From the Section Chair

Dear CLD Members:

At the end of July, the CLD section had 590 members, 10 fewer than the 600 necessary to be allocated four (rather than three) sessions at the 2004 ASA annual meetings. But by mid-September our membership count was 616, making ours the 11th largest of ASA’s 43 sections. Let me extend a welcome and a thank you to the 26 of you who joined in that six week period. On the basis of the new membership numbers, I’ve been able to invite the following people to organize sessions for the 2004 meetings in San Francisco:

Barry Goetz, Department of Sociology, University of Western Michigan, will be organizing the section’s roundtable session, which is open to submissions on any topics relevant to the field of crime, law, and deviance.

Karen Heimer, Department of Sociology, University of Iowa, will be organizing a session entitled “Gender, Crime, and Victimization.” This will be an invited session and will be co-sponsored with the section on Sex and Gender (in exchange for a session they devoted to crime at the 2003 meetings).

Ron Levi, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, will be organizing a session entitled “Beyond the Local? Crime and Law in Transnational Context.” This will be a ‘hybrid’ session – Ron may invite some people to present papers but will also accept open submissions. If you might be interested in participating in this session, please contact him at: ron.levi@utoronto.ca.

Chris Uggen, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, will be organizing a session that reflects the 2004 meeting theme, “Public Sociologies.” Chris’s session, which will be by invitation, will be entitled “Public Criminologies.” (The Theme Statement for the 2004 meetings appears elsewhere in the newsletter.)

In addition to these four CLD section sessions, a number of what the ASA calls “regular sessions” will be devoted to topics of interest to CLD members at the 2004 meetings. Among these regular session topics are: at-risk youth; criminology; deviance and social control; law and society; punishment and confinement; risk; substance use, abuse, and treatment; and violence.

The ASA’s Call for Papers lists...
the session organizers for these regular sessions. The San Francisco meetings promise lots of opportunities for both participating in and attending sessions of interest to members of the CLD section, so I hope you will consider attending.

The annual meetings are also our opportunity to honor section members for their scholarly accomplishments. At the 2004 meetings, we will be presenting two awards, the James F. Short, Jr. Distinguished Article Award, and CLD Student Paper Award (see announcements for both awards elsewhere in the newsletter). Joachim Savelsberg has agreed to chair the Short Award Committee. Based on advice from George Bridges (previous chair), Joachim and I decided to recruit widely for members of the committee and have been delighted with the response. Members of the Short Award Committee are Joachim Savelsberg (chair), Pam Oliver, Dina Rose, Bert Useem, Andres Villarreal, Dario Melossi, Mark Cooney, David Greenberg, Ron Akers, David Jacobs, Val Jenness, Austin Turk, and John Hagan. Eric Silver has agreed to chair the student Paper Award Committee. Serving with Eric will be Rod Engen (previous chair), Catherine Kaukinen, Sara Steen, and Connie Chapple. I am very grateful to all these folks for their willingness to serve on these important committees.

I am also grateful for the assistance, advice and guidance that both Val Jenness, the outgoing Chair of the section, and Charles Tittle, the Chair-Elect, have provided over the last few weeks. Both of them pitched in on an ad hoc recruitment campaign that helped bring our membership numbers up. And Val provided me with an entire notebook documenting the tasks she’d performed as chair – a veritable blueprint for the job that I will add to and pass along to Charles when he assumes office next August. Thanks, too, to the members of the CLD Council (Katherine Beckett, Rob Nash Parker, Darrell Steffensmeier, Pamela Wilcox, Rich Felson, and Christy Visher) who probably had their patience sorely tested over several weeks when I peppered them with e-mails seeking their input and opinions. Christy Visher and Rich Felson deserve special recognition for their responsiveness to this barrage.

The section is very fortunate to have the services of people such as the officers and committee members listed above, as well as Ruth Peterson (secretary-treasurer), Rachel Bridges Whaley (newsletter editor), and Hillary Potter (assistant/student editor). There are always opportunities for such service – for example, you’ll see an ad elsewhere in this newsletter for a webpage manager – so if you are interested in participating more fully in the section, please let me know. One way to do so is to serve as one of our section officers. This year’s Nomination Committee will be soliciting nominations for section offices this fall (an announcement will appear in Footnotes). If you would like to nominate yourself or another section member, you should contact one of the following members of the Nominations Committee:

Gary LaFree, Chair
glafree@crim.umd.edu

Lisa Broidy, Past Chair
lbroidy@umn.edu

Ross Macmillan
macmilla@atlas.socsci.umn.edu

Karen Parker
kparker@crim.ufl.edu

Peter Yeager
pcyeager@bu.edu

I’m particularly interested in finding ways to encourage our members who are graduate students or just out of graduate school to participate more in the section’s activities. One way is to consider submitting ideas for short columns for the newsletter to Rachel Bridges Whaley. Do let me know of your thoughts on how the section might make your participation easier. I look forward to hearing from you.

Cheers!

Rosemary Gartner
Chair, CLD Section
Hello CLD members,

While this issue arrives at your desks a little later than hoped, you should find it useful and intellectually stimulating. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Carl Lafata, the student editor for the 2002-2003 year. I appreciated his excellent editorial skills and know members appreciated his columns. Inside you will find a farewell from him. Thanks for everything Carl!

