



Course Advanced Criminology CRIM7300
Professor Alex R. Piquero, Ph.D.
Term Fall 2017, GR 3.602
Meetings Tuesday 1:00p

Professor's Contact Information

Office Phone (972) 883-2486
Office Location GR 2.246
Email Address apiquero@utdallas.edu
Office Hours TU 10:00- 11:00 or by appointment

Course Description

This course examines contemporary criminological theories and the degree to which research has provided empirical support for explanations of crime and criminality.

Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes

At the end of the course, students will be able to:

1. Understand the assumptions and hypotheses of criminological theories.
2. Evaluate the empirical literature assessing criminological theories.
3. Evaluate how well the criminological theories predict crime.

Required Readings

1. Gottfredson, M.R. and T. Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
2. Laub, J.H. and R.J. Sampson. 2003. *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
3. Bernard, T.J., J.B. Snipes, and A.L. Gerould. 2010. *Vold's Theoretical Criminology* (6th Edition). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
4. Farrington, D.P., A.R. Piquero, and W.G. Jennings. 2013. *Offending from Childhood to Late Middle Age: Recent Results from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York: Springer.
5. Loeber, R. and B.C. Welsh. 2013. *The Future of Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Piquero, A.R. (ed). 2016. *The Handbook of Criminological Theory*. New York: Wiley.

Course Requirements

Exams. There will be two exams this semester. Each exam is worth 40% of your grade (totaling 80%), with class participation comprising the remaining 20% of your grade.

Makeup Exam Policy

Makeup exams will be provided for students who have a university recognized excused absence. Excused absences include (but are not limited to): illnesses with a doctor's note, serious family emergency, special curricular requirements (e.g., conferences), participation in official university activities. Final decision of excused absences is left to the discretion of the professor. In most instances, students will be required to provide written documentation for the absence. Also, you **MUST** talk with me prior to the date of the exam in order to schedule a makeup. All makeup exams **MUST** be scheduled within one week of the original exam.

Attendance. Class attendance will NOT be taken on a regular basis. However, students are expected to attend all class meetings. Students are responsible for ALL material covered in class, whether in class or not. I do NOT hand out my class notes nor do I post notes/powerpoint slides.

Note: Recording of class meetings is only permitted with professor permission.

Student Conduct & Discipline

Classroom Citizenship

UT Dallas Syllabus Policies and Procedures

The information contained in the following link constitutes the University's policies and procedures segment of the course syllabus. Please go to <http://provost.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies/>

In addition to UTD's policies please note the following:

- No student may record any portion of the class without prior instructor approval.
- Students are expected to be courteous and respectful to each other and the instructor.
- All email communications from a student to the instructor must be from a UTD email address.

The University of Texas System and The University of Texas at Dallas have rules and regulations for the orderly and efficient conduct of their business. It is the responsibility of each student and each student organization to be knowledgeable about the rules and regulations which govern student conduct and activities. General information on student conduct and discipline is contained in the UT Dallas printed publication, *A to Z Guide*, which is available to all registered students each academic year.

The University of Texas at Dallas administers student discipline within the procedures of recognized and established due process. Procedures are defined and described in the *Rules and Regulations, Series 50000*, Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, and in *Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities* of the university's *Handbook of Operating Procedures*. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations (SU 1.602, 972/883-6391) and online at <http://www.utdallas.edu/judicialaffairs/UTDJudicialAffairs-HOPV.html>.

A student at the University neither loses the rights nor escapes the responsibilities of citizenship. He or she is expected to obey federal, state, and local laws as well as the Regents' Rules, university regulations, and administrative rules. Students are subject to discipline for violating the standards of conduct whether such conduct takes place on or off campus, or whether civil or criminal penalties are also imposed for such conduct.

Students are expected to be attentive during class and to participate actively in group activities. Students are expected to listen respectfully to faculty and to other students who are speaking. Racism, sexism, homophobia, classism, ageism, and other forms of bigotry are inappropriate to express in class. Classes may discuss issues that require sensitivity and maturity. Disruptive students will be asked to leave and may be subject to disciplinary action.

Academic Integrity

The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends upon the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student demonstrate a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

Scholastic Dishonesty: Any student who commits an act of scholastic dishonesty is subject to discipline. Scholastic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, submitting for credit any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, or any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts.

