaha.edu. Submissions should be approximately 500-1,000 words, but can deviate from this guideline.

Thanks – Candice Batton, Chair, ASC Teaching Committee

TEACHING TIPS COLUMN

Jay S. Albanese, Guest Editor

The Practice of Critical Thinking:

A Method to Evaluate Viewpoints and to Think Critically

Jay S. Albanese
Virginia Commonwealth University

Critical thinking has become the mantra of those looking to change the way education occurs. Rather than emphasizing the accumulation of facts, which still dominates education today at all levels, critical thinking emphasizes instead the ability to evaluate viewpoints, facts, and behaviors objectively, in order to assess the presentation of information---or methods of argumentation--- to establish the true worth of an act or course of conduct. Critical thinking is the basis for making decisions in situations where the facts are unclear or conflict. How to make decisions is not routinely taught (i.e., how to use facts in a principled way). Critical thinking involves the development of abilities to sort through facts intelligently, as well as half-truths, lies, and deceptive arguments, in order to determine the actual value of a statement, position, or behavior.¹

But how can critical thinking be taught? There is disagreement in the literature about how to accomplish this in practice. Some believe critical thinking emphasizes the “critical,” resulting in cynical disbelief, rather than looking for real meaning.² Others point to examples of bad or absent critical thinking on the part of individuals and organizations, but the precise methods for inculcating this skill are elusive for many, especially for students.³ A consensus document identified characteristics of the critical thinker: “The ideal critical thinker is habitually inquisitive, well-informed, trustful of reason, open-minded, flexible, fair-minded in evaluation, honest in facing personal biases, prudent in making judgments, willing to reconsider, clear about issues, orderly in complex matters, diligent in seeking relevant information, reasonable in the selection of criteria, focused in inquiry, and persistent in seeking results which are as precise as the subject and the circumstances of inquiry permit.”⁴ These are all desirable characteristics, but how do we work toward these goals, while teaching courses on a variety of different substantive topics?

This situation led me to create a one-page series of questions for students to use to become more critical in how they think. It is titled, *A Method to Evaluate Viewpoints and to Think Critically: How not to be fooled or misled by weak arguments*, and it designed to offer a concise way to operationalize the meaning of critical thinking for students. I provide students with editorials, and other articles that express a point of view, and have them apply this “Method” to examine whether or not the arguments and conclusions should be believed. I have had some success with this approach, and welcome any feedback, as we each pursue the common objective of promoting principled thinking.

(Continued on page 19)

(Continued from page 18)

A METHOD TO EVALUATE VIEWPOINTS AND TO THINK CRITICALLY

How not to be fooled or misled by weak arguments

By Jay S. Albanese

A. **Author's Background**

1. Is the author qualified to speak on the topic?
2. Is his/her background likely to affect the views expressed?

B. **Principal Contention** (PC): What is the main point(s) the author is making?

C. **Supporting Evidence**: What are the arguments used by the author to sustain his or her principal contention?

D. **How Confident or Wary** Should We Be About This Viewpoint? (i.e., **ways to think critically**).

1. **Recognizing Deceptive Information**

- a. **Disputable Information Source**: Is the source of information valid and reliable? (i.e., are data or valid scientific studies employed versus personal experiences and anecdotes)?
- b. **Factual Errors**: Do you possess knowledge that refutes the author's argument? What is its source? Is it reliable information?
- c. **Ideological Statements**: Can the arguments made be evaluated by some kind of objective evidence, or is it unprovable?
- d. **Unsupported Assertion**: Are the supporting arguments based on reliable facts and evidence or on only opinions?
- e. **Unwarranted Generalization**: Are facts or statistics used about one case to generalize unjustly about an entire group?

2. **Recognizing Deceptive Methods of Argumentation**

- a. **Bad Logic**: Is there a reasonable connection, or causal relation, between the evidence used and the principal contention?
- b. **Categorical Statement**: Is the argument made in such a way that it appears there can be no other logical alternative?
- c. **Conjecture**: Are inferences or predictions made based on incomplete information or guesswork?
- d. **Exaggeration**: Is an opposing point of view distorted or misrepresented to make the author's own view appear stronger?
- e. **Imitation**: Is an assumption made that "everybody" does or should believe in a particular point of view?
- f. **Inflammatory Language**: Is an attempt made to persuade using hysterical or emotionally-charged language in stead of reason?
- g. **Intimidation**: Is there an implied threat that if you don't do or believe something, you are in serious trouble?
- h. **Personal Attack**: Is an opponent criticized personally, rather than a rational debate of his or her ideas?
- i. **Sensationalism**: Is the argument made in a manner that is intended to shock or titillate, rather than inform?
- j. **Testimonial**: Do others quoted to support the author's views have expertise in the area?

¹Jay S. Albanese. *Professional Ethics in Criminal Justice: Being Ethical When No One is Looking*, 2nd ed. (Pearson, 2008).

²Michael S. Roth. "Beyond Critical Thinking." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 56 (January 8, 2010), B4.

³Stan Shapiro, "Decision Making Under Pressure," *The Futurist*, vol. 44 (January-February, 2010), 42; Gerda J. Visser-Wijnveen, Jan H. Van Driel, Roeland M. Van der Rijst, Nico Verloop, Anthony Visser. "The Relationship between Academics' Conceptions of Knowledge, Research and Teaching – A Metaphor Study," *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 14 (December, 2009), 673.

⁴Peter Facione, *Critical Thinking: A Statement of Expert Consensus for Purposes of Educational Assessment and Instruction*. (California Academic Press, 1990).



NORTHERN ILLINOIS
UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN SOCIOLOGY WITH CRIMINOLOGY EMPHASIS

Master of Arts Degree

The Department of Sociology at Northern Illinois University would like to invite applications for admission into its MA program. The program includes training in criminological theory and quantitative and qualitative research methods. Faculty expertise and coursework focus on the criminal justice system, gender and crime, delinquency, offender reintegration, prisons, mental health, and policing. Graduates of the program have gone on to obtain their Ph.D.s at prestigious universities, college teaching positions, and careers in research, law enforcement, and corrections. Graduate Assistantships—including tuition waivers and monthly stipends are available to select applicants.

