

# *The Criminologist*

The Official Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology

Vol. 38, #3

May/June 2013

## Editor's Note:

I continue to be grateful to the knowledgeable, thoughtful people who contribute their talents, time and energy to the *Criminologist*. Editors of the *Criminologist* columns, Charisse Coston (Teaching Tips), Bianca Bersani (Doctoral Student Forum), Todd Clear (Policy Corner), and Jay Albanese (Criminology around the World) continue to offer readers clearly written and timely articles. In Teaching Tips, Kerry Richmond suggests using The National Criminal Justice Commission Project as a teaching tool, and in the Doctoral Student Forum, Allison Carter provides some advice for young college instructors. The three co-editors of *Criminology* share their experience in "Some Thoughts on Accepting Rejection." In the lead article, David McDowell, who won the first ASC Teaching Award in 2011, discusses the award and tells us some of what he has learned about graduate statistics instruction. In the "non-academic" corner, "A View from the Field: What's Happening Outside of Academia," Angela Moore outlines what she and NIJ have learned about how to foster researcher-practitioner collaboration. What a wonderful group of people these are! Please enjoy what they have to say.

Carolyn Rebecca Block, ASC Vice-President

## GRADUATE STATISTICS INSTRUCTOR and the ASC TEACHING AWARD

David McDowall, School of Criminal Justice, University at Albany

As recipient of the 2011 ASC Teaching Award, Becky Block has invited me to contribute an article to *The Criminologist* on some teaching-related issue. I am happy to do so, because it gives me a chance to convey my thanks for this impressive--and truly humbling--award. It also provides an opportunity to express my support for the ASC's increasing attention to teaching activities in the field of criminology and criminal justice.

### *Teaching and the ASC*

I think of myself as primarily interested in scholarship, but during the academic year I spend the largest amount of my time on teaching courses or preparing to teach them. Significant time commitments to instruction are also the rule for most ASC faculty members, and I am sure my responsibilities are lighter than most. Emphasizing the importance of teaching is in keeping with the practice of other leading academic societies, and it is a sign of the ASC's evolving organizational scope.

*(Continued on page 3)*

## IN THIS ISSUE...

Around the ASC.....	7-12	Doctoral Student Forum.....	24-25
Obituaries.....	13-16	A View from the Field.....	26-29
Editors' Corner.....	17-19	Collaboration Corner.....	30
Policy Corner.....	20	Criminology Around the World.....	31-35
Teaching Tips.....	21-22	Notes Regarding the Annual Meeting.....	36-38

## UPCOMING CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

For a complete listing see [www.asc41.com/caw.html](http://www.asc41.com/caw.html)

**2013 SUMMER EVALUATION INSTITUTE**, June 2 - 5, 2013, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, Crowne Plaza Atlanta Perimeter at Ravinia Hotel. For information and to register, please go to <http://www.americanevaluation.org/SummerInstitute13/>. For any questions, please contact Heidi Nye at [info@eval.org](mailto:info@eval.org).

**2013 JUSTICE STUDIES ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE: "FAMILY AND COMMUNITY IN A FRACTURED WORLD: ROOTING FOR JUSTICE, RESTORING THE ROOTS"**, May 30 - June 1, 2013, Arcadia University, Glenside, PA.

**GROVES CONFERENCE FOR MARRIAGE AND FAMILIES, 2013 "AND JUSTICE FOR ALL" - FAMILIES AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**, June 2 - 6, 2013, Boston Marriott Newton. Please visit <http://grovesconference.org/> for more information.

**HOMICIDE RESEARCH WORKING GROUP ANNUAL MEETING WORKING TOGETHER: PARTNERSHIPS TO INVESTIGATE, PREVENT AND RESPOND TO HOMICIDE AND VIOLENCE**, June 5 - 8, 2013, Brunswick, Georgia.

**THE STOCKHOLM CRIMINOLOGY SYMPOSIUM**, June 10 - 12, 2013, Stockholm, Sweden.

**ASIAN CRIMINOLOGICAL SOCIETY 6TH ANNUAL MEETING**, June 27 - 30, 2014, Osaka University of Commerce, Japan. For more information, visit <http://www.ntpu.edu.tw/college/e4/acs/home.php>.

**SOCIAL REHABILITATION AND RE-INTEGRATION OF PRISONERS**, August 30 - 31, 2013, Kampala, Uganda. Theme: "Deepening and Strengthening Professionalism in Prisons". For more information, contact [annteddie@yahoo.com](mailto:annteddie@yahoo.com) or [mmacentre@yahoo.com](mailto:mmacentre@yahoo.com).

**EUROPEAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY ANNUAL MEETING**, September 4 - 7, 2013, Budapest, Hungary. Please visit [www.esc-eurocrim.org/](http://www.esc-eurocrim.org/) for more information.

## *The Criminologist*

The Official Newsletter of the  
American Society of Criminology

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

**Editor: Carolyn Rebecca Block**

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Retired

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

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

**ASC President: ROBERT AGNEW**

Department of Sociology  
Emory University  
1555 Dickey Drive, Tarbutton Hall  
Atlanta, GA 30322

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

## HOW TO ACCESS *CRIMINOLOGY* AND *CRIMINOLOGY & PUBLIC POLICY* ON-LINE

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

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

If you require any further assistance, contact Wiley Customer Service at [cs-membership@wiley.com](mailto:cs-membership@wiley.com); 800-835-6770

(Continued from page 1)

The Teaching Award is a recent addition to the ASC, and it can play a minor but symbolically important role in highlighting instructional efforts within the field. Although the award's description appears to impose an impossibly daunting set of requirements, this is not necessarily true in practice. I have almost exclusively taught statistics courses throughout my career, and for the most part to students at the doctoral level. Over this period, a small but noticeable fraction of the ASC's membership has studied with me at Albany and the University of Maryland. I am privileged to have been involved with such talented students, and the fact that many of them found the courses useful is highly meaningful to me. Still, other contributions are more obvious possibilities for a teaching award, and I can think of multiple colleagues whose work has a strong claim to special recognition.

Given the niche that my teaching occupies, I doubt that I could say anything of general value about instructional philosophies or pedagogical techniques. My experience is far enough from the norm to make it foolish to offer advice to people who have larger classes or students who are less dedicated. I will, however, consider the more general issues of how graduate statistics courses fit into the criminology and criminal justice curriculum, and of what these courses might hope to accomplish.

#### *Graduate Statistics Courses*

Virtually every graduate program has quantitative methods offerings for its students. Sometimes the courses receive little emphasis, and departments delegate them to part-time faculty members or even to other units. Sometimes, especially in doctoral education, departments make them central components of their programs and take pride in them. The importance of statistics instruction in criminology and criminal justice has been a topic of discussion in the past; within just *The Criminologist*, Bushway and Weisburd (2006) provide a notable example.

#### *The Social Context*

Courses on quantitative methods nevertheless stand somewhat apart from other components of the graduate curriculum. Programs generally require these courses for degree completion, and some students are frankly afraid of taking them. This reaction in part reflects the low level of mathematical preparation that is common to students in the social sciences. It also is due to the abstract content of the material, and to its distance from more familiar substantive concerns. Regardless of its origin, such insecurity can encourage students to manifest emotions and behaviors that make the courses unnecessarily difficult for them. Statistics can also provoke a range of other responses, different in form but similarly harmful to learning. These include, for example, students who claim (and sometimes possess) an existing knowledge that is more extensive than a course provides, but who insist on taking it anyway.

These extraneous issues add a separate layer of complexity to teaching quantitative methods. I have never been able to deal satisfactorily with student concerns other than to discourage them and allow experience to (usually) prove them groundless. Mathematics is necessary for a statistics course, and worthwhile instruction cannot neglect mathematical concepts, including difficult ones. Yet a course need not go beyond the mathematics that a topic requires, and the ultimate goal is application rather than mathematical understanding for its own sake.