I would also like to welcome Hillary Potter, our new student editor. Hillary is a doctoral student of sociology at University of Colorado at Boulder. Her dissertation is titled, *The African American Woman’s Role in Black Culture and Its Relationship to Intimate Partner Violence*. Hillary brings to this position many years of teaching, service to the profession, and work experience in the field. She has prepped more than 15 courses since 1997 and has held numerous positions in the criminal justice field since 1990 including juvenile probation officer, a diversion program case manager/counselor, and a supervisor of corrections technicians to name a few. In the current issue, Hillary shares with members several teaching tips based on her years of experience. Look for other articles by Hillary in the next two issues. Welcome Hillary! By the way, Hillary is on the academic job market this year...

In this issue, you will find an article by Philip Smith commenting on a thematic session from the 2003 ASA Meetings in Atlanta. Members are encouraged to submit their comments on sessions they attended.

You will also find an article on offenders and mental retardation, calls for various awards, employment opportunities, members’ achievements and more. Please send submissions for the Spring issue by March 15. Anything goes – articles, brief columns, questions for CLD experts, announcements, advertisements and so on.

Thanks,
Rachel Bridges Whaley
Editor

---

Culture and Punishment: Report on a Thematic Session at the 2003 ASA Meetings in Atlanta

By Philip Smith

Although the study of culture and punishment has a long and distinguished history, only very recently has it become a self-aware intellectual field. In other words, whilst earlier generations of scholars engaged in work that we can reconstruct as having been about “culture and punishment,” current writing is reflexively directed towards this end. Institutional forums such as the conference session reported here can be understood as an indicator of this transition as well as its growing formal recognition. Organized by Joachim Savelsberg (Minnesota) it included papers by John Sutton (U.C. Santa Barbara), Dario Melossi (Bologna), Ryan King (Minnesota), and David Garland (NYU). The discussant was the author of this report.

John Sutton launched a powerful argument for an institutionalist approach to the cultural analysis of punishment. He claimed that cultural sociology was often subjective and impressionistic, that it tended to obscure causal mechanisms and worked with categories that were too aggregated and general to be of any real use. Moreover it was characterized by instability in that it would either neglect power (Parsons and the “old institutionalism”) or reduce culture to power (the cultural studies field). Sutton proposed that a way forward was to understand culture as providing classificatory and cognitive schemas. These shaped practices and were tied to institutional sponsors such as schools, the military and (of course) prisons. In this way culture worked to allocate people among life course options. Competition between institutions for authority and dominion can explain
aggregate outcomes. Shifts in imprisonment rates, for example, have arisen as resources and techniques for managing the lifecourse within populations are shifted from one domain to the next.

The next three papers concerned the issue of national culture and its consequences for criminal justice. Dario Melossi initiated the sequence with a comparative analysis of imprisonment rates in Italy and the United States, this being conducted from within a broadly neo-Gramscian perspective. Reviewing data for the period from 1850 until the present, Melossi concluded that the really interesting conundrum lies in the period since 1946 and especially 1970. Here we find imprisonment rates diverging widely for Italy and the United States even though both were subject to the same post-Fordist economic transition and capitalist re-organization during a sequence of “crisis decades.” Melossi turns to culture to explain this puzzle. In the United States there was an elective affinity and interaction effect between a martial, confrontational culture that had seen positive net rewards to war and violence in the 20th century, and a Protestant value system that emphasized the need for stern rigor in the treatment of malefactors. By contrast, Italy’s negative experiences of fascism and militarism dovetailed with its indulgentist Catholic tradition. Pushing his analysis further, Melossi argued that these intersected with socio-economic forces associated with the transition to Post-Fordism. In the case of the United States they saw the prison assuming a pivotal role in the metamorphosis of capitalism towards its present form.

Ryan King and Joachim Savelberg presented another comparative cross-national analysis of cultural differences. Based on their reading of law texts and interviews with prosecutors in both countries, the paper investigated hate crime law and its enforcement in Germany and the United States and developed a number of more widely generalizable hypotheses. In the German context the collective memory of the Holocaust established a kind of path dependency. With the state being the central carrier of collective memory, hate crime is understood within a broader frame that includes the Nazi rise to political power. As a result, hate crime is read as a threat to the institutional order of the democratic state. In the United States, by contrast, there has been a stronger role played by civil society and affected groups have become the prime carriers of collective memories of hatred. The consequence has been an interest in the victimization of a diverse range of social categories, with laws being understood as needed to protect vulnerable individuals rather than the state itself. This has provided a context where there is a stronger role for group mobilization and moral entrepreneurs. These have fought to get their issues recognized and onto the legislative agenda through lobbying and the collection of data.

David Garland’s paper attacked the idea of American exceptionalism as this has been used to explain the retention of the death penalty. In taking aim at the idea that there is something distinctive about America’s culture that enables it to continue to execute offenders, Garland looked in more detail at two recent, emblematic monographs. The first of these, by Franklin E. Zimring pointed to an enduring vigilante tradition that sustained racial violence, especially in the South. In the second, James Q. Whitman argued that America’s egalitarian origins could be contrasted with Europe’s feudal past. Status concerns inflected punishment differently in each setting. In post-enlightenment Europe there was a concern for “leveling up” whilst in America there was less concern about status degradation. Against such positions Garland argues that there is less to explain than meets the eye. Viewed in the long run America has looked pretty much the same as other nations and fits the secular trend towards the abolition of capital punishment. We really need more local explanations that are responsive to the historical contingencies and struggles of the past few
decades (Supreme Court rulings, the vagaries of public opinion, effective and ineffective lobbying etc.) to explain why the death penalty has managed to sidestep its long term trajectory – at least for the time being.