Criminology Faculty

Keri B. Burchfield (Pennsylvania State University) Communities and Crime, Sex Offenders

Michael C. Campbell (University of California at Davis) Punishment, Prisons

Charles L. Cappell (University of Chicago) Violence, Law and Society

Fred E. Markowitz (University at Albany, SUNY) Violence, Social Control, Mental Illness

J. Kirk Miller (North Carolina State University) Policing, Gender and Crime

Kristopher Robison (Ohio State University) International Terrorism, Political Violence

For further information, contact:

Fred E. Markowitz, Ph.D.

Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies

Department of Sociology

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, IL 60115

815.753.6438

fredm@niu.edu

Visit our website at:

<http://www.sociology.niu.edu/sociology/about/index.shtml>

The ASC Email Mentoring Program

The ASC email mentoring program is free to all ASC students, offering a range of mentoring services. The site lists about 100 ASC members (university faculty, researchers, and administrators) who have volunteered to serve as mentors to our students. These mentors represent ASC experts in the US and internationally, from a variety of demographic features (age, race, and gender). We have a search feature that allows ASC students to search the site for mentors by specialization. So, type the word theory (for instance) in the search bar and, voila, up pops all the mentors who do theory. Also, the site is more accessible than ever as well as being password protected.

Please utilize the web site at <http://ascmentor.anomie.com> (or access it via the ASC main page).

Current Mentors

If you have changed your affiliations, email addresses, or areas of specialization, please let me know and I'll make the updates. Also, if you want off the list, tell me and I'll remove you.

Call for New Mentors

If you're an ASC non-student member and you'd like to sign up for the ASC email mentoring program as a mentor, please email me the following information (below). The program has been a very rewarding experience for those of us serving as mentors and we always welcome new people. We seek not only university faculty but also those working in research institutes (private or public), practitioners, and administrators in any field related to the discipline of Criminology. Students need mentors from a variety of specializations as well as various ages, races, and genders. Interested? Email me your:

Name
Affiliation
Email address
Areas of specialization (e.g., women and crime, technology, community corrections, etc.)
Month and year of birth (optional)
Gender
Race/ethnicity

Students

The program is available and free to all ASC student members. We encourage you to make use of our top-notch national and international experts. The ASC developed the mentoring program in 1994, with the purpose being to link ASC students with experts in the field of Criminology outside their own universities. Students may ask mentors about career choices, research and theoretical issues, personal-professional concerns (such as what it's like to be a minority Criminologist in a variety of work settings).

The ASC Email Mentor of the Year Award

Students, please nominate the mentor who has been most helpful to you via the ASC email mentoring program. I will forward your recommendation to the ASC Board. The award is then delivered at the ASC annual meetings, along with a very impressive plaque. Please make your nominations to me by **September 1** of every year.

Let me know if you have any questions or suggestions for improvement. Students and Mentors are encouraged to contact me at:

Bonnie Berry, PhD
Director
Social Problems Research Group
Mentor_inbound@socialproblems.org

ACCOUNTABILITY VERSUS KNOWLEDGE-BUILDING FRAMES FOR EVALUATION OF COMPLEX CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS

Akiva M. Liberman, National Institute on Drug Abuse

Note: Views expressed here are solely those of the author and do not represent official positions of the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Program evaluation can be framed in terms of accountability, where the goal is to check whether funded programs produce the outcomes that were anticipated. Or evaluation can be framed in terms of knowledge building, where the goal is to generate knowledge to inform future program decisions. Although complementary in the abstract, these two goals are often at odds in evaluating complex programs, especially if implemented by different teams in many sites. Ironically, when funders frame evaluation in accountability terms, they often undermine the ability to build knowledge incrementally.

A key difference concerns time orientation. Accountability essentially looks backward and asks about the effects of past program decisions (at the time of evaluation). Implications for future program decisions – primarily whether to continue or terminate funding – are expected to follow directly. In contrast, knowledge-building starts from a future orientation, and asks how future program decisions can best be informed by evaluating the current program. These future program decisions may include program termination or continuation, but may also include decisions about program improvement, including modification of the program, of site or funding criteria, or program eligibility.

With either frame, I take the key evaluation question to be about the effects of the program on desired outcomes. It is important to distinguish this from a more basic accountability question: Did the program do what was promised? This is primarily addressed by auditing and performance measures. Monitoring program performance is much more straightforward and has a shorter time-frame than evaluating whether that program then produces desired outcomes. When performance monitoring is equated or confused with outcome evaluation, then outcome evaluation is expected in the same time-frame, and for about the same level of effort, as performance monitoring. This naïve expectation then sets the stage for squandering evaluation resources on evaluations that produce little useful knowledge.

Evaluation in Stages

When a complex program is implemented at many sites by many different people, it is essentially impossible for it to be implemented consistently across sites. Even if generally well-implemented, unless the program has a clear, detailed and well-specified manual for implementation, what is implemented will vary widely. Many complex programs or policies lack implementation manuals clear enough to generate consistent implementation, and sometimes lack a clear logic model that articulates how the program might produce anticipated outcomes. Nonetheless, with an accountability frame, such a complex program is often subjected to an outcome evaluation, and frequently to a large multi-site or national evaluation. But under these circumstances, the predictable results are findings of considerable variation in implementation, which preclude definitive statements about program impact. Some well-implemented sites may show positive effects, but of unclear reliability, since the study was not designed around those sites. The evaluation may document some blatant implementation failures, but little is usually learned about necessary program ingredients, conditions for quality implementation, or whether the program would have the desired impact if well implemented. Repeated evaluations of this sort do not accumulate, and this feeds skepticism about both the utility of evaluation and program effectiveness.