More often than unproductive attitudes, however, I encounter students who are enthusiastic about learning statistics and who are open to the possibility that they will find value in the subject. This is more frequently true of doctoral students than of those at the Masters level, but even Masters students can find the topics engaging. Interest in statistical methods appears to have increased over my career, amounting to a modestly upward sloping trend. This might be only a matter of my imagination, but it is consistent with the growing sophistication of statistical analyses within the field. It also draws support from the increasing number of recent PhD's who want to teach statistics, and whose backgrounds would allow them to do well at it.

Many approaches besides quantitative analysis are useful in studying crime and criminal justice topics, of course, and students often prefer them. But quantitative methods are central to the field (see, e.g., Bushway and Weisburd, 2006), and familiarity with them is necessary for understanding research reports and reading empirical work. I find that very few graduate students question the value of statistics generally, and that even fewer engage in the anti-intellectual practice of rejecting the subject out of hand.

#### *Masters Courses*

By its nature, the content of a statistics course follows a standard sequence of topics. Descriptive statistics come before inferential statistics, and univariate summaries come before multivariate analysis. Reflecting the logic of this progression, introductory textbooks have for many decades adopted almost identical formats. Instructors who too rapidly pass over the earlier and seemingly more straightforward topics risk creating confusion that will grow over time and eventually reduce understanding of the material.

(Continued on page 4)

*(Continued from page 3)*

Although introductory statistics has a standard content, courses can differ widely in their strategy and goals. Masters (or undergraduate) courses sometimes stress statistical principles, and sometimes concentrate on data analysis and computation. The point of such courses is usually to expose students to the broad ideas that underlie quantitative methodology. They may also try to provide enough conceptual background that the students can understand empirical research presentations at an elementary level. The fact that the courses cover only one semester does not allow goals that go significantly beyond this.

Basing an introductory course on data analysis essentially slights statistical concepts in favor of computation, and uses software as a substitute for detailed presentations of major techniques. This can be popular with students, especially since recent cohorts tend to be knowledgeable about computers and enjoy using them. It also allows instructors to describe a wide range of statistical methods, including some of the complex analytical techniques that are in current use.

An exclusively data analysis approach could possibly be useful to students in their later careers, but I prefer the alternative of focusing on concepts and principles. Emphasizing software and analysis without the underlying ideas can amount to teaching the words for magic spells. Due to their superficial conceptual coverage, students who complete these courses sometimes believe that they have a knowledge of statistical methods that they do not in fact possess. Concentrating on the broader ideas of statistical reasoning is not without its own problems, and is perhaps of less immediate and obvious value. It can nevertheless lay a foundation for additional development, and it offers students a more realistic view of how researchers go about understanding their data.

### *Doctoral Courses*

Teaching doctoral statistics also presents varied possibilities. Yet here the goal is more obvious: to instill a level of competence that will allow students to understand and use quantitative methods at a high level of professional accomplishment. Doctoral programs often use a multi-course sequence to help students reach this level of competence. Albany is probably typical in offering courses at the introductory, intermediate, and advanced levels.

The introductory doctoral course that I teach considers the same set of topics as do its counterparts at other levels of instruction. It differs from them, however, by stressing ideas that will have broad use across many areas of application. Ideally such a course would devote much attention to the foundations of statistics, but the realities of student math preparation constrain the scope of this orientation. Even with limited use of mathematical formalisms, however, careful development of central concepts can be helpful in introducing a core of abstract and general principles.

Given preparation in elementary statistics, the second course can then cover regression models in greater detail. Regression is the basis for most quantitative analyses in the social sciences, and its ability to generalize in many directions makes a deep knowledge of it highly desirable. Given its importance to data analysis, the course that I teach concentrates almost entirely on single-equation models for continuous outcome variables. The ideas and methods of the continuous linear case also apply to other analytic situations, which are often simply extensions of it. With a good understanding of linear regression, the more complex models and methods easily follow.

The second-level course seeks to develop a sophisticated understanding of the uses and limitations of linear models. Texts that address the issues in sufficient depth, such as Fox (2008), Kutner, Nachtsheim, and Neter (2004), and various introductions to econometrics, make substantial demands on the students. The aims of a second-level PhD course nevertheless require this type of presentation, and part of the purpose of the introductory course is to help make such material more accessible. Relatively elementary texts, such as the Sage green cover regression books, are not satisfactory substitutes, since they do not treat the topics in enough detail to allow further development.

Third-level statistics courses can then cover any of a range of specialized topics. Such courses might introduce a variety of methods or consider only one. The courses are more valuable to the degree that they concentrate on methodological issues with obvious applications to criminology and criminal justice. These include almost all methods available to the social sciences, encompassing time series and spatial analyses at both the individual and group levels. My course focuses on only a single major topic, but it varies the topic over a period of years. This is useful in avoiding the shallow coverage that can come from trying to fit several conceptually unrelated methodologies into one semester.

Yet, the topical content of an advanced course is probably less important than its ability to expand and reinforce earlier material. No course or set of courses could possibly include the range of methods that working scholars will apply in their research. The third-level course can be helpful in providing the knowledge and confidence necessary for students to undertake additional self-directed study.

*(Continued on page 5)*

(Continued from page 4)

### *Computing and Examples*

Statistics courses at all levels benefit from frequent example analyses that illustrate applications to criminal justice and criminology data. The substantive focus on crime and crime control is what makes the field distinctive from the other social science disciplines and ultimately justifies its existence. Students at any level better understand statistical methods when they see them in use, and this is why most social science departments teach their own courses. I like “realistic” data that presents examples in a partly stylized context over “real” situations that contain often irrelevant complexities. This is nevertheless a matter of taste, and the use of practical analytical situations is more important than the precise form of the examples.

Examples usually require statistical software, and proficiency with computer programs is a skill that students often value. Focusing on computations can sometimes get in the way of underlying principles, however, and even become an obstacle to learning. As in Masters courses, a heavy emphasis on software can mislead PhD students into thinking that interpreting printouts is a substitute for understanding the methods themselves. Perhaps as undesirable, stressing software encourages students to shape their data analyses around the procedures that popular computer programs make available. Sometimes this orientation even leads students to allow program features to drive the questions they study in their dissertation research.

One solution to this problem is to give only minimal attention to software, and to regard computer programs as calculating devices that have no particular importance in their own right. Placing little weight on computing issues also allows instructors to consider multiple software packages. Currently, SAS, SPSS, and Stata are in wide use in criminology and criminal justice, along with the R statistical language. Some amount of familiarity with all these is useful for prospective researchers. This is especially so for R, which is difficult to use but has a cost structure (free) and flexibility that make it attractive for future use.

### *The Point*

The courses that I have described take as their target audience students who are not especially interested in quantitative methods as ends in themselves. They seek to develop the skills necessary to conduct empirical research and to read and evaluate statistical analyses that appear in the field’s journals. All students will forget many of the details of the courses, but most will also develop and refine their skills on their own. Scholars ultimately learn what they know through their own efforts, and very real limits exist on what a course in statistics might accomplish. If quantitative methods instruction has long-term usefulness, it is in providing models and introductions that allow continued learning and extension.

### **References**

- Bushway, S. & Weisburd, D. 2006. “Acknowledging the Centrality of Quantitative Criminology in Criminology and Criminal Justice”. *The Criminologist*, 31:1-4.
- Fox, J. 2008. *Applied Regression Analysis and Generalized Linear Models* (second edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kutner M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Neter, J. 2004. *Applied Linear Regression Models* (fourth edition). New York: Irwin.
-



## GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

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

**Main Areas of Specialization:**  
*Corrections, Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice, Criminology, Policing*