Given the content of the previous paper it was somewhat ironic that my discussion began by pointing to specifically “American” qualities of the four presentations. In each case there were concerns to avoid abstraction, to focus on middle range explanation, and to anchor cultural systems in institutions. These have become established as pivotal to the tradition of cultural sociology in America over the past 20 years. This realism offers advantages over the cultural-studies inspired program of “cultural criminology,” not least because of its elective affinities with more mainstream criminology. These might allow a theoretically informed, sociological approach to culture and punishment to be taken on board by the centre of the field rather than marginalized. There is, however, a price to be paid for this intellectual modesty. Sometimes extravagant statements are needed to set the terms of debate, even if one or two decades are needed to reel these back in. If we want the field of culture and punishment to become influential a more audacious and confrontational approach could have its uses. This had been the case in comparative and historical sociology, for example, where a series of bold texts in the 1970s and 1980s put the area on the map. I also expressed concern over the powerful emphasis in all the papers on institutions as the carriers of culture. As we have seen with neo-institutionalism there is an ever-present danger of slippage into social structural reductionism, with hidden interests and organizational imperatives calling the tune. What is needed is a two stage approach to analysis and writing. We first need a thick description of what the punishment, law, or policy at hand actually means, preferably buttressed by a theory that guarantees cultural autonomy such as structuralism. We can then go on to see how this intersects with institutional and political realities. If we jump straight into institutional analysis we are never really putting meaning in the spotlight. Isn’t this what the study of “culture and punishment” should be about?

Philip Smith is Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at Yale University.

A Farewell Note

I wanted to take a moment to voice my appreciation for being selected as last academic year’s graduate student assistant editor. It was a terrific opportunity to be introduced to many new people and read a number of great articles. It was also an opportunity for me to convey some law enforcement related information that I felt was of significance to those in the fields of sociology, criminology, and criminal justice. It is my hope that presenting the information from my unique perspective as both a graduate student and a police officer was valuable (or at least interesting) for readers.

I received a great deal of positive feedback on my articles, which has helped me enormously in my academic as well as professional endeavors. I am particularly grateful to Amy Mamea at ASA for her technical support, and Dr. Rachel Whaley for her instruction and mentoring. I look forward to meeting many of you in person at future conferences, and extend an open invitation to contact me if I may be of assistance to any of you in any way. Thanks again and have a great academic year!

Carl J. Lafata
Western Michigan University
c1lafata@wmich.edu

Theme Statement for the 2004 ASA Meetings in San Francisco: Public Sociologies

As mirror and conscience of society, sociology defines, promotes and informs public debate about class and racial inequalities, new gender regimes, environmental degradation, multiculturalism, technological revolutions, market fundamentalism, and
state and non-state violence. More than ever the world needs public sociologies – sociologies that transcend the academy and engage wider audiences. Our potential publics are multiple, ranging from media audiences to policy makers, from think tanks to NGOs, from silenced minorities to social movements. Teaching is central to public sociology: students are our first public for they carry sociology into all walks of life. Academic sociology also needs the world. In stimulating debate about issues of the day, public sociologies inspire and revitalize our own discipline as it also connects us to other disciplines. While public sociologies charge the academy with mission and zeal, our professional competencies in theory and research give legitimacy, direction and substance to public sociologies.

Today, public sociologies face four daunting challenges.

* To defend the very idea of the public, increasingly threatened by privatization programs, multinational firms, mass media, unfettered commerce, and national security regimes.

* To harness sociology’s longstanding critical imagination, reminding us that the world could be different. As they turn private troubles into public issues, public sociologies should challenge the world as we know it, exposing the gap between what is and what could be.

* To be inclusive and democratic, building bridges open to all and without tolls, bridges that connect multiple communities within and outside sociology.

* To recognize, learn from, and engage with public sociologies in different countries. We should build bridges that span the world—level bridges with two-way traffic.

The ASA Section on Crime, Law, and Deviance, Student Paper Competition for 2004

Call for Papers

The ASA Section on Crime, Law, and Deviance announces its annual Student Paper Award competition. The winner will receive $500 to offset the cost of attending the 2004 ASA meetings. Papers should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages and should follow the manuscript preparation guidelines used by the American Sociological Review. Co-authored papers are acceptable if all authors are students. Submit five printed copies to Eric Silver, Department of Sociology, 211 Oswald Tower, University Park, PA 16802. Email correspondence to: exs44@psu.edu. Submission deadline is April 15, 2004.

“Faking” Retardation: Unlikely in Death Penalty Cases

By Suzanne Lustig and Sarah Murray

Since the June 2002 United States Supreme Court ruling against executing capital defendants with mental retardation, there has been concern that “every” capital defendant and his attorneys would seek exemption from
the death penalty through a claim of mental retardation. This suspicion echoes dissenting Justice Antonin Scalia's argument that “the symptoms of this condition can be readily feigned.” But there is strong evidence that malingering is not a likely accomplishment, and criteria for determining retardation are less subjective than that for psychiatric disorders. While it is important to delineate why “faking” retardation is unlikely, sociologists and criminologists would best expend our energy informing the public of a far greater concern: Many defendants with mental retardation are not being identified, thus detracting from the significance of the Supreme Court ruling.