Plagiarism, from the web, from portions of papers for other classes, and from any other source, is unacceptable and will be dealt with under the University's policy on plagiarism (see general catalog for details).

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (*Title 17, United States Code*) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials, including music and software. Copying, displaying, reproducing, or distributing copyrighted works may infringe upon the copyright owner's rights and such infringement is subject to appropriate disciplinary action as well as criminal penalties provided by federal law. Usage of such material is only appropriate when that usage constitutes "fair use" under the Copyright Act. As a UT Dallas student, you are required to follow the institution's copyright policy ([Policy Memorandum 84-I.3-46](#)). For more information about the fair use exemption, see <http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/copypol2.htm>.

Email Use

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The University encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student's UT Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UT Dallas student account. This allows the University to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individuals corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UT Dallas furnishes each student with a free email account that is to be used in all communication with University personnel. The Department of Information Resources at UT Dallas provides a method for students to have their UT Dallas mail forwarded to other accounts.

Withdrawal from Class

The administration of this institution has set deadlines for withdrawal from any college-level courses. These dates and times are published in that semester's course inventory and in the academic calendar. Administration procedures must be followed. It is the student's responsibility to handle withdrawal requirements from any class. In other words, a professor or other instructor cannot drop or withdraw any student. You must do the proper paperwork to ensure that you will not receive a final grade of "F" in a course if you choose not to attend the class once you are enrolled.

Student Grievance Procedures

Procedures for student grievances are found in *Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities*, of the university's *Handbook of Operating Procedures*. In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter with the instructor, supervisor, administrator, or committee with whom the grievance originates (hereafter called "the respondent"). Individual faculty members retain primary responsibility for assigning grades and evaluations. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the grievance must be submitted in writing to the respondent with a copy of the respondent's School Dean. If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent, the student may submit a written appeal to the School Dean. If the grievance is not resolved by the School Dean's decision, the student may make a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Education, and the dean will appoint and convene an Academic Appeals Panel. The decision of the Academic Appeals Panel is final. The results of the academic appeals process will be distributed to all involved parties. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations.

Incomplete Grade Policy

As per University policy, incomplete grades will be granted only for work unavoidably missed at the semester's end and only if 70% of the course work has been completed. An incomplete grade must be resolved within eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. If the required work to complete the course and to remove the incomplete grade is not submitted by the specified deadline, the incomplete grade is changed automatically to a grade of F.

Office of Student AccessAbility (OSA)

UT Dallas is committed to providing equal educational opportunities for students with documented disabilities to all University courses and programs. Any student with a documented physical, psychological, or learning disability, which affects his/her academic performance, is eligible for services. If you need classroom accommodations, please make an appointment with the Office of Student AccessAbility at: SSB 3.200 (3rd Floor in SSB), 972-883-2098. Office hours are Monday – Thursday, 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m., Friday 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Evening appointments are available by request. <http://www.utdallas.edu/studentaccess/>. OSA provides registered students with an accommodation letter to present to faculty members. The letter verifies that the student is qualified to receive certain accommodations. The accommodation letter should be presented to instructors of each course at the beginning of the semester. The approved accommodations should be discussed at that time. It is the student's responsibility to notify his/her professor of their needs. The University of Texas at Dallas is proud to be an educational institution that welcomes and supports a diverse student body.

Religious Holy Days

The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, *Texas Code Annotated*. The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one week. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment.

If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of *TEC 51.911(b)*, and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee.

Resources to Help You Succeed

The GEMS Center (located within the Conference Center) provides a wide array of free academic support and enhancement for UT Dallas students. Offerings include, but are not limited to, a Math Lab and Writing Center, Peer Tutoring (with a focus on science, technology, engineering and math courses), test review sessions, and academic success coaching. The current menu of services, schedules, and contact information is posted on the GEMS website: <http://www.utdallas.edu/ossa/gems/>.

Academic Calendar (TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE)

DATE

TOPIC & READING

8/22 Introduction–Good Theory/Variance/Causality
BSG1; P1-2-3.

Walker, H.A. and Cohen, B.P. 1985. Scope statements: Imperatives for evaluation theory. *American Sociological Review* 50: 288-301.