When a knowledge-building frame is applied to evaluation, the first issue is which evaluation objectives are most useful to pursue with the current program, at its stage of development. If a program is expected to vary widely in implementation, assessing the effects of the program as already implemented will rarely be the initial objective. Instead, a more useful objective is usually to assess whether the program has the *potential* to produce the desired impact, if well implemented. This focuses evaluation efforts on a few model program sites that strongly implement clear program models. Conducting an outcome evaluation at those model sites using strong methods is key, along with strong fidelity measures.

Even at model sites, a first evaluation often finds weaknesses in the program and its implementation, which warrant improvement before any evaluation can be considered a strong test of the program. Only after positive findings at model sites is there much reason to conduct a large national or multi-site outcome evaluation to explore generalizability and implementation consistency, at a second stage. At this point, if positive model results fail to replicate, that motivates further study of differences in context, implementation, and participants, in order to understand when, where, and for whom the program is effective. In health research, the first stage is commonly called an *efficacy* trial, which tests an intervention under optimal conditions, followed by an *effectiveness* trial under more common conditions.

(Continued on page 23)

(Continued from page 22)

If a complex program is not well specified, then we expect different model sites to implement it differently. This is perhaps most apparent when a complex funded program includes a set of components, but the mix of components is not mandated and/or some components are optional. In this situation, no single model site can be taken as representing the program generally. Instead, different model sites may implement alternative program models or realizations of the program. Here, jumping directly into a large multi-site or national outcome evaluation seems quite unrealistic for generating useful knowledge. If, by design, local considerations generate alternative realizations of the program, none of which have been rigorously tested at model sites, then when this variation in program realizations is combined with the usual varying implementation quality, we should anticipate the resulting variability in outcomes to swamp our abilities to generate strong inferences about the program's effects. A much more productive first step is to study several alternative sites that strongly implement different realizations of the program, and evaluate the potential of these alternative realizations to produce desired effects.

In short, if a program is not ready for a definitive outcome evaluation, we should anticipate that a large multi-site study will produce equivocal outcome results, and may produce little useful guidance for future program decisions or program improvement. If approached instead with a knowledge-building frame, at the first-stage, we use evaluation to study the program's potential under optimal conditions and whether the program needs improvement. The next study then incorporates whatever was already learned. We will learn more from a sequence of studies designed to build on each other than from large but premature multi-site outcome evaluations.

Evaluability Assessments and Process Evaluations.

Regardless of how evaluation is framed, no one wants to conduct useless evaluations. As a prerequisite for evaluation, evaluability assessments sometimes assess whether a program has a coherent model and basic data collection procedures, and filter out many evaluations that are anticipated to generate no useful knowledge (Trevisan, 2007; Zedlewski & Murphy, 2006). Evaluations also often include process evaluations to study program implementation. When the program shows no effects, process evaluations help distinguish ineffective from poorly implemented programs. With considerable creativity and initiative, energetic evaluators can sometimes also use a process evaluation to drive program improvement, and hopefully another round of evaluation (e.g., G.R.E.A.T., Esbensen, 2004). Initially framing evaluation around knowledge-building, and considering whether the program is likely to need a cycle of program development, would increase the chances that evaluations would productively drive program development in this way.

Conclusion

Program decisions often do not wait for definitive evidence-based programs. Intimate partner violence, drug use, school violence, and related problems often demand immediate action. Even as program developers and researchers work to develop and test programs, starting small and building to scale, and while other initiatives mount demonstration programs (essentially the model programs discussed above), program funders also often broadly fund some programs in the present. These programs should be treated as experimental and used to generate evidence (Lieberman, 2009).

Funders are then interested in accountability. Accountability goals are primarily served by auditing and the analysis of performance measures, activities which are quite distinct from program evaluation. For complex programs that have not already been subject to a cycle of development and testing (i.e., prior evaluation activity with a knowledge-building frame), an accountability frame often produces evaluations with premature expectations for definitive outcome results, and which generate little useful knowledge for future program improvement.

Framed instead in terms of knowledge-building, evaluation seeks to maximize what we can learn at the current stage of program development. Each evaluation study is designed to inform the next round of program decisions and program development. Over time, study results accumulate and naturally build upon each other to generate knowledge for funders and policy-makers about what works.

References

- Esbensen, F. (2004). Evaluating G.R.E.A.T.: A school-based gang prevention program. *Research for Policy*. National Institute of Justice.
- Lieberman, A. M. (2009). Advocating evidence-generating policies: A role for the ASC. *Criminologist*, 34, 1-5. American Society of Criminology.
- Trevisan, M. S. (2007). Evaluability assessment from 1986 to 2006. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28, 290-303.
- Zedlewski, E. & Murphy, M. B (2006, July). Maximize your evaluation dollars. *NIJ Journal*, #254.

ON CRIMINOLOGICAL INDIFFERENCE TO THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC MELTDOWN

By David Shichor, Henry Pontell, and Gilbert Geis

The relationship between academics in the social sciences and policy makers is problematic at best. Many social scientists, including criminologists, bewail the fact that policy makers do not take account and make use of their research findings, their analytical skills, and their recommendations in making plans and reaching decisions. For their part, policy makers often find academic work too theoretical, esoteric, obtuse, and impractical. An ASC journal, *Criminology & Public Policy*, was launched in 2001 to seek to redress this situation. The editor stated the mission of the publication in its inaugural issue:

“The central objective of the journal is to strengthen the role of research findings in the formulation of crime and justice policy by publishing and widely disseminating empirically-based, policy-focused studies of important crime and justice policy questions” (Clear & Frost, 2001:1).