In fact, persons with mild or borderline mental retardation characteristically try to disguise their condition, making it difficult for the first point of contact in criminal processing – the police – to appropriately identify them. Defense attorneys must become aware that competency to waive Miranda rights is as crucial as competency to stand trial; that defendants with mental retardation all too readily enter into plea bargains; and that those with mental retardation are often co-defendants with “friends” of normal intellect, for whom the person with mental retardation is the “fall guy.” The Developmentally Disabled Offenders Program, the only such advocacy group in New Jersey and one of the very few in the country, has developed a pertinent guide for attorneys: “Defendants with Mental Retardation,” published by the New Jersey Bar Association.

Advances in DNA technology cast a spotlight on false confessions and wrongful convictions, leading to state moratoriums on the death penalty. The suspect with mental retardation has demonstrated a tendency to false confessions linked to willingness to please, and often waives his Miranda rights unknowingly. Law enforcement, the judiciary, and corrections personnel – even many defense attorneys – are unaware of this offender subgroup. Mental retardation and mental illness often are confused – a great obstacle in identifying the suspect with mental retardation – while those with mental retardation are reflected in greater number, and receive fewer legal protections.

About three percent of the population has mental retardation – the vast majority of these with IQ scores from 52-75 (i.e., mild and borderline), precisely the groups that are most vulnerable to involvement with the criminal justice system. Between six and 10 percent of the prison population may be classified as having mental retardation. Incredibly, some statistics reflect that 20 percent of death row inmates may have mental retardation, with strong implications for lack of early legal identification, and posing questions as to the application of the recent Supreme Court ruling in the absence of such identification.

Most Americans agree that holding those with mental retardation to the same standard of punishment as those of normal IQ – particularly when execution is a possibility – is uncivilized. Certainly the Supreme Court ruling reflects that view. All of us, especially advocates, undoubtedly agree that defendants with mental retardation should be held accountable for proven criminal actions, even when culpability is tempered.

The Developmentally Disabled Offenders Program, a program of New Jersey Arc, battles a double-edged sword. The erroneous perception linking mental retardation and criminality must continue to be dispelled. Yet, the public and legal community must be informed of this group's vulnerability to involvement in crime, often at the hands of a criminal of normal intelligence. Human services professionals, endeavoring to create a “normal” lifestyle for those with mental retardation, must make their clients aware of the irony that a greater presence in society means possible exploitation, by potential criminals, and also by those who remain uninformed in the criminal justice system. Advocates emphasize, first and foremost, the responsibilities...
intrinsic to freedom. The tendency for those with mental retardation to be dealt with too leniently or too punitively presents an on-going challenge, one that the Program has faced for 10 years in working with this population.

Mental retardation in a criminal case is legally proven with professional evaluation of adaptive behavior, formal IQ testing, and thorough investigation of the defendant's past educational experiences, augmented by family and other witness testimony. Though the criminal justice system might prefer a quick determination of mental retardation by a single IQ score, other factors, determined through evaluation by experienced diagnosticians, are crucial in showing that intellectual impairment has produced “real world” disabling effects, and ensuring the individual is not merely a poor test-taker, but a truly disabled individual. The CAST-MR (Competence Assessment to Stand Trial for Defendants with Mental Retardation) and the adaptive behavior component coupled with the age-of-onset requirement, provide a check against any possibility of malingered claims of mental retardation.

Admittedly, some scholars, jurists and even human services professionals believe attempts at malingering occur – usually in cases in which IQ scores decline with subsequent testing, often due to “cultural gaps” in the subject's knowledge of certain vocabulary and phenomena. However, students of crime, law, and deviance are better focused on those in the system that should be identified as having mental retardation and have not been.

Suzanne Lustig, Esquire, is Director of the Developmentally Disabled Offenders Program, a program of New Jersey Arc, located in North Brunswick, NJ.

Sarah Murray is a graduate student of Sociology, William Paterson University of New Jersey.

Members’ Achievements and Announcements


Karen L. Bune has been selected to appear in the 2004 edition of Marquis Who’s Who in the World. She also had an article published in the Summer 2003 edition (Vol. 1, No. 3) of Critical Response of the International Association of Chiefs of Police entitled, “Hate Crime Victimization Eased by Proactive Professionals.” Ms. Bune is a national victim services consultant and an Adjunct Professor of Victimology at George Mason University in Fairfax, VA, and Marymount University in Arlington, VA. She is a recognized national public speaker and trainer in the victim services field.

“Justice for the Poor: A Study of Criminal Defense Work” by Debra S. Emmelman. Part of the Law, Justice and Power Series edited by Austin Sarat (2003, Ashgate Publishing: London and Burlington, VT). Emmelman examines the behavior of one group of court-appointed defense attorneys and reaches the conclusion that although these attorneys behave in a legally ethical (or ‘procedurally just’) manner, case outcomes are unduly shaped by social class and are therefore substantively unjust. This occurs because poor defendants typically lack cultural rhetoric that favorably influences those who construct and operate the criminal court system. Ironically, this means that in many cases, the process of plea bargaining may be more substantively just than
A major contribution of the study is the detailed analysis of the manner by which oppression and substantive injustice occur in the adjudication of cases and how the cultural practices of the powerful frequently misconstrue, exclude, and mute the voice of the poor.