**For more information, please visit our website at:**  
[www.uc.edu/criminaljustice](http://www.uc.edu/criminaljustice)

### *The Faculty*

**Michael L. Benson** (University of Illinois) White-Collar Crime; Criminological Theory; Life-Course Criminology  
**Susan Bourke** (University of Cincinnati) Corrections; Undergraduate Retention; Teaching Effectiveness  
**Sandra Lee Browning** (University of Cincinnati) Race, Class, and Crime; Law and Social Control; Drugs and Crime  
**Aaron J. Chalfin** (University of California, Berkeley) Criminal Justice Policy; Economics of Crime; Research Methods  
**Nicholas Corsaro** (Michigan State University) Policing, Environmental Criminology, Research Methods  
**Francis T. Cullen** (Columbia University) Criminological Theory; Correctional Policy; White-Collar Crime  
**John E. Eck** (University of Maryland) Crime Prevention; Problem-Oriented Policing; Crime Pattern Formation  
**Robin S. Engel** (University at Albany, SUNY) Policing; Criminal Justice Theory; Criminal Justice Administration  
**Ben Feldmeyer** (Pennsylvania State University) Race/Ethnicity, Immigration, and Crime; Demography of Crime; Methods  
**Bonnie S. Fisher** (Northwestern University) Victimology/Sexual Victimization; Public Opinion; Methodology/Measurement  
**James Frank** (Michigan State University) Policing; Legal Issues in Criminal Justice; Program Evaluation  
**Edward J. Latessa** (The Ohio State University) Rehabilitation; Offender/Program Assessment; Community Corrections  
**Sarah M. Manchak** (University of California, Irvine) Correctional interventions, Risk Assessment and Reduction, Offenders with Mental Illness  
**Joseph L. Nedelec** (Florida State University) Biosocial Criminology; Evolutionary Psychology; Life-Course Criminology  
**Paula Smith** (University of New Brunswick) Correctional Interventions; Offender/Program Assessment; Meta-Analysis  
**Christopher J. Sullivan** (Rutgers University) Developmental Criminology, Juvenile Prevention Policy, Research Methods  
**Lawrence F. Travis, III** (University at Albany, SUNY) Policing; Criminal Justice Policy; Sentencing  
**Patricia Van Voorhis** (University at Albany, SUNY; Emeritus) Correctional Rehabilitation and Classification; Psychological Theories of Crime; Women and Crime  
**Pamela Wilcox** (Duke University) Criminal Opportunity Theory; Schools, Communities, and Crime, Victimization/Fear of Crime  
**John D. Wooldredge** (University of Illinois) Institutional Corrections; Sentencing; Research Methods  
**John P. Wright** (University of Cincinnati) Life-Course Theories of Crime; Biosocial Criminology; Longitudinal Methods  
**Roger Wright** (Chase College of Law) Criminal Law and Procedure; Policing; Teaching Effectiveness

---

## **AROUND THE ASC**

### **CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR 2014 ELECTION SLATE OF 2015 - 2016 OFFICERS**

The ASC Nominations Committee is seeking nominations for the positions of President, Vice-President and Executive Counselor. Nominees must be current members of the ASC, and members in good standing for the year prior to the nomination. Send the names of nominees, position for which they are being nominated, and, if possible, a current C.V. to the Chair of the Nominations Committee at the address below (*preferably via email*). Nominations must be received by **August 1, 2013** to be considered by the Committee.

Jody Miller  
School of Criminal Justice  
Center for Law and Justice, Suite 555  
123 Washington Street  
Rutgers University  
Newark, NJ 07102  
[jody.miller@rutgers.edu](mailto:jody.miller@rutgers.edu)

### **REMINDER: DISCUSSION SITE FOR OVERLY SIMILAR JOURNAL SUBMISSIONS**

If you wish to discuss the Overly Similar Journal Submissions articles from the March/April issue, you can do so here:  
<http://editorscornerseptoct2012.activeboard.com>.

### **RECENT PhD GRADUATES**

**Twyman-Ghoshal, Anamika**, "*Understanding Contemporary Maritime Piracy*". Chaired by Nikos Passas and Glenn Pierce, November, 2012, Northeastern University.

# DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY

## AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

*2013 Membership Drive, Awards, and ASC-Atlanta*

### DIVISION MEMBERSHIP DRIVE 2013

The Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) seeks to promote and improve the use of experimental evidence and methods in the advancement of criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy. The Division is also home to the Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC), which honors outstanding scholars who have advanced experimental research.

Spring is a great time for ASC members to renew or start your 2013 membership to the Division! We invite everyone to explore our website at <http://cebcp.org/dec/> to learn about our activities, interests, and the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*.

**TO DOWNLOAD THE FORM FOR YOUR ASC AND DEC MEMBERSHIPS:** Visit the ASC membership page located at <http://www.asc41.com/appform1.html> .

### NOMINATIONS FOR FELLOWS AND AWARDS

The DEC and AEC are now accepting nominations for AEC Fellows and Honorary Fellows, the Joan McCord Award, the Outstanding Young Experimental Scholar Award, the Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award, the Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial, and the Student Paper Award.

Please send all nomination letters to the DEC Secretary-Treasurer at [expcrim@gmail.com](mailto:expcrim@gmail.com) by June 15, 2013 for consideration for awards presented at ASC-Atlanta.

To see all award winners of past years, visit <http://cebcp.org/dec/>



*Award winners and friends at ASC-Chicago 2012. Left to right: Lynette Feder, Anthony Braga, Phil Cook, Mark Lipsey, Jerry Lee, Bruce Taylor, Charlotte Gill, Karen Amendola & Cody Telep.*

### DEC AT ASC-ATLANTA, 2013 AND ELECTIONS

We look forward to seeing everyone at our annual Joan McCord Lecture and DEC/AEC awards ceremony in Atlanta. The McCord lecture will begin at 2pm on Wednesday, followed by the DEC Awards Ceremony, Meet and Greet, and Announcement of the new 2014-2015 Board. We hope to see you there!



**DEC & aEC**



**The ASC Division on Corrections & Sentencing  
Requests Nominations for Annual Awards**

**Lifetime Achievement Award**

This award honors an individual's distinguished scholarship in the area of corrections and/or sentencing over a lifetime. Recipients must have 20 or more years of experience contributing to scholarly research. Retired scholars will be considered. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate's curriculum vitae and should be submitted to Pauline Brennan, Awards Committee Chair, at [pkbrennan@unomaha.edu](mailto:pkbrennan@unomaha.edu) no later than **September 2, 2013**.

**Distinguished Scholar Award**

This award recognizes a lasting scholarly career, with particular emphasis on a ground-breaking contribution (e.g., book or series of articles) in the past 5 years. The award's committee will consider both research in the area of corrections and sentencing and service to the Division. Recipients must have 8 or more years of post-doctoral experience. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate's curriculum vitae and should be submitted to Pauline Brennan, Awards Committee Chair, at [pkbrennan@unomaha.edu](mailto:pkbrennan@unomaha.edu) no later than **September 2, 2013**.

**Distinguished New Scholar Award**

This award recognizes outstanding early career achievement in corrections and sentencing research. The award's committee will consider both research in the area of corrections and sentencing and service to the Division. Recipients must have less than 8 years of post-doctoral experience. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate's curriculum vitae and should be submitted to Pauline Brennan, Awards Committee Chair, at [pkbrennan@unomaha.edu](mailto:pkbrennan@unomaha.edu) no later than **September 2, 2013**.

**Student Paper Award**

This award is presented in recognition of the most outstanding student research paper. Eligibility is limited to papers that are authored by one or more undergraduate or graduate students and have not been previously published or submitted for publication. Submissions will be judged on five evaluative criteria, including: the overall significance of the work; its research contribution to the field; integration of prior literature in the area; appropriateness and sophistication of the research methodology (if applicable); and overall quality of writing and organization of the paper. Papers should not exceed 30 pages of double-spaced text. References, tables, and figures are not included in the page limit. Please send papers to Kate Fox, Student Paper Award Committee Chair, at [katefox@asu.edu](mailto:katefox@asu.edu) no later than **August 31, 2013**.



## Dissertation Scholarship Award

The Division on Corrections & Sentencing of the American Society of Criminology announces a dissertation scholarship award. The DCS will grant a monetary award of \$1,000 to assist a doctoral student with completion of his/her dissertation. *Doctoral students who have, or will have, successfully completed their dissertation prospectus defense at the time of the award are eligible to apply.* The award is aimed specifically at students who are working on a sentencing or corrections topic for their dissertation and we are looking for a dissertation with the potential to make a unique and important contribution to the field. These monies can be used to assist with data collection or to offset other costs associated with the dissertation research. To be eligible, students must have completed all required course work, passed qualifying comprehensive exams, and have successfully defended the dissertation prospectus by the award date (November, 2013).