The introduction of the journal was a welcome step toward making criminological and criminal justice research findings salient for policy makers at relevant agencies and in legislative bodies. The hope was that some of the material would influence policy decisions. To what degree and in regard to what issues this occurred remains difficult to determine satisfactorily. It is important to note however, that several scholars voiced doubts about the extent to which social science in general can provide guidance to social policy (see, e.g., Moore, 2002), and expressed specific reservations about the potential impacts of criminological and criminal justice research (see, e.g., Austin, 2003).

More recently, in an attempt to circulate policy proposals, a 432-page volume was published that focused on public proposals from an American Society of Criminology conference. *Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice Policy* (Frost, Freilich & Clear, 2010) included twenty-four policy-oriented articles as well as responses to them. Many of the articles and responses were written by well-known and highly-regarded criminologists. The book was distributed gratis to persons attending the 2009 ASC meetings in Philadelphia.

In addition to an introductory essay on the general issue of criminological and criminal justice policy, the following substantive topics were addressed: justice, drug and alcohol use and abuse, policing, terrorism, immigration, juvenile justice, and corrections.

Policy recommendations by criminologists in these traditional substantive areas undoubtedly are important and timely. However, the absence of any reference to white-collar and corporate crime at a time when the United States is deeply involved in the worst economic meltdown since the Great Depression, borders on the unbelievable. The economic and social harms caused by sub-prime mortgage brokers, appraisers, and other businesspersons have been comprehensively documented for some time. In spite of the fact that so far there has been only one criminal case involving investment agency higher-ups connected to the mortgage crisis (resulting in a “not guilty” verdict for the two alleged offenders), there are compelling indications that many unlawful practices were involved in these transactions, including insider trading, false documentations, illegal accounting practices, failure to provide correct information on contract terms, and record manipulations.

Similarly, other major white-collar crime cases, such as the Bernie Madoff and Alan Stanford Ponzi schemes, widespread illegal backdating of stock options, and late trading in mutual funds, have received practically no attention from criminologists in their professional role. To take but one example, in contrast to total criminological neglect, there is a virtual cornucopia of empirical and theoretical articles published in the finance, business, law, and ethics journals focusing on illegal backdated stock options.

In the catastrophic economic meltdown, according to all indicators a large number of illegal and unethical acts were committed and regulators and enforcement agencies (and criminologists) were caught napping on their job. So why is it that the published policy recommendations of criminologists ignore these and similar kinds of earlier white-collar crime outbreaks? Are these matters not within the purview of “important crime and policy questions?” A forthcoming issue of *Criminology & Public Policy* with contributions on the economic meltdown, will no more than merely tweak at the fringes of this huge problem. Compare it to the outpouring of criminological publications on terrorism, many of them the result of government funding, a resource notably absent in the realm of white-collar crime scholarship.

(Continued on page 25)

(Continued from page 24)

Edwin H. Sutherland, in his 1939 presidential address to the American Sociological Society, challenged criminological and sociological theory by maintaining that it had not embraced white-collar offenses that he defined as violations of the law by persons in the higher echelons of the social system. In his presentation, Sutherland observed that economists failed to adequately incorporate sociological material in their scholarly endeavors and that sociologists studying crime did not satisfactorily comprehend and utilize insights and information from the discipline of economics. Today his characterization of the cross-disciplinary inadequacies of economics vis-à-vis sociology and vice versa has taken a lopsided turn. While economists and professionals in related disciplines (accounting, finance, business administration, business ethics, and business law) have produced a barrage of books, articles, and research reports on diverse aspects of the economic crises, arguing fervently in favor of or in opposition to remedial approaches, mainstream criminology and the ASC conference policy recommendations have taken no interest in such matters.

Whether the reason for this neglect lies in the lack of expertise of criminologists in regard to complicated financial manipulations, lack of knowledge of the regulatory problems and processes, lack of available data bases that lend themselves to sophisticated statistical analyses that now are the manta of “scientific” criminology, lack of top-notch disciplinary outlets for articles that do not use quantitative techniques, lack of professional interest among most criminologists in white-collar crime, the marginalization of white-collar crime research in the discipline, or any other explanation, the fact remains that criminology, much to the detriment of its policy relevance, appears oblivious to one of the major global recessions of modern times caused by capitalist overextension, unabashed greed, fraudulent manipulation, and lax oversight. The absence of professional criminological attention to the meltdown that continues to severely harm countless millions of people not only in the United States but throughout the world not only puts into question the effectiveness and integrity of the policy focus of the ASC, but may well hurt the image of criminology as an academic endeavor to be taken seriously by policy makers.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. (2003). Why criminology is irrelevant. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2:557-563.
- Clear, T. R. and Frost, N. A. (2001) *Criminology & Public Policy: A new journal of the American Society of Criminology*. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 1:1-3.
- Frost, N. A. Freilich, J. D. and Clear, T. R. (Eds.) (2010). *Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice Policy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Moore, M. H. (2002). The limits of social science in guiding policy. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2:32-42.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1940). White-collar criminality. *American Sociological Review*, 5:1-12.
-

DIVISION NEWS

DIVISION OF INTERNATIONAL CRIMINOLOGY

Dear Criminology Scholar,

The Division of International Criminology within the American Society of Criminology would like you to consider division membership. Membership includes the following benefits:

- ◆ Subscription to the division journal: *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*.
- ◆ Access to the Division's List Serv which includes notices on grants, publications, international meetings, etc.
- ◆ The opportunity to network with national and international researchers and conference organizers
- ◆ Information on possible United Nations involvement
- ◆ Opportunities for service to the discipline
- ◆ Opportunities for students to meet and to be mentored by faculty from around the world or locals who work globally
- ◆ Free division membership to persons from developing and third tier nations

For more information visit the Division website at: <http://www.internationalcriminology.com>

The annual membership is \$20 (regular) and \$15 for students. You must first be a current member of ASC before joining the division at: <http://www.asc41.com/appform1.html>

Welcome!

-The Membership Committee.