Sampson, R.J. 2000. Whither the sociological study of crime? *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:711-714.

8/29 Classical Criminology
BSG2; P4,8.

Cohen, L. and M. Felson. 1979. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44:588-608.

Paternoster, R., L. Saltzman, T. Chiricos, and G. Waldo. 1982. Perceived risk and deterrence: Methodological artifacts in perceptual deterrence research. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 73:1238-1258.

- Lauritsen, J.L., R.J. Sampson, and J.H. Laub. 1991. Victimization among adolescents. *Criminology* 29:265-289.
- Decker, S.H., R. Wright, and R. Logie. 1993. Perceptual deterrence among active residential burglars: A research note. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 31:135-147.
- Stafford, M. and M. Warr. 1993. A reconceptualization of general and specific deterrence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:123-135.
- Piquero, A.R. and G.F. Rengert. 1999. Studying deterrence with active residential burglars. *Justice Quarterly* 16:451-71.
- Pogarsky, G. and A.R. Piquero. 2003. Can punishment encourage offending? Investigating the 'resetting' effect. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 40:95-120.
- Paternoster, R. 2010. How much do we really know about criminal deterrence? *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 100:765-824.
- Jacobs, B.A. 2010. Deterrence and detarrability. *Criminology* 48:417-441.
- Piquero, A.R., R. Paternoster, Greg Pogarsky, and Thomas A. Loughran. 2011. Elaborating the individual difference component in deterrence theory. *Annual Review of Law & Social Science* 7:335-360.
- Braga, A.A. and D. Weisburd. 2012. The effects of focused deterrence strategies on crime: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 49:323-358.
- Nagin, D.S. 2013. Deterrence in the 21st century: A review of the evidence. In M. Tonry (ed.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* (volume 42, pp. 199-263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loughran, T.A., Paternoster, R., Chalfin, A., & Wilson, T. 2016. Can rational choice be considered a general theory of crime? Evidence from individual-level panel data. *Criminology* 54:86-112.
- Lee, Y-J., Eck, J.E., and Corsaro, N. 2016. Conclusions from the history of research into the effects of police force size on crime—1968 through 2013: a historical systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 12:431-451.
- Pickett, J.T., & Roche, S.P. 2016. Arrested development: Misguided directors in deterrence theory and policy. *Criminology & Public Policy* 15:727-751.
- Nagin, D.S. 2016. "What we've got here is failure to communicate". *Criminology & Public Policy* 15:753-765.

Fishbein, D.H. 1990. Biological perspectives in criminology. *Criminology* 28:27-72.

Raine, A., P. Brennan, and S.A. Mednick. 1997. Interaction between birth complications and early maternal rejection in predisposing individuals to adult violence: Specificity to serious, early on-set violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 154:1265-1271.

Tibbetts, S.G. and A.R. Piquero. 1999. The influence of gender, low birth weight and disadvantaged environment in predicting early onset of offending: A test of Moffitt's interactional hypothesis. *Criminology* 37:843-878.

Caspi, A., J. McClay, T.E. Moffitt, J. Mill, J. Martin, I.W. Craig, A. Taylor, and R. Poulton. 2002. Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science* 297:851-854.

Rhee, S.H. and I.D. Waldman. 2002. Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis of twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Bulletin* 128:490-529.

Wright, J.P. and D. Boisvert. 2009. What biosocial criminology offers criminology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 36:1228-1240.

Barnes, J.C., K.M. Beaver, and B.B. Boutwell. 2011. Examining the genetic underpinnings to Moffitt's developmental taxonomy: A behavioral genetics analysis. *Criminology* 49:923-954.

Rocque, M., B.C. Welsh, and A. Raine. 2012. Biosocial criminology and modern crime prevention. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40:306-312.

van den Bree, M.B.M., N. Williams, and T.E. Moffitt. 2014. Genetic influence on antisocial behaviour, problem substance use and schizophrenia: evidence from quantitative genetic and molecular genetic studies. In J. Gunn and P. Taylor (eds.), *Forensic Psychiatry*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Burt, C.H. and Simons, R.L. 2014. Pulling back the curtain on heritability studies: Biosocial criminology in the postgenomic era. *Criminology* 52:223-262.