Proposals should include the following:

1. Narrative: A 1500 word narrative outlining the dissertation topic as well as data collection methods and analytic strategy.
2. Budget: A separate detailed budget page. Students should also include a detailed explanation of how they expect the monies would be expended.
3. Curriculum Vitae: A current copy of the student's curriculum vitae.
4. Support Letter: The student's dissertation chair must submit a signed statement of support describing (a) the current status of the proposed work, and (b) the student's potential to successfully complete the dissertation (see eligibility requirements).

Applications should be submitted via e-mail to [dcs.dissertation@gmail.com](mailto:dcs.dissertation@gmail.com) no later than **Monday, September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 at 5pm**. The narrative, budget, vitae, and letter of support should be submitted on separate pages in one pdf document. If necessary, the letter of support can be attached as a separate document or sent directly by the dissertation chair to the above email address. The winner will be notified in October 2013 and be recognized at the November ASC meeting in Atlanta, Georgia. Any questions regarding eligibility or appropriate dissertation topics should be directed to Natasha Frost, Dissertation Award Committee Chair, via email at [n.frost@neu.edu](mailto:n.frost@neu.edu) or to Aaron Kupchik, Division Chair, via e-mail at [akupchik@udel.edu](mailto:akupchik@udel.edu).



Marguerite Q. Warren and Ted B. Palmer  
Differential Intervention Award

The Differential Intervention Award is given to a researcher, scholar, practitioner, or other individual who has significantly advanced the understanding, teaching, or implementation of classification, differential assignment, or differential approaches designed to promote improved social and personal adjustment and long-term change among juvenile and adult offenders. The award focuses on interventions, and on ways of implementing them that differ from “one-size-fits-all,” “one-size-largely-fits all,” or “almost fits all,” approaches. The recipient’s contribution can apply to community, residential, or institutional within or outside of the United States.

Consideration for this award does not necessarily require a full-blown nomination (which usually requires quite a bit of work in preparation). Just send the award committee the person’s name, affiliation, and a couple of sentences on what that person has done to deserve consideration for the Warren/ Palmer Differential Intervention Award. Nominations should be sent to Benjamin Steiner at [bmsteiner@unomaha.edu](mailto:bmsteiner@unomaha.edu) no later than **September 1st, 2013**.

## American Society of Criminology 2013 Division on Women and Crime Student Paper Competition

The Division on Women and Crime (DWC) of the American Society of Criminology invites submissions for the Student Paper Competition. The 2012 competition had the highest number of paper submissions in the history of the competition – a total of 25 submissions! The winners will be recognized during the DWC breakfast meeting at the 2013 annual conference in Atlanta. The graduate student winner will receive \$500.00 and the undergraduate student winner will receive \$250.00. For submissions with multiple authors, the award money will be divided among co-authors.

**Deadline:** Papers should be RECEIVED by the committee chair by **September 10, 2013**

**Eligibility:** Any undergraduate or graduate student who is currently enrolled or who has graduated within the previous semester is eligible. Note, any co-authors must also be students, that is, no faculty co-authors are permitted. To document eligibility, every author/co-author must submit proof of student status. This eligibility proof may be in the form of a letter from your department chair or an unofficial transcript.

**Paper Specifications:** Papers should be of professional quality and must be about, or related to, feminist scholarship, gender issues, or women as offenders, victims or criminal justice professionals. Papers must be no longer than 35 pages including all references, notes, and tables; utilize an acceptable referencing format such as APA; be type-written and double-spaced; and include an abstract of 100 words or less.

Papers may *not* be published, accepted, or under review for publication at the time of submission.

**Submission:** One electronic copy using MSWord must be received by the co-chair of the committee by the stated deadline (please do not send a PDF file). In the reference line, identify whether this is to be considered for the graduate or undergraduate competition. Please refrain from using identifying (e.g., last name) headers/ footers, as the papers will be blind-reviewed.

**Judging:** Members of the paper competition committee will evaluate the papers based on the following categories: 1. Content is relevant to feminist scholarship; 2. Makes a contribution to the knowledge base; 3. Accurately identify any limitations; 4. Analytical plan was well developed; 5. Clarity/organization of paper was well developed.

**Notification:** All entrants will be notified of the committee's decision no later than November 1<sup>st</sup>. Winners are strongly encouraged to attend the conference to receive their award.

### **Co-Chairs of Committee:**

Email all **paper submissions** to:

Angela R. Gover, PhD | School of Public Affairs | University of Colorado Denver |  
phone (303)315-2474 | [angela.gover@ucdenver.edu](mailto:angela.gover@ucdenver.edu)

For all other correspondence:

Lisa A. Murphy, Ph.D. | Department of Psychology | La Sierra University |  
phone: (951) 272-6300 x1008 | [lmurphy@lasierra.edu](mailto:lmurphy@lasierra.edu)

---

## OBITUARIES

### **Edwin W. Zedlewski**

Edwin W. Zedlewski passed away on April 14, 2013. As a career public servant for more than 35 years, Dr. Edwin Zedlewski helped form, shape, and nurture our nation's criminal justice research agenda. He helped form and hone the research tools to understand "what works," he helped broker a more effective partnership between research, practice, and public policy, and he made real lasting contributions to the safety of our communities and neighborhoods across the country.

To his colleagues at NIJ, Ed was known as a persistently optimistic, unflappable colleague with a "steel trap" memory and a flair for hosting impromptu "ice cream socials." To the field, he became a consistent beacon of empiricism, evidence, and rigor in measuring what works and what's promising in fighting crime. He dedicated his career to the work and the mission of NIJ and OJP.

Ed was been an employee of the U.S. Department of Justice from September, 1975 to February 2011. His years of public service were dedicated to the advancement of public safety through research and evaluation at the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Ed held several key posts at NIJ including Science Advisor to the NIJ Director (1984-1992), Director of Corrections Research (1992-1996), Director of Program Development, 1998-1999), Assistant Director (1999-2000), Senior Science Advisor (2001-2008), and Director of NIJ's International Research Center (2008-present). His early accomplishments helped to lay the foundation of the National Institute of Justice: developing and administering NIJ's evaluation program under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988; serving as consultant to the President's Commission on Organized Crime; conducting a study of DEA airport surveillance, a study later placed in evidence by the U.S. Solicitor General in *Royer v. Florida*; leading a three-year project integrating public- and private-sector investments into a general theory of crime prevention and deterrence; advising the Bureau of Justice Statistics on the design of the National Crime Survey; leading the development of the Corrections and Law Enforcement Family Support (CLEFS) program; and fostering partnerships with the Ford Foundation and Harvard University's *Innovations in Government* program and the *Goldstein Awards* in policing to highlight and accelerate the pace of innovation in criminal justice. Among his more recent achievements were his leadership in establishing NIJ's *Breaking the Cycle* demonstration program; the *Re-Entry Partnerships* initiative; his contributions to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy subcommittee on Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, including contributing significantly to the 2005 OSTP publication on Research on Terrorism; and his formation of a new partnership on research supporting crime policy with the National Governor's Association.

One of Ed's most significant later achievements was the development and implementation of a cutting-edge demonstration project to test the utility of DNA for high-volume non-violent crimes in five U.S. jurisdictions. This study contributed significantly to revolutionizing the way that police agencies use DNA to solve high-volume crimes like burglaries and car thefts. Ed's innovative approach, linking social/behavioral science and program evaluation to the emerging technology of DNA analysis and trace evidence helped to usher in what we know recognize as a new era in crime-solving, forensics, and policing.

Ed was an accomplished researcher and writer and authored many research papers including "*DNA Analysis for "Minor" Crimes: A Major Benefit for Law Enforcement*," (2006, with Mary B. Murphy); "*Why Prisons Matter*," (1997); "*Private Security and Controlling Crime*," (1990); "*The Economics of Disincarceration*," (1984); "*Space Flight, Street Crime, and Methodological Juxtaposition*," (1984); and "*Performance Measurement in Public Agencies: The Law Enforcement Evolution*," (1979). Some of latest writing was as a contributing author to an edited volume on calculating costs of crime and the benefits of crime prevention initiatives.