DIVISION NEWS

DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY

The Executive Board of the American Society of Criminology has established a new Division of Experimental Criminology. The purpose of the Division shall be “the promotion and improvement of experimental evidence and methods in the advancement of criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy.”

Underpinning the establishment of the new Division of Experimental Criminology is the growing conduct, synthesis and theoretical use of randomized experiments by ASC members. This is indicated by several facts:

- The founding of the Academy of Experimental Criminology in 1998, whose 50 Fellows meet annually at ASC for a dinner and open ASC panel sessions (see <http://www.crim.upenn.edu/aec/>)
- The founding of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group in 2000, which has completed 18 full systematic reviews of experimental and quasi-experimental evidence (see http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/reviews_crime_justice/index.php)
- The founding of the Journal of Experimental Criminology in 2005,
- The growing and over-room-capacity attendance at all Academy of Experimental Criminology events held at ASC in the past three years,
- The growing interest among graduate students in experimental methods, and
- The increasing interest among ASC members in offering rigorous evidence on policy effectiveness as manifest in articles in Criminology & Public Policy.

The field of experimental criminology is unified by the practical and theoretical problems in designing, delivering, analyzing, interpreting and synthesizing randomized controlled field experiments. This unity is clear in the standard objectives of such designs as required by the multi-disciplinary CONSORT statement (see <http://www.consort-statement.org/>). It is also clear that there are great complexities and challenges in delivering high-quality experiments under the standards of field research set by the CONSORT statement organization. These problems provided fertile ground for the coming together of an intellectual community that will now be recognized and supported in the form of an ASC Division.

Dues for the 2010 membership year are \$35 and \$10 for students.

For more information, contact:

Doris MacKenzie
Department of Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University
211 Oswald Tower
University Park, PA 16801
Tel 814-867-3291
Fax 814-863-7216
Email: d1m69@psu.edu
Campus office 327A Pond

IN MEMORIAM

JAMES A. INCIARDI, Professor of Sociology and Criminal Justice at the University of Delaware, died on November 23rd 2009 after a courageous battle with cancer. His career began as a Parole Officer in New York, and he later transitioned to the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission. After completing his PhD at NYU, Jim spent several years at the University of Miami before finding his academic home at the University of Delaware in 1976. For many years Jim directed UD's Criminal Justice Program, and he became renowned as a teacher of criminal justice. In 1991, Jim founded the Center for Drug and Alcohol Studies at UD.



Jim was an incredibly productive researcher and scholar, and received continuous funding from NIDA for some 30 years. His studies examined drugs-crime linkages, drug abuse treatment for criminal offenders, as well as HIV prevention for at-risk populations. Jim's work led to the creation of the KEY/CREST Therapeutic Community continuum, which became a national model for criminal justice treatment. In recognition of this work, Jim received the Outstanding Scholar Award from the University of Delaware in 1994 and was awarded a Merit Grant from NIDA. In 1995 he was named a Fellow of the American Society of Criminology.

During his career Jim produced an extensive body of scholarly work that will be an enduring memorial. He was a "translational scientist" long before the term came into vogue, interested in moving research into practice. A memorial service at UD is planned for February 26, 2010. Contributions can be made to the James A. Inciardi Memorial Award Fund at UD to support outstanding students in the field of Criminology.

Submitted by Steven S. Martin, University of Delaware

JOHN IRWIN, Professor Emeritus at San Francisco State University (SFSU), passed away January 3. After a conviction for armed robbery and serving a five-year sentence in California's prison system, he received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of California, Berkeley in 1968.



Irwin taught Sociology and Criminology at SFSU for 27 years. In prison he discovered that convicts were mostly ordinary human beings. This insight, not entirely appreciated by many academics that study crime and criminals, guided all of his academic and political activities. His considerable research on prisons included six books: *The Felon*, *Prisons in Turmoil*, *The Jail*, and *It's About Time* (with James Austin), *The Warehouse Prison*, and *Lifer*. He was also one of the contributing authors to the American Friends Service Committee's influential report *Struggle for Justice*.

John contributed to many community programs over the years, including Project Rebound at SFSU, and as an organizer and leader of the Prisoners' Union in California. He received the August Vollmer award from the American Society of Criminology, and served on the Board of Directors for the JFA Institute and the Sentencing Project.

John was one of the founding members of the Convict Criminology Group. He came to ASC to see the cons and to help the group grow and prosper. We found his wise counsel and sincere friendship to be invaluable. John was proud to be a "convict criminologist" and advocate for social justice. See Convict

Criminology Memorial at <http://www.convictcriminology.org/index.html>.

Submitted by Stephen C. Richards, James Austin, Barbara Owen, Jeffrey Ian Ross

SYMPOSIUM ON CRIME AND JUSTICE

The Past and Future of Empirical Sentencing Research

September 23 & 24, 2010

University at Albany, Page Hall Auditorium, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, NY

Symposium Director: Shawn Bushway

We have assembled a top flight group of scholars to review the current state of sentencing research and chart future directions.

MAIN PAPERS

The Role of Race in Sentencing Outcomes Eric Baumer, The Florida State University

Risk Assessment in Sentencing Kelly Hannah-Moffat, University of Toronto

Discretion and Decision Making in the Sentencing Process Shawn Bushway, University at Albany and Brian Forst, American University

Managing the Criminal Justice Population Bill Sabol, Bureau of Justice Statistics

The schedule also features a distinguished panel of session chairs and discussants.

Registration: General - \$125.00; Student - \$75.00 Reception and Dinner: General - \$40.00; Student - \$25.00

Available Scholarships - Research Poster Session - Young Scholar Paper Competition

Visit us at www.albany.edu/scj/SentencingSymposium.htm for additional information.

This event is made possible in large part by a grant from the National Science Foundation (SES-0939099).

NEW SPECIAL ISSUE FOR 2010!

What works in investigative psychology?