Barnes, J.C., Wright, J.P., Boutwell, B.B., Schwartz, J.A., Connolly, E.J., Nedelec, J.L., and Beaver, K.M. 2014. Demonstrating the validity of twin research in criminology. *Criminology* 52:588-626.

Rocque, M., & Posick, C. 2017. Paradigm shift or normal science? The future of (biosocial) criminology. *Theoretical Criminology* 21:288-303.

Moffitt, T.E. 1990. The neuropsychology of juvenile delinquency: A critical review. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 12* (pp. 99-169).

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Steinberg, L. 2007. Risk-taking in adolescence: New perspectives from brain and behavioral science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 16:55-59.

Raine, A. 2008. From genes to brain to antisocial behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 17:323-328.

Raine, A. and Y. Yang. 2006. Neural foundations to moral reasoning and antisocial behavior. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* 1:203-213.

Seguin, Jean R. 2008. The frontal lobe and aggression. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology* 6:1-20.

Yang, Y. and A. Raine. 2009. Prefrontal structural and functional brain imaging findings in antisocial, violent, and psychopathic individuals: A meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging* 174:81-88.

Ogilvie, J.M., A.L. Stewart, R.C.K. Chan, and D.H.K. Shum. 2011. Neuropsychological measures of executive function and antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Criminology* 49:1063-1108.

Piquero, A.R., David P. Farrington, Natalie Fontaine, Gina Vincent, Jeremy Coid, and Simone Ullrich. 2012. Childhood risk, offending trajectories, and psychopathy at age 48 years in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law* 18:577-598.

Glenn, A.L. and A. Raine. 2014. Neurocriminology: Implications for the punishment, prediction and prevention of criminal behaviour. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 15:54-63.

Bellair, P.E., McNulty, T.L., and Piquero, A.R. 2016. Verbal ability and persistent offending: A race-specific test of Moffitt's theory. *Justice Quarterly* 33:455-480.

Steinberg, L. 2017. Adolescent brain science and juvenile justice policymaking. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, forthcoming: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/law0000128>

9/19 Social Disorganization
BSG7; P7,9

Bursik, R.J. 1988. Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology* 26:519-552.

Rose, D.R. and T.R. Clear. 1998. Incarceration, social capital and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology* 36:441-79.

Sampson, R.J., S. Raudenbush, and F. Earls. 1997. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277:918-24.

Kubrin, C.E. and R. Weitzer. 2003. New directions in social disorganization theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 40:374-402.

Sampson, R.J., J.D. Morenoff, and S. Raudenbush. 2005. Social anatomy of racial and ethnic disparities in violence. *American Journal of Public Health* 95:224-232.

Matsueda, R.L., K. Drakulich, and C.E. Kubrin. 2006. Race and neighborhood codes of the street. In R.D. Peterson, L.J. Krivo, and J. Hagan (Eds.) *The Many Colors of Crime: Inequalities of Race, Ethnicity, and Crime in America*. New York University Press.

Kirk, D.S. and J.H. Laub. 2009. Neighborhood change and crime in the modern metropolis. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 39* (pp. 441-502). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Steenbeek, W. and J.R. Hipp. 2011. A longitudinal test of social disorganization theory: Feedback effects between cohesion, social control and disorder. *Criminology* 49:833-871.

Davies, G. and J. Fagan. 2012. Crime and enforcement in Immigrant neighborhoods: Evidence from New York City. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 641:99-124.

Sampson, R.J. 2013. The place of context: A theory and strategy for criminology's hard problems. *Criminology* 51:1-31.

Weisburd, D., Groff, E.R., & Yang, S-M. 2014. The importance of both opportunity and social disorganization theory in a future research agenda to advance criminological theory and crime prevention at places. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 51:499-508.

9/26

Strain Theory

BSG8; P11

Agnew, R. 1992. Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* 30:47-87.

Piquero, N.L. and M.D. Sealock. 2000. Generalizing general strain theory: An examination of an offending population. *Justice Quarterly* 17:449-488.

Agnew, R. 2001. Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38:319-361.

Jang, S.J. and B.R. Johnson. 2003. Strain, negative emotions, and deviant coping among African Americans: A test of general strain theory. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 19:79-105.