Ed was a graduate of the Doctoral program in Economics at George Washington University, Washington, DC. Before joining the Department of Justice, he was a research analyst and consultant to the Chief of Naval Operations in the U.S. Navy.

He is survived by his wife Sheila, and their two sons, John and Charles.

Submitted by Thomas E. Feucht

---

## OBITUARIES

### **Stanley Cohen (1942 - 2013)**

Stanley Cohen, Emeritus Professor of Sociology in the London School of Economics, passed away in early January after a long battle with Parkinson's disease. Stan was a transformative thinker with a unique ability to combine compelling scholarship with a passionate commitment to social justice. He was also an inspiring mentor, helpful colleague and valued friend to so many fortunate enough to have known him.

Stan was born in 1942 and grew up in South Africa. He studied sociology and social work at the University of Witwatersrand and later moved to London with his wife Ruth to work as a psychiatric social worker. In 1963, he entered the London School of Economics to pursue doctoral research on social responses to vandalism. His PhD dissertation provided the basis for his book *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (1972). In this work, Stan proposed the term and concept "moral panic" to connote how overreactions to minor and/or extreme forms of deviance can make matters far worse. Moral panic is now a part of the English language and is routinely employed in criminology and sociology studies.

After a move to Durham University in 1967 and later to the University of Essex in 1972, Stan began collaboration with Laurie Taylor. They were founding members of the National Deviancy Conference in 1968, which challenged criminological orthodoxy. Their study of the conditions and effects of long-term imprisonment in H Wing in Durham Prison, *Psychological Survival* (1972), significantly heightened prison policy concerns in the Home Office. That book along with *Prison Secrets* (1976) which discussed the lack of clear-cut inmate rights in prison, set the stage for Stan's celebrated "dispersal of control" thesis.

Drawing upon the legacy of Orwell as much as Foucault, Stan's *Visions of Social Control* (1985) analyzed the ever-widening social control reach of the state into everyday life, employing such metaphors as net-widening, mesh-thinning, exclusion and inclusion. This classic book provided a comprehensive and sweeping analysis of the growth of Western systems of social control and how this historic growth shapes and informs their current and likely future patterns. *Visions of Social Control* demonstrated the value of studying social control and the role of ideology from a past, present and future perspective while refraining from reliance upon traditional ideological battles. As a result, the book transcended mere ideological or theoretical categorization. Rather, it was an exemplar of confronting theory with best available empirical evidence and allowing the resulting arguments/conclusions to stand as they emerged whether ambiguous or nuanced. This, indeed, was a hallmark of Stan's work that was without unambiguous conclusions but replete with original, prescient and altogether thoughtful arguments that always push readers to think in new and different ways. Over the past quarter century since its publication, and especially since 9/11, many of his predictions of ever greater inclusionary and exclusionary controls have been all too fully borne out.

A later phase of Stan's work was his book *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (2001) which combined his rich expertise in criminology with his concern for human rights that was shaped by his growing up in the turmoil of apartheid South Africa and later witnessing firsthand the plight of the Palestinians while living in Israel. The book focused upon reactions to information about inhumanities and cruelties and how states and the powerful can employ "techniques of neutralization" to avoid embarrassing realities. *States of Denial* was chosen as Outstanding Publication of 2001 by the International Division of the American Society of Criminology and was awarded the 2002 British Academy Book Prize.

Stan's many contributions to our understanding of crime, punishment, delinquency, mass media and human rights resulted in numerous awards and recognitions including in 1998 the Sellin-Glueck Award from the American Society of Criminology and his election as a fellow of the British Academy. Stan received Honorary Doctorates from the University of Essex in 2004 and Middlesex in 2008. In 2009 he received the Outstanding Achievement Award from the British Society of Criminology.

Throughout Stan's career, he maintained a sense of skepticism, irony, fascination, and humor about social life. Moreover, and particularly noteworthy to the current debate over "public sociology" and "public criminology" regarding scholar versus activist/policy roles, Stan effectively embraced both. He recognized that committed scholarship involved a delicate balance even when scholars are clearly informed about a particular area or situation. Stan understood that it is not a matter of committed scholars becoming embroiled in public policy debates by supporting a particular policy. Rather, committed scholars need to identify and explain what policy choices and likely consequences are involved in particular decisions. As Stan exemplified throughout his career, objective scholarship cannot be trumped by mere advocacy or the "taking sides" for some particular policy choice but rather seeking a curious and simultaneous balance between detachment and passion.

We are confident that Stan's work will continue to prove durable and that future generations will be able to employ and test their sense of reality against the standards he set.

Submitted by Thomas Blomberg and David Downes

## **OBITUARIES**

### **Dale K. Sechrest (1939 - 2011)**

Some people have a vibrancy that makes them appear to be larger than life. Undoubtedly this is why it has taken the faculty at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) so long to come to terms with the loss of one of our distinguished members. Dale K. Sechrest, or as he preferred to be called "Uncle Dale", passed away unexpectedly at Loma Linda Hospital on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011 from cancer-related complications.

Dale was born in Taft, CA on April 22, 1939. Enlisting in the Army in 1957, Dale monitored Soviet radio and missile activity from Turkey. Upon returning state-side, he used the G.I. Bill—obtaining a B.A. in Psychology (1964) and a M.S. in Sociology (1966) from San Jose University. Following a short stint as a Deputy Probation Officer with the Contra Costa County Probation Department in El Cerrito, CA, Dale worked through a sequence of applied research positions.

Officially, Dale spent a couple of years with the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in Washington, DC. Several years later he found his way back to California to join the American Justice Institute in 1971. From 1973-1975 he served as a Project Director with the Center for Criminal Justice, at Harvard Law School. Dale's tenure with applied research organizations culminated in a 10 year relationship with the American Correctional Association. And, somewhere in the middle of it all, Dale completed a D.Crim. from the University of California at Berkeley, 1974. Shortly thereafter the program was disbanded; no one is certain what to make of this coincidence.

Always on the go, Dale jumped into the academic world with a faculty position at Florida International University. A native Californian, Dale soon left the humidity and mosquitos, returning to his home state and settling in at CSUSB. Dale's passion for correctional research never waned and during his 21 years at CSUSB. As director of the Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR-CSUSB), Dale mentored countless students and faculty on the art of applied research. Generous to a fault, Dale's opportunities became your course release or M.A. thesis as he drew everyone in around him to help with the research. Dale was always "just trying to get organized", and though he frequently lamented that he was "maligned and misunderstood", he was beloved by all. His legacy extends far beyond the countless publications and research reports he completed. Dale is survived by his ex-wife, Judy Sechrest; three children, Stephanie Conner, Alan Sechrest and David Sechrest; 6 grandchildren, two nephews, and 1 great grandchild; and, many colleagues. It is no exaggeration to say that Dale touched thousands of lives. Never at a loss for words, Dale's wit and occasional limerick, continues to echo in our hearts. He is greatly missed.

Dale's dedication to supporting the scholarly development of students and faculty will be honored with the Dale Sechrest Memorial Fund and a research lab named in his honor. For more information or to make a gift, please see <https://development.csusb.edu/makeagift/>.

Submitted by Gisela Bichler

---

## OBITUARIES

### **Gerald R. Garrett (1940 - 2013)**

Emeritus Professor of Sociology Gerald R. Garrett, PhD (1940-2013) passed away unexpectedly in Hoosick Falls NY on January 14, 2013. Professor Garrett received his MA and Ph.D. degrees from Washington State University and his BA from Whitman College. His 1971 dissertation, *Drinking Behavior of Homeless Women*, anticipated his lifelong interest in disaffiliated populations. He worked initially in alcoholism research at Columbia University with sociologist Howard M. Bahr.

Dr. Garrett joined the Department of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts Boston in 1970 and played many important roles in the department and the larger University community until his retirement in 2002, after which he was named professor emeritus. He was a founder of the Department of Sociology's Criminal Justice major, director of the University's Alcohol and Substance Abuse Studies program, and acting chair for one year of the Department of Sociology. He taught key courses in the sociology and criminal justice curricula, including Criminology, Corrections and an internship in Alcohol and Drugs. His students rated his teaching as outstanding and he was a popular and beloved adviser to many.