This special issue of *Legal and Criminological Psychology* journal will help you to solve problems that occur in investigative contexts and suggest answers for the following:

- **How best to interview children and other vulnerable witnesses?** *Ray Bull, UK*
- **How to achieve the most informative and accurate recall from adult witnesses in interviews?** *Ronald Fisher, USA*
- **How to interview suspects in an effective yet ethical manner?** *Saul Kassin et al., USA*
- **How best to detect deception?** *Stephen Porter et al., Canada*
- **How to conduct fair line-ups that lead to accurate identification?** *Neil Brewer et al., Australia*
- **How to differentiate between real and simulated amnesia?** *Harald Merckelbach et al., The Netherlands*
- **How can psychological knowledge contribute to more effective and successful offender profiling?** *Laurence Alison et al., UK*
- **How to counteract common and powerful extra-legal factors that may influence a juror's decision-making?** *Steven Penrod, USA*

BUY IT NOW FOR £25 (approx \$40)

Buy your special issue TODAY and Society members will receive a **FREE** online subscription to *Legal and Criminological Psychology* valid until end of this year (offer ends 31 March 2010)*.

E-mail: sales@bps.org.uk or **order online TODAY @** www.bps.org.uk/whatworks

* Offer only applies to new subscribers



The
British
Psychological
Society

www.bpsjournals.co.uk

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE CRIMINOLOGIST will regularly feature in these columns position vacancies available in organizations and universities, as well as positions sought by members of the Society. A charge of \$175.00 with the absolute maximum of 250 words allowed will be made. Half pages and full pages may also be purchased for \$225 and \$300 respectively. **It is the policy of the ASC to publish position vacancies announcements only from those institutions or agencies which subscribe to equal education and employment opportunities and those which encourage women and minorities to apply.** Institutions should indicate the deadline for the submission of application materials. To place announcements in THE CRIMINOLOGIST, send all material to: ncoldiron@asc41.com. When sending announcements, please include a phone number, fax number and contact person in the event we have questions about an ad. The Professional Employment Exchange will be a regular feature at each Annual Meeting. Prospective employers and employees should register with the Society no later than three weeks prior to the Annual Meeting of the Society. The cost of placing ads on our online Employment Exchange is \$200 for the first month, \$150 for the second month, and \$100 for each month thereafter. To post online, please go to www.asc41.com and click on Employment.

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENTS START ON NEXT PAGE



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Associate Provost and Dean for Research and Strategic Partnerships

John Jay College of Criminal Justice invites applications and nominations for the position of Associate Provost and Dean for Research and Strategic Partnerships, the chief research officer of the College and the spokesperson and champion for all research, scholarly, and creative work. His/her efforts will be aimed at expanding research activities in all academic areas and developing new institutional research programs and strategic partnerships to support research. In close collaboration with the President and Provost, he/she will serve as the primary contact between the College and federal and state funding agencies and corporate and other partners, including foreign governments and international universities. He/she will have responsibility for promoting and supporting research and creative activity within the College, assisting faculty to obtain and manage external funding, and broadening awareness of the societal value of the faculty's research activities. He/she will increase the College's success at securing institutional grants to support teaching, learning, and student success. He/she works closely with the President and Provost on strategic planning to develop research initiatives and with the Development Office to maximize private foundation and corporate connections, in support of grants and gifts. Please see the web announcement for an expanded list of responsibilities.

The Associate Provost and Dean will possess an earned doctorate and qualify for the rank of full Professor in one of the departments of the College, with a strong background in teaching and research and an excellent record in funded research. The successful candidate will have management experience in an academic environment and will demonstrate highly developed consultative, negotiation, and communication skills. He/she will demonstrate a commitment to diversity and to promoting a culture that nurtures various forms of inquiry and scholarship, across multiple disciplines.

TO APPLY: Please send cover letter, resume, and the names and contact information of three references to candidates@jjay.cuny.edu or mail to Attn.: Inez Brown, Office of the Provost & Academic Affairs, 899 Tenth Avenue, Room 634T, New York, NY 10019.

MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY

JOB POSTING NUMBER: 0600352

JOB POSITION TITLE: Assistant Professor, Homeland Security - Full Time

JOB DUTIES: Teach 9 credits per semester in criminology, statistics and Homeland Security (12 credits with a 3 credit course load reduction). Advise students. Maintain disciplinary currency and scholarship. Departmental service as appropriate.

REQUIREMENTS: An earned Ph.D. in criminal justice/criminology or a closely-related field. ABD status with Ph.D. completed by August 15, 2010 will be considered.

CLOSING DATE FOR APPLICATIONS: 02-15-2010

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS: Anticipated opening for the 2010-2011 academic year. Tenure track.

Transcripts and letters of recommendation should be directed to the academic department.

For more information about Criminal Justice please go to: http://www.monmouth.edu/academics/criminal_justice/default.asp

REQUIRED APPLICANT DOCUMENTATION: Resume or Curriculum Vitae, Cover Letter

TO APPLY:

For further information on this position, additional vacancies, or to apply: visit: <http://jobs.monmouth.edu>

**MONMOUTH
UNIVERSITY**

Where Leaders look forward™

Monmouth University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY NEW ORLEANS

Position/Rank and Salary: The Department of Criminal Justice at Loyola University New Orleans is seeking applications for two tenure-track (Assistant and Associate) Professor positions beginning Fall 2010. The Department is expanding in areas of expertise and programming to include a new online degree, Masters of Science in Criminal Justice Administration (MSCJA), aimed at private and public sector criminal justice and risk mitigation practitioners and administrators. We are particularly seeking candidates who have experience in developing and teaching online courses or have helped develop online curriculum. We desire applicants who are multi-disciplinary in their approach and/or educational backgrounds.

Areas of specialization and research agenda are open. Our region is a laboratory for all aspects of relevant and practical research. Members of the department have active research agendas and practical experience in a wide range of topics, including disaster and crime, loss prevention, homicide studies, interrogations, victim services, cybercrime, technologies and justice, transnational crime and economic development, forensics, and beyond.