The second edition of David Friedrichs’ *Trusted Criminals: White Collar Crime in Contemporary Society* has now been published by Thomson/Wadsworth. The first edition was described in a number of published reviews as the most comprehensive survey of what is known about white collar crime and its control. The new edition addresses many recent developments – including the “corporate scandals” involving Enron, WorldCom, and other corporations – and incorporates some “student-friendly” features such as boxes, lists of key terms, and discussion questions.

**John H. Laub** and **Robert J. Sampson.** *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70* (2003, Harvard University Press). Building on *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life* (1993), this book presents and analyzes newly collected data on crime and social development up to age 70 for 500 men who were originally remanded to reform school in the 1940s. Born in Boston circa the Great Depression, these men were the subjects of the well-known *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* study by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck (1950). Updating their lives at the close of the 20th century, and connecting adult life experiences back to childhood, this book presents what is arguably the longest longitudinal study of age, crime, and development in the world. The aim is to understand and explain the lives of troubled boys as they progress from childhood and adolescence to adulthood and old age, especially patterns of criminal offending and behaviors in other important domains of adult life (for example, work, family, military service). In addressing this topic, Laub and Sampson rely on extensive quantitative data and in-depth life-history narratives. Explaining continuity and change in crime throughout adulthood, they present a revised conceptualization and integrated life-course theory of persistent offending and desistance from crime.

**Fred Markowitz** was recently promoted to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Sociology at Northern Illinois University. His research is in the areas of violence, communities and crime, and mental illness.

**Journal of Social Issues, 2003, Vol. 59, No. 1,** devoted entirely to issues of contemporary privacy, contains “A Tack in the Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance” by **Gary T. Marx.** Eleven behavioral techniques of neutralization intended to subvert the collection of personal information are discussed: discovery moves, avoidance moves, piggy backing moves, switching moves, distorting moves, blocking moves, masking moves, breaking moves, refusal moves, cooperative moves and counter-surveillance moves. In Western liberal democracies the advantages of technological and other strategic surveillance developments are often short-lived and contain ironic vulnerabilities. The logistical and economic limits on total monitoring, the interpretive and contextual nature of many human situations, system complexity and interconnectedness, and the vulnerability of those engaged in surveillance to be compromised, provide ample room for resistance. Neutralization is a dynamic adversarial social dance involving strategic moves and counter-moves and should be studied as a conflict interaction process. The article is available at [http://www.garymarx.net](http://www.garymarx.net).

**Tom McNulty** was recently promoted to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Sociology at the
The latest issue of the journal *Punishment and Society* (October 2003, Vol.5, No. 4) carries a “Symposium on Migration, Punishment and Social Control in Europe,” edited by Dario Melossi, with the following contributions: “In a Peaceful Life’: Migration and the Crime of Modernity in Europe/Italy” (Dario Melossi); “A ‘Reserve Army of Delinquents’: The Criminalization and Economic Punishment of Immigrants in Spain” (Kitty Calavita); “Migration, Crime and Victimhood: Responses to Sex Trafficking in the EU” (Jo Goodey); “A Question of Dangerous Races?” (Asale Angel-Ajani); and “To These Wet and Windy Shores: Recent Immigration Policy in the UK” (Jock Young).

I vividly remember my first teaching post several years ago. While working as a juvenile diversion counselor, I replied to an advertisement for adjunct instructors in a criminal justice program at a local state college. I looked forward to imparting the knowledge I had gained at that stage in my career on to undergraduates, but feared their impression of me and what I had to offer. Though this is an anticipated initial reaction to any new public speaking endeavor, and even more so for those of us who were painfully shy at some time in our lives, it can also affect the outcome of that first day of class and throughout the remainder of the term. In this column, I would like to pass on some of the “tricks of the trade” I have obtained during my neophyte years as an instructor of undergraduate education to graduate students who are new to teaching, and to those who anticipate teaching in the near future.

The first piece of advice I offer is to have confidence in your knowledge of the subject. Whether your first teaching gig is as a professor’s teaching assistant, for which your responsibility is to facilitate recitations or labs for the professor’s weekly lectures, or you are administering your own course, I have found it useful and crucial to access several sources outside of the required course readings to become well-informed on the subject. As we know from being lifelong students ourselves, students are often geared up with questions related to the lecture plan – even if only tangentially related. I have found this to be especially true in introductory criminal justice and criminology courses I have taught. These courses often tend to mimic legal aid seminars, with such advice-seeking inquiries as: “I have a ‘friend’ who got arrested for [insert offense] and [insert dilemma].” Unless you have a law degree, significant training or experience in the area addressed, or are well-studied in the subject matter, it is sometimes best to simply defer the question until you can do more research and maybe direct the student to the campus legal services office or a local legal aid clinic. Or, even better, make it a spur-of-the-moment assignment for the student to do research and report back to the class. Simply because we teach a course does not mean we have to know the answer to everything related to that topic. However, it does help to be well-prepared.

Unfortunately, being both a graduate student and a college instructor leaves little time to do substantial additional research for each of the topics covered in a course. Some methods I have found to be beneficial in assisting with class preparation that provide better presentations of the textbook material, yet are not overwhelming, are:
• Search through daily and recently archived articles in local newspapers that relate to the class topic. Using current events as examples to explain the subject matter are excellent ways to connect the coursework (particularly theory) to the real world. Fortunate to our discipline, crime-related topics are permeated throughout news publications on a daily basis.

• Rent videos from your college/university library that you do not plan to view in class. The good documentary videos often provide a well-organized and comprehensive review of the subject. In addition, prior to the start of the course, or during the term, search TV network websites that tend to air documentary-type productions for schedules of shows. Networks such as A&E, the Discovery Channel, and the History Channel broadcast crime-related documentaries on a regular basis (and they are fairly inexpensive to purchase).