Mazerolle, P., G. Capowich, and A.R. Piquero. 2003. Examining the links between Strain, situational and dispositional anger, and crime: Further Specifying and testing general strain theory. *Youth and Society* 35:131-157.

Baron, S.W. 2004. General strain, street youth and crime: A test of Agnew's revised theory. *Criminology* 42:457-483.

Piquero, N.L. and M.D. Sealock. 2004. Gender and general strain theory: A preliminary test of Broidy and Agnew's gender/GST hypotheses. *Justice Quarterly* 21:125-158.

Tittle, C., L. Broidy, and M. Getz, 2008. Strain, crime and contingencies. *Justice Quarterly* 25:283-312.

Hoffmann, J.P. and K.R. Spence. 2010. Who's to blame? Elaborating the role of attributions in general strain theory. *Western Criminology Review* 11:1-12.

Morris, R., M. Carriaga, B. Diamond, N.L. Piquero, and A.R. Piquero. 2012. Does prison strain lead to prison misbehavior? An application of general strain theory to inmate misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40:194-201.

Botchkovar, E., & Broidy, L. 2013. Accumulated strain, negative emotions, and crime: A test of general strain theory in Russia. *Crime & Delinquency* 59: 837-860.

Bishopp, S.A., Worrall, J., & Piquero, N.L. 2016. General strain and police misconduct: The role of organizational influence. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 39: 635-651.

10/3 EXAM 1

10/10 Social Learning Theory
BSG9; P12-13

Akers, R., M.D. Krohn, L. Lanza-Kaduce, and M. Radosevich. 1979. Social learning and deviant behavior: A specific test of a general theory. *American Sociological Review* 44:636-655.

Thornberry, T.P., M.D. Krohn, A.J. Lizotte, and D. Chard-Wierschem. 1993. The role of juvenile gangs in facilitating delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:55-87.

Warr, M. 1998. Organization and instigation in delinquent groups. *Criminology* 34:11-37.

Matsueda, R.L. and K. Anderson. 1998. The dynamics of delinquent peers and delinquent behavior. *Criminology* 36:269-308.

Haynie, D. 2001. Delinquent peers revisited: Does network structure matter? *American Journal of Sociology* 106:1013-1057.

Gardner, M. and L. Steinberg. 2005. Peer influence on risk-taking, risk preference, and risky decision-making in adolescence and adulthood: An experimental study. *Developmental Psychology* 41:625-635.

McGloin, J., C. Sullivan, A.R. Piquero, and S. Bacon. 2008. Investigating the stability of co-offending and co-offenders among a sample of youthful offenders. *Criminology* 46:155-188.

Pratt, T.C., F.T. Cullen, C.S. Sellers, L.T. Winfree, Jr., T.D. Madensen, L.E. Daigle, N.E. Fearn, and J.M. Gau. 2010. The empirical status of social learning theory: A meta-analysis. *Justice*

Quarterly 27:765-802.

Goldweber, A., E. Cauffman, J. Dmitrieva, A.R. Piquero, and L. Steinberg. 2011. The development of criminal style in adolescence and young adulthood: Separating the lemmings from the loners. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 40:332-346.

Vieraitis, L.M., N.L. Piquero, A.R. Piquero, S.G. Tibbetts, and M. Blankenship. 2012. Do women and men differ in their neutralizations of corporate crime? *Criminal Justice Review* 37:478-493.

Pyrooz, D., G. Sweeten, and A.R. Piquero. 2013. Continuity and change in gang membership and gang embeddedness. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 50:239-271.

Paternoster, R., J.M. McGloin, H. Nguyen, and K.T. Thomas. 2013. The causal impact of exposure to deviant peers: an experimental investigation. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 50:476-503.

10/17 Control Theory
BSG10; P10,22

Gottfredson, M.R. and T. Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cullen, F.T. 1994. Social support as an organizing concept for criminology: Presidential address to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. *Justice Quarterly* 11:527-559.

Pratt, T.C. and F.T. Cullen. 2000. The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. *Criminology* 38:931-964.

Piquero, A.R., R. MacIntosh, and M. Hickman. 2000. Does self-control affect survey response? Applying exploratory, confirmatory, and item response theory analysis to Grasmick et al.'s self-control scale. *Criminology* 38:897-929.