We enjoy a culture of collaboration and collegiality, both within our department and university-wide. In addition to teaching responsibilities, colleagues are expected to advise undergraduate and graduate students, participate in the department, college and university committees, service learning/internship activities, and maintain active involvement in scholarly activities, including publication and securing outside funding.

We seek candidates who can contribute to the online MSCJA program. We anticipate the hiring of at least one candidate who, in addition to the appropriate scholarly credentials, ideally has a background in corporate risk and/or a public sector criminal justice agency.

A demonstration of teaching effectiveness will be required as part of the interview process. Salary is competitive and commensurate with qualifications and experience.

Qualifications: All applicants should have a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice, Administration of Justice, Criminology, Sociology, Public Administration or Political Economy from an accredited institution.

Appointment /Start Date: August 2010

Application Deadline: March 31, 2010. Application review begins immediately and the positions will remain open until filled.

Application Process: Qualified candidates should send a letter of interest, a curriculum vitae, official graduate transcripts, writing sample(s), a sample of a course syllabi and list of courses taught, course evaluations, and three (3) letters of reference to Dr. Vincenzo A. Sainato, c/o Mr. David Aplin, Faculty Search Committee, Loyola University New Orleans, 6363 Saint Charles Avenue, Stallings Hall, Campus Box 55, New Orleans, LA 70118. Loyola University New Orleans is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. For more information about our university and department, please visit <http://www.loyno.edu/> and <http://www.loyno.edu/criminaljustice/> or email crimjust@loyno.edu.

MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY

JOB POSTING NUMBER: 0600351

JOB POSITION TITLE: Assistant Professor, Research Methods - Full Time

JOB DUTIES: Teaching 9 credits per semester in the areas of Research Methods in Criminal Justice, Professional Writings in Criminal Justice, and Intelligence in Criminal Justice (12 credits with a 3 credit course load reduction). Serve on committees. Advise students. Maintain disciplinary currency.

REQUIREMENTS: Ph.D in Criminal Justice, Criminology, or a closely-related field is required. Juris Doctorate is not a substitute for Ph.D. ABD may be considered if the degree can be obtained by August 15, 2010. Excellent interpersonal, organizational and communication skills.

PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS: Strong ability in Criminal Justice Writings, knowledge in Intelligence in Criminal Justice.

CLOSING DATE FOR APPLICANTS: 02.15.2010

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS: Anticipated opening for the 2010 - 2011 academic year. Tenure track.

Transcripts and letters of recommendation can be directed to the academic department. For additional information about Criminal Justice, please go to: http://www.monmouth.edu/academics/criminal_justice/default.asp

REQUIRED APPLICANT DOCUMENTS: Resume or Curriculum Vitae, Cover Letter

TO APPLY:

For further information on this position, additional vacancies, or to apply: visit: <http://jobs.monmouth.edu>

**MONMOUTH
UNIVERSITY**

Where Leaders look forward™

Monmouth University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN

CRIMINAL JUSTICE POSITIONS ANNOUNCEMENT

Ph.D. Program Director, Department Chair and Faculty Positions
Department of Criminal Justice
Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences
University of New Haven, 300 Boston Post Road, West Haven, CT 06516

The Department of Criminal Justice, Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences, University of New Haven is recruiting for multiple positions as follows:

- (1) **Ph.D. Program Director.** This faculty appointment will be at the Associate Professor or Professor rank and candidates must possess academic experience suitable for the appropriate rank, including an earned doctorate. A Ph.D. in Criminal Justice is strongly preferred. A proven record of academic excellence in teaching, service and scholarship is required. Prior experience in a doctoral degree granting program in criminal justice is required. Candidates with strong research records and experience with externally supported grants and research projects are highly desirable.
- (2) **Department Chair.** This faculty appointment will be at the Associate Professor or Professor rank depending upon experience and the candidates must possess academic experience suitable for the appropriate rank. An earned doctorate is required. A Ph.D. in Criminal Justice is strongly preferred. A proven record of academic excellence in teaching, service and scholarship is required. Prior academic administrative experience is highly valued, particularly experience as a department chair.
- (3) **Tenure-track Assistant Professor or Associate Professor faculty positions.** These tenure-track positions require a doctoral degree. A Ph.D. in Criminal Justice is strongly preferred. Another earned doctorate in a discipline other than Criminal Justice, that is otherwise consistent with the stated specialization, may also be considered. Doctoral Candidates (A.B.D.) who are nearing the completion of their degree program may also be considered for the Assistant Professor rank. A J.D. degree alone is not sufficient for these positions. The desired specialty areas are:
 - a. Investigative Services
 - b. National Security or Security Studies
 - c. Digital Forensics or Forensic Computer Investigations
 - d. Crime Scene Investigations or Crime Scene Forensics
 - e. Forensic Psychology

All faculty positions require teaching, scholarship, service and other duties consistent with the University's *Faculty Handbook*. These positions are pending final budgetary and administrative approvals. The roles of Ph.D. Program Director and CJ Department Chair may be combined for an initial period.



Application Procedure: Send a cover letter indicating position or positions applied for and summarizing relevant background, a vita, and contact information for three references to:

Search #09-95

University of New Haven

300 Boston Post Road • West Haven, CT 06516

Or via e-mail to hrdept@newhaven.edu

UNH is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer

CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD

Stockholm Criminology Symposium

Don't miss out on the fifth consecutive Stockholm Criminology Symposium, which takes place in Stockholm, Sweden June 14-16, 2010. The Symposium will offer three days filled with the latest research findings within the field of criminology and crime policy. The main theme, *Improving Policing*, will present a variety of approaches and methods developed and implemented by police forces, researchers and governmental institutions. There will also be a large number of presentations under the theme *Contemporary Criminology*, which will provide an updated overview of the current state of knowledge. The organizers' welcome abstracts and panel suggestion within the two themes until April 26.