• Conduct a general Internet search on the subject matter. It is amazing what pops up during these searches. Just be careful to separate factual, “legitimate” websites from the others.

Another approach I believe is essential, for both new and experienced teachers in higher education, is that several methods of instruction are employed in (and outside) the classroom. One student does not necessarily learn in the same manner as the next student. This appears to be even more evident in my teaching experiences at a “non-traditional” comprehensive four-year college with an open enrollment policy, which is experiencing an increasing faction of “traditional” students who choose to attend the college instead of a competitive-selection institution. As a result, I have found that strictly lecturing during each class session of the course may not be beneficial to many students. Even in the most traditional and competitive settings, we must remember that we, as instructors, are competing with highly stimulating television programming, the Internet, video games, and many other activities that offer more excitement than sitting in class. Granted, you do not want to turn your classroom into a reality TV set, but realize that attention spans of students have decreased over the past several years – even since the youngest grad student teacher was an undergraduate.

The following are several of the methods that are being used in teaching at the college/university level:

• Traditional lecture
• Lecture with Power Point
• Lecture with encouragement of and emphasis on student participation (i.e., calling on students)
• In-class group work

• In-class debates
• In-class writing assignments followed by student presentations or general discussion
• Documentary or feature film videos, with lecture, discussion, group work, or other methods, preceding or proceeding the showing
• Course webpage bulletin boards or class listservs
• Guest lecturers who have noteworthy experience in the criminal justice field
• Tours to courtroom proceedings and correctional facilities; and law enforcement ride-alongs

I personally believe that the use of only a couple of the techniques listed above is not in the best interest of the students. I believe it is important to incorporate as many of the available teaching methods throughout the course. And it is not necessarily something that has to be planned out at the start of the term. For instance, on those extreme weather days when you may expect class attendance to be low, or when you are just not in the mood for lecturing that day (yes, it happens to even those of us who enjoy teaching), come up with a fun group project for the students. Teaching crime- or deviance-related courses provides us with a bevy of opportunities to have fun inside and outside the classroom.
Teaching in the area of crime and deviance also positions us to teach what many believe is the worst problem in society. This often leads to heated class discussions or debates. It is imperative to address this at the start of the course and to remind students throughout the term that the classroom is a safe place to have intense, thought-provoking discussion, but that blatant bigotry, insensitivity, and disrespect will not be tolerated.

I am often most confronted with this issue during discussions regarding the death penalty, domestic violence, homosexuality, abortion, and race/ethnicity disparities in the criminal justice system. And I have been challenged with this during most of the current semester in a hate crimes course I am teaching. Oftentimes, students in crime and deviance courses are divided based on their religious beliefs, political beliefs, gender role expectations, racist stereotypes, and convictions about sexuality. And, not that this is not the case in other disciplines, but our students often leave class with feelings of despair, guilt, and anger as a result. I have found that debriefing at the end of these tense class sessions is absolutely necessary. I do not go to the extent of singing “Kumbaya” with the students and forcing them into a group hug, but I do summarize the issues brought up in class and express to them that I am available outside of class to address their concerns about the discussion.

In summation, though this logic may be wrought with elitist undertones, it is important to remember that it is your class. Revisit your course objectives and class outline often, be thoroughly prepared for each class session, and remember that it can be fun!

Further Reading:
The Journal of Criminal Justice Education and Teaching Sociology often have relevant, timely, and helpful articles that will assist with teaching crime- and deviance-related courses. Also, browse the ASA website for Teaching and Academic Resources at http://www.asanet.org/pubs/techres.html.

Spotlight on a Crime, Law, and Deviance Program

Crime, Law and Deviance at The University of Kentucky
By Pamela Wilcox

THE DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY SETTINGS
The University of Kentucky’s graduate program in crime, law, and deviance is housed, administratively, within the Department of Sociology. The crime, law, and deviance program (CLD), however, involves professors with appointments in Sociology as well as several faculty members from other academic departments. The program also has affiliated with it an endowed professorship – The Ronald L. Akers Professor of Criminology/Deviance, named in honor of one of the department’s most distinguished alumni.

Typically, there are 15-20 active graduate students majoring or minoring in crime, law and deviance. The crime, law, and deviance program and the Department of Sociology are part of a larger university which continues to be designated as a Research University of the First Class and Kentucky’s flagship university. The University enrolls approximately 18,000 undergraduate and 6,000 graduate and professional students annually.

THE CURRICULUM
The Department of Sociology, including the program in crime, law, and deviance, offers both M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. Ph.D. students in crime, law, and deviance are required to take 12 credit hours of coursework in their “primary area of specialization.” Another 9 hours of coursework must come from a “secondary” area of specialization. In addition, students must complete 6 hours of required sociological theory courses and 9 hours of methods and statistics courses.
Elective classes round out the remainder of the coursework. The Ph.D. program of study then culminates in the writing of a dissertation. M.A. students in Sociology (including those in the CLD program) are required to take 24 hours of coursework in addition to writing a thesis. Students can also select a non-thesis program which requires 30 hours of coursework in addition to completing a writing project. Among the required hours, M.A. students must take 3 hours of sociological theory and 3 hours of methods/statistics. Topical courses available to both Ph.D. and M.A. students in crime, law, and deviance include “Sociology of Drug Abuse,” “Deviance and Subcultures,” “Inequality and the Social Control of Crime,” “Schools and Crime” and “Macro Theories of Crime.”