Simpson, S.S., and N.L. Piquero. 2002. Low self-control, organizational theory, and corporate crime. *Law and Society Review* 36:509-547.

Pratt, T., M. Turner, and A. Piquero. 2004. Parental socialization and community context: A longitudinal analysis of the structural sources of social control. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 41:219-243.

Tittle, C.R., D.A. Ward, and H.G. Grasmick. 2004. Capacity for self-control and individuals' interest in exercising self-control. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 20:143-172.

Hay, C. 2006. Parenting, self-control, and delinquency: A test of self-control theory. *Criminology* 39:707-736.

Piquero, A.R. and J. Bouffard. 2007. Something old, something new: A preliminary investigation of Hirschi's redefined self-control. *Justice Quarterly* 24:1-27.

Wikström, P-O H. & Treiber, K., 2007. The role of self-control in crime causation: Beyond Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, 4:237-264.

Piquero, A.R., W.G. Jennings, and D.P. Farrington. 2010. On the malleability of self-control: Theoretical and policy implications regarding a general theory of crime. *Justice Quarterly* 27:803-834.

Moffitt, T.E., L. Arseneault, D. Belsky, N. Dickson, R.J. Hancox, et al. 2011. A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *PNAS* doi: 10.1073/pnas.1010076108.

Wikström, P-O H. and R. Svensson. 2010. When does self-control matter? The interaction between morality and self-control in crime causation. *European Journal of Criminology* 7:395-410.

Gottfredson, M.R. 2011. Sanctions, situations, and agency in control theories of crime. *European Journal of Criminology* 8:115-127.

Meldrum, R.C., J.T.N. Young, and F.M. Weerman. 2012. Changes in self-control during adolescence: Investigating the influence of the adolescent peer network. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40:452-462.

Burt, C.H., Sweeten, G., and Simons, R.L. 2014. Self-control through emerging adulthood: Instability, multidimensionality, and criminological significance. *Criminology* 52:450-487.

Pratt, T.C., Turanovic, J., Fox, K.A., & Wright, K.A. 2014. Self-control and victimization: A meta-analysis. *Criminology* 52: 87-116.

Pratt, T.C. 2016. A self-control/life-course theory of criminal behavior. *European Journal of Criminology* 13: 129-146.

Diamond, B., Morris, R.G., & Piquero, A.R. 2017. Stability in the underlying constructs of self-control. *Crime & Delinquency* 63: 235-266.

Vazsonyi, A.T., Mikuska, J., & Kelley, E.L. 2017. It's time: A meta-analysis on the self-control-deviance link. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 48:48-63.

10/24 Labeling Theory
BSG11; P14

Wellford, C.F. 1975. Labeling theory and criminology: An assessment. *Social Problems* 22:332-345.

Matsueda, R.L. 1992. Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquent behavior: Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1577-1611.

Sherman, L.W. 1993. Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:445-477.

Triplett, R.A. and G.R. Jarjoura. 1994. Theoretical and empirical specification of a model of informal labeling. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 10:241-276.

Braithwaite, J. 2000. Shame and criminal justice. *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 42:281-298.

Hay, C. 2001. An exploratory test of Braithwaite's reintegrative shaming theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38:132-153.

Pager, D. 2003. The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology* 108:937-975.

Rebellon, C., A.R. Piquero, and S.G. Tibbetts. 2010. Anticipated shaming and criminal offending. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38:988-997.

Morris, R. and A.R. Piquero. 2013. For whom do sanctions deter and label? *Justice Quarterly* 30:837-868.

Matsueda, R.L. 2014. The natural history of labeling theory. In D.P. Farrington and J. Murray (eds.), *Labeling Theory, Empirical Tests, Advances in Criminological Theory* (volume 18, pp. 13-44).

Liberman, A.M., Kirk, D.S., and Kim, K. 2014. Labeling effects of first juvenile arrests: Secondary deviance and secondary sanctioning. *Criminology* 52:345-370.

Restivo, E., & Lanier, M.M. 2015. Measuring the contextual effects and mitigating factors of labeling theory. *Justice Quarterly* 32:116-141.