The Stockholm Prize in Criminology is awarded in conjunction with the Symposium. The 2010 winner, Professor David Weisburd of Hebrew University, Israel and George Mason University, USA, will receive the Prize at Stockholm City Hall on June 15, 2010. All participants are invited to the ceremony, which is followed by a gala dinner. Professor Weisburd receives the Prize for a series of experiments showing that intensified police patrol at high crime "hot spots" does not merely push crime around.

Each year the Symposium attracts well over 500 participants from close to 40 countries. It is organized by the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention on behalf of the Swedish Ministry of Justice.

Further information can be found at www.criminologysymposium.com or by calling +468 401 87 82.

The Asian Criminological Society Founded: A Bold Step

As many now know, the Asian Criminological Society (ACS) has been established. At its founding conference in Macau (December 2009), a President (Jianhong Liu, University of Macau), Vice-President (Peter Grabosky, Australian National University) and Executive Board were elected. John Braithwaite (Australian National University) was elected as Chair of the ACS General Assembly. The inaugural meeting was attended by criminologists from all regions of Asia, and was immensely successful. The working language of ACS is English. An annual conference is planned, with the next scheduled for December 2010 in India. The society aims to focus and develop criminological research in and on the Asian region. In due course a website will be launched which will provide details on membership fees and related information. A notice with details will be posted in *The Criminologist* at that time. We actively seek to develop collaborative links with other scholarly societies across the world. We encourage all scholars and practitioners with an interest in the Asian region to join the ACS.

Asia (which encompasses 47 countries and 60 percent of global population) is an increasingly significant part of the world. Scholarly national criminology societies have developed in recent years. The highly successful *Asian Journal of Criminology* has encouraged work of the highest standards, and now the ACS adds exciting new possibilities for cutting edge empirical research and theoretical development in criminology. Please join us in this new journey!

If you are interested in learning more about or joining the ACS, then contact Professor Susyan Jou at acs2009forever@gmail.com.

CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD



16th WORLD CONGRESS
International Society for Criminology

The 16th World Congress of the International Society for Criminology in 2011

The 16th World Congress of the International Society of Criminology (ISC) will be held at the Kobe International Conference Center in Kobe, Japan, on August 5-9, 2011. The local host is the Japan Federation of Criminological Associations (JFCA), which is formed by the eight criminological associations in Japan covering a wide range of disciplines from sociological criminology to correctional medicine. JFCA has started its preparation for the Congress with close consultation with the ISC leadership.

The general theme and other details will be determined at the meeting of ISC's Board and Scientific Commission in Paris in May, 2009. An official website will be set up and the first circular will be prepared soon afterward.

Kobe is a port city with 1.5 million inhabitants located near Osaka in western Japan. (<http://www.kvca.or.jp/convention/english/index.html>) As one of the first ports opened to the outside world in the late 19th century, Kobe has a distinctive international atmosphere which attracts tourists both from abroad and from Japan. Although devastated by the earthquake of 1995, Kobe, the "Phoenix", has quickly risen again, and now fully enjoys its prosperity.

The city is served by two nearby international airports (the Kansai International Airport and the Osaka International Airport) as well as a municipal airport. A day trip to Kyoto and Hiroshima can easily be made by train, and a trip to Tokyo in eastern Japan is also easy by train or plane.

The Congress is to be held at the Kobe International Conference Center, located on a man-made island in the Port of Kobe. (<http://kobe-cc.jp/english/index.html>) It is conveniently surrounded by a group of hotels with varying prices, and all congress sessions will be held in the fully air-conditioned rooms under one roof of the Conference Center.

We will keep you posted of the progress. Please plan ahead to attend this important event for the world community of criminologists. It may be a good idea, for instance, to make this Congress a part of your summer vacation in 2011. You will not be disappointed, intellectually or otherwise.

Those who wish to be placed on our mailing list to receive further information are kindly requested to write to:

Secretariat, 16th World Congress of ISC
wcon2011@oucow.daishodai.ac.jp

International Society for Criminology (ISC)

President, Board of Directors: Tony Peters
President, Scientific Commission: Serge Brochu
Secretary General: George Picca

Organizing Committee, 16th World Congress of ISC

Chair: Toyo Atsumi
Vice Chair: Yohji Morita
Secretary General: Ichiro Tanioka

Local Arrangement Committee, 16th World Congress of ISC

Chair: Setsuo Miyazawa
Vice Chair: Toyoji Saito
Vice Chair: Minoru Yokoyama

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

The Criminologist
*Official Newsletter of the
 American Society of Criminology*
 Vol. 35, No. 2

PERIODICAL
 POSTAGE PAID
 TOLEDO, OHIO

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY
 1314 Kinnear Rd., Suite 212
 Columbus, OH 43212-1156
 ISSN 0164-0240

MARK YOUR CALENDAR
FUTURE ASC ANNUAL MEETING DATES

2011	November 16 – 19	Washington, D.C.	Hilton Washington Hotel
2012	November 14 – 17	Chicago, IL	Palmer House Hilton Hotel
2013	November 20 – 23	Atlanta, GA	Atlanta Marriott Marquis
2014	November 19 – 22	San Francisco, CA	San Francisco Marriott
2015	November 18 – 21	Washington, D.C.	Hilton Washington
2016	November 16 – 19	New Orleans, LA	New Orleans Hilton
2017	November 15 – 18	Philadelphia, PA	Philadelphia Marriott Downtown
2018	November 14 – 17	Atlanta, GA	Atlanta Marriott Marquis

2010 ANNUAL MEETING

**MAKE YOUR RESERVATIONS EARLY FOR SAN FRANCISCO
 NOVEMBER 17-20, 2010**

San Francisco Marriott
 \$195 single/double
 800-228-9290 (Toll-free)

You MUST mention that you are with the ASC to obtain this rate.