Gerald R. Garrett was a nationally recognized expert in criminal justice, substance abuse studies, and homelessness. He was co-author, with Richard Rettig and Manuel Torres of *Manny: A Criminal Addict's Story* (Houghton Mifflin), with Howard Bahr, of *Women Alone: The Disaffiliation of Urban Females*, with Calvin J. Larson, of *Crime, Justice, and Society* (Rowman and Littlefield) and with Russell Schutt, of *Responding to the Homeless: Policy and Practice* (Plenum). He also published many articles and book chapters on these and related topics. He served as President of the Northeastern Association of Criminal Justice Sciences, President of the International Coalition for Addiction Studies Education, was a member of the Higher Education Center for Alcohol & Substance Abuse Prevention, was senior consultant for the Addiction Technology Transfer Center of New England (with the goal of infusing alcohol and substance abuse knowledge into college curricula), and more recently, served as an adviser to the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Counseling Program at Middlesex Community College. He helped build a strong legacy of applied sociology at UMass Boston.

Submitted by Russell Schutt

*More complete obituaries can be found at [http://asc41.com/obituaries/obituaries\\_home.html](http://asc41.com/obituaries/obituaries_home.html)*

---

## EDITORS' CORNER

### WHEN EDITORS “DECLINE THE OPPORTUNITY” TO PUBLISH YOUR MANUSCRIPT: SOME THOUGHTS ON ACCEPTING REJECTION

**Eric Baumer, Wayne Osgood, and Rosemary Gartner**  
Editors of *Criminology*

The “rejection phrase” can come in many flavors, but it tastes pretty awful no matter how it is worded. A rejection is a rejection, whether an editor “declines the opportunity to publish your paper” because it is insufficient on one or more grounds; sees many positive qualities, but is unable to publish it because of “limited page space;” or perhaps suggests that the “manuscript is both good and original, but the part that is good is not original, and the part that is original is not good.”<sup>1</sup> Unless it comes from the *Journal of Universal Rejection* (JofUR), which promises lightning fast rejections from the “most prestigious journal (judged by acceptance)” without “suffering waves of anxiety regarding the eventual fate of your submission”<sup>2</sup>, a manuscript rejection is bound to sting at least a little. The three of us have received many rejection letters in our collective professional careers, and we have had to deliver this news quite a lot over the past few years. After all, it is by far the modal outcome in top peer-reviewed social science journals, including *Criminology*.<sup>3</sup> We thought it might be useful, therefore, to comment on some positive ways to react to rejection that can improve your chances of success in our field. As we contemplated this, three pieces of advice came to mind.

#### Sing a Happy Tune

Our first piece of advice is: *Don't get too discouraged by rejection; it happens to everybody*. Any colleague who says she or he has never had a paper rejected almost surely either is lying or hasn't submitted many papers to top journals. Although having a manuscript rejected is a real bummer that may feel very personal, it is useful to remember that it is just part of the profession. Even so, we suspect it may be healthy to allow yourself a day or two to curse the reviewers and editors before looking for more constructive ways to move forward. One of our colleagues—Professor Richard Felson—has written a catchy song that might be helpful:

*Stand By Your Manuscript*  
(To the tune of “Stand by Your Man”)  
Richard Felson

Sometimes it's hard to be a scholar,  
When all your papers just get panned.  
You've gotten bad reviews, from folks with low IQs,  
For reasons you don't understand.

And so you find a lesser journal,  
Not even close to the top ten.  
They say it's unfit, but you can resubmit,  
If you do the whole thing again.

Do it again.  
Revise and resubmit.  
My model doesn't fit.  
I'll never be promoted.

Stand by your man(uscript).  
Why don't the reviewers like me?  
I'm doing the best that I can.  
Do it again.

<sup>1</sup>An apt quote attributed to (but not found in the writings of) the renowned English writer and literary critic, Samuel Johnson.

<sup>2</sup>See <http://www.universalrejection.org/>.

<sup>3</sup>In 2012, 87% of manuscripts submitted to *Criminology* (N=278) were rejected (Criminology Editorial Report, 2012).

(Continued from page 17)

Do it again.  
I'm tired of revision.  
Why can't they just take one now and then?  
Do it again.

### **Cool Off, Evaluate the Situation, and Look for Positives**

Albert Einstein famously quipped that “in the middle of difficulty lies opportunity,” and this certainly seems apropos when pondering the rejection letter you just received. Though it might provide some relief if you immediately upload the original version of the “just rejected” manuscript to another journal’s submission site, you would do better to take more time to reflect on the reviewer and editor comments that you received. If you allow your emotions to settle and your ego to recover a bit, you will reduce the likelihood that your next move is ill considered. Yes, on the day the rejection letter arrives the reviewers’ reactions may seem unreasonable and their suggestions worse than useless. In our experience, however, they are likely to turn into some useful insights a week or so later.

There are a variety of reasons to pause a bit before you simply edit your letter of submission and send the unchanged paper to another journal. First, that quick submission may further reduce your chances of success and risk damaging your reputation. Though each journal makes independent editorial decisions, the pool of reviewers well suited to a paper may be small enough that it will be sent to some of the same reviewers. Repeat reviewers will not be pleased if you have ignored all of their suggestions. Our impression is that too many rejected papers go right back out the door, making little or no use of invaluable feedback from experts who have invested many hours in studying and understanding the work. We see this in comments from our own reviewers when they evaluate papers that they have reviewed previously. Even if another journal accepts the unchanged paper, remember that the original reviewers are likely to read the final version too (given that they work in your area). When they do, wouldn't you rather they thought of you as a serious scholar bent on making your work as good as possible, rather than as someone in a hurry who got lucky rolling the dice at another journal?

Taking more time also will help you benefit from the reviewer comments. Whether we like to admit it or not, others can help improve our masterpieces, so a calm, cool, and reasoned analysis of the reviewer comments that are bundled with a rejection letter is probably worth the effort. In fact, a recent paper published in *Science* suggests that rejection can be beneficial in more tangible ways; because they are improved by review processes at two journals, papers rejected the first time and then accepted by another journal are cited more often than papers accepted the first time around (Calcagno et al., 2012, 338:1065-1069).

Another good reason to wait a bit before your next step is to seek feedback from others. Consider sharing your paper and the reviews with a colleague or two, and ask her/him/them for their honest appraisal of the merit of the reviews. Sometimes reviewers' opinions are quite divergent and they raise concerns that are not easy to reconcile with one another. It is reasonable to expect the editor's letter to explain the basis for rejection, but that may or may not provide much guidance about the most useful way to improve the paper. A trusted colleague or two can be a big help for filtering the good points from the not so great, negotiating divergent views, and shining a clearer light on items we might be wise to modify before resubmitting.

### **Take the Smart Advice, Be Thoughtful, and Move Forward**

Sometimes we learn from the peer-review process that our paper has shortcomings serious enough that the best place for it will be a remote storage facility or a comforting winter fire. Be sure to consider the effort it will take to arrive at a publication you can be proud of, or whether it is even possible. Have the reviewers identified flaws that mean this paper can never have the impact you hoped? Perhaps your time would be better spent on your “next even better piece” than on reviving one that seems to be headed for a slow death.

The more typical scenario is that a paper has some problems that, with additional thought and effort, can be resolved sufficiently to yield a nice contribution in another peer-reviewed outlet. While rejection is part of the academic journey, it does not have to be the destination. As the American aphorist, Mason Cooley, put it, “after rejection – misery, then thoughts of revenge, and finally, oh well, another try elsewhere.”

(Continued on page 19)

(Continued from page 18)

We suggest that you think carefully about the good free advice that came with your rejection, and use it to increase your chances of success at another high-quality outlet. Take the reviewers' advice seriously, no matter how far off base it might seem at first. You may ultimately conclude that the reviewers "simply got it wrong," but even that is useful feedback about where you need to sharpen and clarify your paper to keep the next set of reviewers from committing the same "mistake." Of course, as an author you should never feel like you have to do everything the reviewers say. Indeed, you should not lose sight of the specific objectives of your paper and what you are trying to accomplish. With that as a guidepost, however, we suspect that some of your most fundamental goals are to make a valuable contribution to the field and to take the care to make your paper the best it can be. Making good use of the feedback you get from reviewers—even (perhaps especially) when rejected—will help you achieve these goals.