In addition to the learning opportunities offered in the classroom, the department regularly offers colloquia on a variety of topics relevant to the major areas of study. Recent papers presented at such colloquia include “A Reexamination of the Crime-Fear Linkage” and “Graffiti in the Midwest: A Reaction to Disaster.” There are additional opportunities to collaborate with faculty and other students outside the classroom while learning the details of conducting research. Research assistantships are available from various research centers on campus, including the Center for Prevention Research and the Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. Individual faculty working on funded research projects – such as the ongoing Rural Substance Abuse and Violence Project – also hire graduate research assistants and provide undergraduates with research internships.

Finally, an important aspect of the curriculum includes instructional training. Ph.D. students are required to take a semester-long seminar on teaching, and several additional workshops on teaching-related issues are held throughout each semester. Many students serve as teaching assistants for faculty and then later move onto teaching their own courses when reaching more advanced stages of the program. Both introductory-level undergraduate Sociology courses as well as upper-division undergraduate courses in the areas of crime, law, and deviance are available to graduate students for teaching through part-time instructorships.

The curriculum described above is designed to prepare students for jobs in both academic and applied settings. Recent graduates from the crime, law, and deviance program have accepted positions at a number of colleges and universities across the country, including University of Pittsburgh, Southern Illinois University, East Tennessee State University, Kent State, Ohio University, Indiana University -- Pennsylvania, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Capital University, McKendree College, and Northern Marianas College. Others have taken positions with agencies such as Kentucky’s Administrative Office of the Courts, and University of Kentucky’s Center for Prevention Research.

UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL RESOURCES

Computer Support: The Department of Sociology is one of the few social science departments at the University of Kentucky that has a computer lab. The newly-upgraded facility is called Sociology Laboratory for Analysis, Instruction, and Research (SOC LAIR). SOC LAIR serves the needs of multiple disciplines and programs in terms of research and advanced professional development and instruction. SOC LAIR also serves as a work area where faculty meet with research assistants and co-investigators to plan, coordinate, and carry out research. SOC LAIR provides meeting tables for discussing research strategies, computer facilities for data entry, and a projector and screen to plan research and examine results. The lab also provides the necessary computers (sixteen Pentium IV computers) and software (SPSS, SAS, STATA, HLM, MLwiN, LISREL, AMOS, SUDAN, GIS, NUDIST, ETHNOGRAPH, and ATLAS) to engage in both quantitative and qualitative...
analysis. SOC LAIR also houses the necessary equipment to engage in textual and other documentary analysis: fiche reader, micro-film reader, TV, VCR, and scanners. Finally, SOC LAIR contains a library which includes CD ROM data sets, server accessible data sets, web accessible data sets, ICPSR and other data set handbooks, statistical methodology texts, qualitative research manuals, and other relevant book, journals, and magnetic media.

**Libraries**: The University of Kentucky has an extensive system of libraries, including a new main facility, the W.T. Young Library (opened April 1998). This library features 1.2 million volumes, 57 group study and seminar rooms, and 350 faculty study rooms. It is said to be among the most technologically-advanced libraries in the world.

**The Faculty in Crime, Law, and Deviance**

**Richard R. Clayton**, Professor of Public Health and Director, Center for Prevention Research; Ph.D. University of Tennessee, 1970

*Interests*: Drug abuse; prevention and intervention research; social epidemiology; evaluation research

*Recent Publications*: Dr. Clayton’s recent work appears in Preventive Medicine, Drugs and Society, Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Substance Use and Misuse, and the Drug and Alcohol Dependence, Journal of Health and Social Behavior.

**Scott Hunt**, Assoc. Professor of Sociology; Ph.D. University of Nebraska, 1991

*Interests*: Symbolic interactionism; social construction of public problems; social movements; identity theories


**Carl Leukefeld**, Professor of Behavioral Sciences and Director, Center on Drug and Alcohol Research; D.S.W., Catholic University, 1975

*Interests*: Drug abuse treatment; crime and drug abuse; evaluation research


**Donald R. Lynam**, Associate Professor of Psychology; Ph.D. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1995

*Interests*: Antisocial behavior across the lifecourse; chronic offending; violence


**William F. Skinner**, Professor of Sociology; Ph.D., University of Iowa, 1984

*Interests*: Deviance; sexuality; drug and alcohol studies; problem gambling; methods and statistics


**Pamela Wilcox**, Associate Professor of Sociology, Ronald L. Akers Professor of Criminology-Deviance; Ph.D. Duke University, 1994

*Interests*: Community-level social control; victimization; fear of crime; fear-related precautionary behavior; school violence

*Recent Publications*: Dr. Wilcox recently authored Criminal Circumstance: A Dynamic Multicontextual Criminal Opportunity Theory with colleagues Kenneth C. Land (Duke University) and Scott A. Hunt (University of Kentucky). Her other recent work appears in Addiction, Criminology, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Justice Quarterly, Social Science
Research, and Violence and Victims

Rick S. Zimmerman, Associate Professor of Communications and Sociology; Ph.D. Wisconsin-Madison, 1983
Interests: Medical Sociology; HIV risk behavior; health and illness behavior; survey methodology for sensitive behavior