Besemer, S., Farrington, D.P., & Bijleveld. 2017. Labeling and intergenerational transmission of crime: The interaction between criminal justice intervention and a convicted parent. *PLOS ONE*, forthcoming <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172419>

10/31 Developmental Theory
BSG15; P18

Loeber, R., and M. LeBlanc. 1990. Towards a developmental criminology. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 12, pp. 375-473). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moffitt, T.E. 1993. Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* 100:674-701.

Horney, J., D.W. Osgood, and I.H. Marshall. 1995. Criminal careers in the short-term: Intra-individual variability in crime and its relation to local life circumstances. *American Sociological Review* 60:655-673.

Piquero, A.R., D.P. Farrington, and A. Blumstein. 2003. The criminal career paradigm. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 30* (pp. 359-506). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Farrington, D.P. 2003. Developmental and life-course criminology: Key theoretical and empirical issues – The 2002 Sutherland Award Address. *Criminology* 41:221-255.

Laub, John H. and Robert J. Sampson. 2003. *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Piquero, A.R. 2011. James Joyce, Alice in Wonderland, the Rolling Stones, and criminal careers. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence* 40:761-775.

Carlsson, C. 2012. Using 'turning points' to understand processes of change in offending: Notes from a Swedish Study on Life Courses and Crime. *British Journal of Criminology* 2:1-16.

Farrington, D.P., A.R. Piquero, and W.G. Jennings. 2013. *Offending from Childhood to Late Middle Age: Recent Results from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York: Springer.

Piquero, N.L. and T.E. Moffitt. 2014. Can childhood factors predict workplace deviance? *Justice Quarterly* 31:664-692.

Piquero, A.R. 2015. Understanding race/ethnicity differences in offending across the life course: Gaps and opportunities. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* 1:21-32.

Sampson, R.J., & Laub, J.H. 2016. Turning points and the future of life-course criminology: Reflections on the 1986 criminal careers report. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 53: 321-335.

Jennings, W.G., Rocque, Fox, B.H., Piquero, A.R., & Farrington, D.P. 2016. Can they recover? An assessment of adult adjustment problems among males in the abstainer, recovery, life-course persistent, and adolescence-limited pathways followed up to age 56 in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Development and Psychopathology* 28:537-549.

Broidy, L., & Cauffman, E. 2017. The Glueck women: Using the past to assess and extend contemporary understandings of women's desistance from crime. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* 3:102-125.

11/7 Integrated Theory
BSG15; P17

Elliott, D.S., S.S. Ageton, and R.J. Canter. 1979. An integrated perspective on delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency* 16:3-27.

Hirschi, T. 1979. Separate and unequal is better. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 16:34-38.

Thornberry, T.P. 1987. Towards and international theory of delinquency. *Criminology* 25:863-892.

Nagin, D.S. and R. Paternoster. 1993. Enduring individual differences and rational choice theories of crime. *Law and Society Review* 27:467-496.

Bernard, T.J. and J.B. Snipes. 1996. Theoretical integration in criminology. In M. Tonry (Ed.)

Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research, Volume 20 (pp. 301-348). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Piquero, A.R. and S.G. Tibbetts. 1996. Specifying the direct and indirect effects of low self-control and situational factors in offender decision making: Toward a more complete model of rational offending. *Justice Quarterly* 13:601-631.

Agnew, R. 2003. An integrated theory of the adolescent peak in offending. *Youth & Society* 34:263-299.

Agnew, R. 2014. Social concern and crime: Moving beyond the assumption of simple self-interest. *Criminology* 52:1-32.

Chouhy, C., Cullen, F.T., and Unnever, J.D. 2016. Mean streets revisited: Assessing the generality of rival criminological theories. *Victims & Offenders* 11:225-250.

11/14 NO CLASS ASC

11/21 NO CLASS FALL BREAK

11/28 Evaluating Criminological Theory (MAY NEED TO ADJUST TIME)
BSG17; P21,24

Weisburd, D. and A.R. Piquero. 2008. How well do criminologists explain crime?: Statistical modeling in published studies. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 17* (pp. 453-502). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loeber, R. and B.C. Welsh. 2013. *The Future of Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bruinsma, G. (2016). Proliferation of crime causation theories in an era of fragmentation: reflections on the current state of criminological theory. *European Journal of Criminology*, 13, 659-676.

12/5 FLEX DAY WILL BE USED IN NEED OF MAKE-UP OR EXAM 2 ADMINISTRATION.