So, after you have recovered from the initial blow of the rejection, we encourage you to pick yourself up off the mat with reviews in hand, and spend some time reworking your paper to enhance its prospects elsewhere and, more important, to maximize its potential contribution to the field. Though it might be tempting to sidestep this process and go it alone, as John Lennon and Paul McCartney remind us, there are many intrinsic benefits to getting by "with a little help from our friends." We may not always immediately think of reviewers (or editors) as our friends, but they sure are doing us a great service if they provide good honest feedback that helps us improve our work.

### Reference

V. Calcagno, E. Demoinet, K. Gollner, L. Guidi, D. Ruths, and C. deMazancourt. 2012. "Flows of research manuscripts among scientific journals reveal hidden submission patterns." *Science*. 33: 1065-1069.

## IACP Excellence in Law Enforcement Research Award



Each year, the IACP's Research Advisory Committee, in partnership with the Sprint, accepts applications from law enforcement agencies for the *IACP/Sprint Excellence in Law Enforcement Research Award*. This award is given each year to three law enforcement agencies (one overall winner and two runner ups) that have sought to improve their operational effectiveness through careful research conducted by the department, usually in collaboration with a respected academic research partner.

A representative from each winning agency will be provided with complimentary conference registration, airfare, and lodging at IACP's 120<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference being held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; where an event to recognize the winning agencies will be held.

Applications are due by  
**June 29, 2013**

For information about how to apply, please [click here](#) or visit the IACP website at [www.theiacp.org](http://www.theiacp.org). Instructions are available with the downloadable application form.

In cases where research was a collaboration between a department and a local university, the lead officer typically attends with a professor from the university. Awards recipients are recognized in a *Police Chief* magazine article highlighting the department's research accomplishments.

In an era of narrowing resources, and a movement toward evidence based policing, the IACP/Sprint award program allows agencies to showcase their research efforts, and demonstrate how research changed and improved departmental policy. As an IACP/Sprint award winner, these agencies also promote effective policing across the country as their stories are shared across IACP membership.

Questions? Please contact John Firman at [firmanj@theiacp.org](mailto:firmanj@theiacp.org) or 1-800-THE-IACP, ext 207

## POLICY CORNER

**Todd R. Clear**, ASC Policy Committee Chair

Some of the implications of the March Sequester for crime and justice research funding are now becoming clearer. Mary Lou O'Leary, Acting Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs, said in a recent communication to OJP grantees:

“For the Department of Justice, the total reduction was \$1.67 billion in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013, which, by law, must be applied to all Department programs. This reduction will result in serious consequences for the administration of justice for our communities across the Nation. The sequestration cut OJP FY2013 funding levels by about \$110 million.”

Recently, Howard Silver, Executive Director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), advised the American Society of Criminology of the impact on NIJ and BJS. In the original 2013 appropriations, the National Institute of Justice would receive \$43 million, of which \$5 million would transfer to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for DNA related projects. The Bureau of Justice Statistics would receive \$48 million, of which \$36 million is designated for the National Crime Victimization Survey.

With the passage of H.R. 933, which provides funding for the rest of FY 2013, the final numbers for that fiscal year are now available. On its way to final passage, the Commerce, Justice, Science portion of the bill, which includes NIJ and BJS, suffered an across-the-board (ATB) cut of 0.1877 percent. The Sequester of five percent is then deducted from that number. That would leave BJS with a final FY 2013 budget of about 44.8 million and NIJ with about \$40.1 million.

NIJ receives additional money from other sources. They would get, before the Sequester reductions, \$3.5 million for Violence Against Women Act research, as well as \$4 million from Byrne Justice Assistance Grant for research on domestic radicalization violence. Congress maintained the “set-aside” of two percent of Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs’ funds that can be transferred to NIJ and BJS for OJP-related research and statistical work.

The Sequester gives the Attorney General authority to reprogram funds across budget accounts within DOJ by up to 5% per account. This enables the AG to avoid furloughs in departments such as FBI and DEA, as he did on March 24, moving \$150 million from other units into the Prison budget. The effect of this kind of reprogramming could be to further diminish the total OJP budget, which of course reduces the NIJ/BJS.

The overall funding plan for crime and justice research and statistics is miniscule, compared to the total federal budget: *less than one ten-thousandth of a percent of discretionary spending!* It would seem so small that it would disappear from the radar screen, when it comes to cuts. But this teeny federal commitment to crime and justice research is an argument that cuts both ways. One the one hand, it is so small that cutting it cannot do much in the way of good. On the other hand, this is the kind of sum that can easily get swallowed up in larger cuts—lacking much of a champion and easy to include in other expense-cutting moves.

Another ominous indicator of where we are now: on March 22, the Senate voted to bar the use of National Science Foundation funds for political science research not deemed essential to national security or economic interest. Could justice department research face a similar fate?

What can be done to protect crime and justice research funding? Working together with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the ASC has been regularly meeting with staff of the relevant Senate and House Committees. But right now, *everyone* affected by the Sequester is doing that. If you feel strongly about protecting crime and justice research funding, write to your federal congressional representatives, and let them know.

## **TEACHING TIPS COLUMN**

Edited by Charisse T. M. Coston

University of North Carolina at Charlotte ([ccoston@uncc.edu](mailto:ccoston@uncc.edu))

The peer reviewed Teaching Tips column is geared toward sharing ideas that will help improve teaching in both undergraduate and graduate level criminology and criminal justice courses. Submissions should be between 500 and 1,000 words. Tips can consist of:

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

Please send submissions for “Teaching Tips” to Charisse T.M. Coston at [ccoston@uncc.edu](mailto:ccoston@uncc.edu).

Thanks – Charisse T.M. Coston, Chair; Natasha M. Ganem, Kristi Holsinger, Christopher Lyons, Stephen L. Muzzatti, and Heather L. Scheuerman, Members, ASC Teaching Committee.

## **TEACHING TIP: THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION PROJECT** **Engaging Criminal Justice Students in a Collaborative Learning Assignment**

**Kerry M. Richmond, PhD**

Department of Criminal Justice-Criminology, Lycoming College

The criminal justice system in the United States is currently facing many challenges, such as prison overcrowding, concerns over racial profiling by police officers and budgetary constraints, all of which have consequences of social, economic and political importance. While criminal justice majors are familiar with these issues, as a professor, I struggle to get students to see themselves as active participants in fostering change in the system and to make connections between these larger issues and their future careers. More specifically, students often resist learning research methodology as they do not see it as relevant, or needed, for their chosen profession. While few students who major in criminal justice will go on to work in public policy, as practitioners they will be affected by these decisions in some way. As a way to impress upon students the significance of evidence-based practices, I created a collaborative learning project for an upper-level criminal justice research methods course that aims to illustrate the importance of scientific research in addressing real-world criminal justice issues.

Despite continuous calls for reform, there has not been a comprehensive examination of the criminal justice system in this country since 1965 when President Johnson created the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. In 2009, however, Senator Jim Webb (D-Virginia) called for such a commission to be developed to conduct an in-depth study on the criminal justice system. Using Senator Webb’s legislation as a starting point, the assignment asks students to take on the role of the National Criminal Justice Commission, which is tasked with identifying the central challenges facing the criminal justice system and developing recommendations for reform.

In the beginning of the semester, in order to set up the project, students read President Johnson’s 1967 special message to Congress on crime in the United States (“President Johnson’s Special Message”, 1967), and the text of Senator Webb’s proposed National Criminal Justice Commission Act (S. 306, 2011). In both of these texts, Johnson and Webb argue that the criminal justice system is broken and that steps must be taken to fix it. The purpose of having students read these statements is for them to understand the role that research plays in facilitating change within the criminal justice system and the importance of bringing together various stakeholders to get a broad perspective on the causes and consequences of problems that exist. The class learns about the recommendations put forth by Johnson’s Commission and which ones were implemented successfully, such as the National Crime Victimization Survey, the 9-1-1 system, firearms registration and halfway houses (The President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967).