THE APPLICATION PROCESS
The Department of Sociology accepts applications for Fall admissions. We require that all applications be received by January 15 for full consideration in decisions regarding both admissions and funding (e.g., fellowships and assistantships) for the following Fall semester. As a first step in the application process, contact the chair of the crime, law, and deviance program in the Department of Sociology at University of Kentucky. Send the enclosed postcard or contact the chair at the following address/phone/fax/e-mail:

Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Sociology
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0027
Phone: (859)257-6895
FAX: (859)323-1956
e-mail: socdgs@uky.edu

Elsevier’s Research in Social Problems and Public Policy seeks papers for Volume 13 on the organizational, institutional, and policy response to offenders with mental illness. From arrest to release from incarceration, the organizational response to individuals with mental illness and those with mental illness and substance abuse problems involved with the criminal justice system needs exploration. Issues worthy of consideration include the role of the police and the courts, and how jails cope with increasingly diverse populations awaiting trial. Additionally, once adjudication occurs, how are persons with multiple problems including mental illness managed and are community-based programs such as probation and parole effective? Finally, what happens to persons with mental illness when they are released from correctional custody to the community? Quantitative and qualitative research on organizational responses to “mentally ill offenders” as well as their responses to the institutional processes in their lives will be the basis of this volume and chart new directions for social policy in three areas of criminal justice processing: (1) pre-adjudication, (2) post adjudication, and (3) post-release. Please send double-spaced, 20 page manuscripts Stephanie Hartwell, Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 02125-3393 by April 30, 2004, or pass this call along as I would be delighted to review submissions from junior colleagues. Prior questions or inquiries will be responded to by email: stephanie.hartwell@umb.edu.

The National GAINS Center announces its 2004 Conference to be held at the Flamingo Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada, May 12-14, 2004. The GAINS Center is now accepting proposals addressing mental health and substance abuse issues for people in contact with the criminal justice system. Proposals may take the form of individual 20 minute presentations, 90 minute panel presentations (4 panelists maximum), or posters highlighting your promising program. For more information and a Call for Papers application, please email Jordan Gobrecht, GAINS Conference Coordinator, at jgobrecht@prainc.com or call toll free at (800) 311-4246 ext. 237.
The 2004 GAINS Conference promises to be a vibrant, motivating gathering where providers, policymakers, administrators, researchers, consumers and family members will share their experiences in designing, implementing, and delivering innovative programs for people with co-occurring disorders in contact with the justice system. Strategies based on the recommendations of the President’s New Freedom Commission on Mental Health will be highlighted along with emerging best practices and evidence-based practices (EBP). Visit the GAINS Web site at www.gainsctr.com for more information.

Did you know that…?

...the CLD section has a listserv that can be used to post announcements to all members of the section? Until now, the section has not (as far as we are aware) made use of this listserv. Recently, the section chair has been receiving more requests to do so and so would like your views on whether and for what purposes the listserv ought (or ought not) to be used. Possible uses are: sending out job advertisements, announcing section award information, allowing other sections to contact our section membership, posting issues of general interest to members, and more. Please let Rosemary Gartner, section chair, know your opinions on the listserv – from enthusiastic endorsement of any and all uses to unbridled fear of receiving even more unsolicited e-mail. Also, if you or anyone you know might be interested in acting as the listserv manager, contact Rosemary Gartner at rosemary.gartner@utoronto.ca.

Employment Opportunities

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology invites applicants with primary specialization in quantitative analysis for a tenure-track position (rank Assistant Professor) to begin August 2004. A Ph.D. in sociology is preferred. The primary responsibilities of this position include teaching our graduate-level introduction to quantitative analysis course, teaching a second graduate course in some quantitative specialty (e.g., multilevel analysis, analysis of categorical data, SEM, etc.), teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in your substantive area, and active engagement in research and service. The normal teaching load is two courses per semester. Substantive specialization is open but preference will be given to candidates with interests consistent with the strengths of the department (see our department graduate web page at http://sa.ncsu.edu/s&a/grad home.htm for further information). Candidates must show clear evidence of outstanding teaching and scholarship. The department consists of 34 faculty, of whom 27 are sociologists. NC State offers competitive salaries, administrative commitment to facilitate research productivity and excellent area amenities. Formal screening of applicants begins November 17, 2003. Send curriculum vita; a letter of application outlining your research agenda, quantitative courses you are able and willing to teach (enclose syllabi for graduate quantitative courses, if available), and your teaching philosophy; and three letters of reference to: Chair, Quantitative Recruitment Committee, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 2400 Founders Drive, 1911 Bldg., Rm. 301, Box 8107, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8107. NCSU is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. NC State welcomes all persons without regard to sexual orientation. For ADA accommodations, individuals with disabilities should contact: Bruce Cheek, (919) 515-3180; e-mail: wbcheek2@sa.ncsu.edu.

Useful CLD Websites
The Crime, Law, Deviance Section has a webpage on the ASA website that is in need of some development. Presently it provides copies of previous newsletters and lists section officers. Ideally, it should describe our various awards, list the membership on our committees, provide information on the section’s sessions at the next ASA meetings, and so forth.

If you have a good working knowledge of HTML, are willing to put in some time to be trained by the ASA webmaster, and would like to do some service for the section, please contact Rosemary Gartner at rosemary.gartner@utoronto.ca for more information about this position.

Applications wanted for position of CLD Webpage Manager
Please submit material for the spring issue to 
[mailto: rachel.whaley@wmich.edu by March 15, 2004.]