*(Continued on page 22)*

(Continued from page 21)

I also show the class a clip of Senator Webb introducing the National Criminal Justice Commission Act to the Senate floor (Senator Webb, 2009) to examine the parallels between President Johnson's Commission and what Senator Webb is trying to accomplish. As criminal justice majors, many students are familiar with the issues that Senator Webb discusses, such as high rates of incarceration, racial disparities and the drug and mental health issues of inmates. The point is to highlight the relevance of research in creating criminal justice policy and to draw students' attention to the fact that these are issues which are being discussed on a national-level and in which they have some expertise.

Students are then divided up into task forces, based on individual preference, which focus on a specific aspect of the criminal justice system. Task forces are made up of three to four students each and address the following areas: the definition and measurement of crime, policing, courts and sentencing, corrections, juvenile delinquency, and drugs. Each task force is required to put together a 20-25 page report, which identifies the central challenges facing that specific area of the criminal justice system and which puts forth evidence-based recommendations to address those problems. To give students the opportunity to utilize the skills being learned in the course, task forces are also asked to describe how each recommendation could be evaluated, so that a future commission could examine whether the recommendations were effective. This is a way for students to see how research skills can be applied outside of an academic setting. Finally, given the interest in having this activity serve as a capstone experience for students, at the end of the semester, each task force gives a presentation to department faculty members and students on their report. This gives students the opportunity to exhibit their presentation skills to a larger audience and to field questions from those outside of the class.

While the bulk of the work for this project is done independently by each task force, I wanted to create an environment in class which mimics the work of a real commission. Therefore, during the semester, four in-class Commission meetings are held in which each task force provides an update on their work. These meetings allow students to draw on the expertise of the other members of the commission, as well as to receive feedback and suggestions on their ideas.

By developing an assignment that parallels how a commission would function in the "real world," the hope is that students begin to understand the relevance and importance of the skills they are learning in the classroom. Students are encouraged to keep up with current events and issues in the field and to critically analyze these issues within a broader context. Through the course of the semester, they become "experts" in their area and are given the opportunity to discuss and create solutions they believe would be effective, instead of simply learning about various reforms that have been implemented through a class lecture. As a result, students become active learners and are more invested in the outcome of the project. Students also gain experience working together as a team and hone their writing and presentation skills through discussion, practice and revision. Finally, they begin to understand the challenges and need for research in reforming the criminal justice system. Given the direction that the criminal justice system is headed, these are important qualities for our graduates to attain.

## **References**

National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2011, S. 306, 112<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2011). The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. 1967. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Senator Webb. (2009, March 30). Senator Webb Introduces Bill to Overhaul America's Criminal Justice System. Retrieved from: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8WRc8LPMe4I>.

Text of President Johnson's Special Message to Congress on Crime in United States. (1967, February 7). *New York Times*, p. 24.



**ADLER.**

**FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE.**

Offering a 100% online  
M.A. in Criminology

**OPEN HOUSE**

**Tuesday, June 11**

**10:30am-12:30pm**

**RSVP 312.662.4100**

The Adler School is founded on an important idea: Our health resides in our community life and connections. This is what drives our ground-breaking curricula and commitment to social justice.

We work with those courageous enough to want to change the world. Our master's and doctoral degrees prepare students with the theory and practice to become agents of social change. **The Adler School — Leading Social Change. Apply today.**



**adler.edu**

Adler School of Professional Psychology  
17 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60602

## DOCTORAL STUDENT FORUM

### **TWENTY-SOMETHING TEACHING TWENTY-SOMETHINGS** **The Trials and Tribulations of being a Young College Instructor**

**Allison Carter**, Doctoral Student  
*University of South Carolina*

You are in your twenties. You got the graduate assistantship (sigh of relief) and now you are instructing your own college course. It is exciting, it is a terrific opportunity, and it is terrifying! Being a young person teaching college students who are near your age is a challenge. The hardest part? Establishing yourself as the authority figure in the classroom. The easy parts? Being in touch with their generation, understanding how they learn, and having fun!

#### **You Are An Instructor! Now What?**

Your first semester of teaching is a big deal. No matter if you have been a teaching assistant for a million classes, this is YOUR first class. First thing to do is to “borrow” someone’s syllabus and possibly their lecture materials. Having this as a backup is very helpful. Their syllabus already follows University guidelines and you have their lectures, in case you get stuck. The second step is to order a few books from publishers (free for instructors) so you can compare how course material is presented. Then, select a book for the class and put the order in at the student bookstore. Now you are ready to go.

First, create your syllabus.\* Include the rules that you expect to be followed, the kinds of assignments students will be expected to complete, the class schedule, and grade breakdown. This is your contract with your students.

Next, create your lectures, leaving some free days to review difficult material. A good plan is to prepare lectures before the semester starts and then review the week’s material every weekend. Think logically here; try to anticipate questions they may have, teach the material so it is clear and it flows (for instance, you would not teach about the differences between UCR and NCVS without first introducing each of them), use visuals when you can – students like to be entertained, and have discussion times or in-class assignments to engage students in the material.

Teaching is what you make of it. Adding creativity to lectures or in-class assignments will create an exciting learning environment for both you and your students. Your first semester of teaching you will learn by trial and error, figuring out what methods and techniques work best for you.

#### **Who is the Authority Figure? YOU Are!**

Establishing boundaries as a young instructor is not easy. You will get those students who assume you are going to be “chill” about not turning in assignments on time or coming to class late every day simply because you are young. Stand strong my friend! Personally I take offense when they think they can walk all over me. I always ask myself, “Would a student ever do this to a more senior professor?” The answer is often NO. Do seasoned professors have to deal with rude, inappropriate (and sometimes dirty) language in the classroom, students calling them “Dude”, students saying they were late because they are hung-over, or even students drinking beer in class?! Maybe, but if and when they do, they are equipped with the experience and knowledge of how to address these issues promptly.

So, what is the trick in establishing yourself as an authority figure in the classroom? Well, it is different for every person. My philosophy? To be all business the first few weeks of class. I dress in business attire, do not make jokes, and take attendance every day. I also establish clear rules from day 1 letting them know, sternly, that texting is my biggest pet peeve and that if they cheat on an assignment I will send them to the academic integrity office. Then, and most importantly, I follow through on these: I mark them absent if they are late and tell them to put their phones at the front if they cannot handle not texting for an hour. Oh, and I never let them call me by my first name; I made that mistake my first semester of teaching.

Over time, my roll taking slims, I start to wear jeans, and I joke around (sometimes too much). A student even wrote on one teaching review, “She was really harsh at first but then was really cool. Beware if you get on her bad side.” That is exactly my tactic – to let them know who is boss. Now, this does not mean you need to come off as this hard-core know-it-all who will never be nice; there is a happy balance that each young person needs to explore. Other young instructors have found their balance with being really nice, but not so “casual.” It is mostly based on your personality; it may take a semester or two to figure out what works best, and that is ok.

*(Continued on page 25)*

(Continued from page 24)

### **Teaching Students Who Are Older Than You**

I am not going to lie; for me, teaching students who were older than me was just weird. Now that I have taught for over two years, though, I am much more comfortable with it. Having older students in the classroom adds a dynamic that I thoroughly enjoy. You grow up learning to respect authority and that older equals wiser. When someone your dad's age asks you about the proper way to define your sampling frame, it kind of catches you off guard. But, ultimately you are at the front of the room for a reason; you know the answers! So, answer the question as if any other student asked it.

### **Teaching Evaluations (and Rate My Professor!)**

You love them or you hate them. When you get the email saying that your first teaching evaluations are posted, it is scary. You see your overall scores are really good. Then you scroll down to see individual comments. Some students write things that are funny, some are really nice, and some are not so nice. Do not let one bad review ruin all the good ones! Take it with a grain of salt. Of course some people are going to love you and some will dislike you, and really it is all about who showed up for class the day evaluations were passed out. You will learn which reviews are important to build on for your future teaching. You will also get the reviews that are very satisfying, "Ms. Carter is the best teacher. She took the time to help us understand and made the material fun! You could tell she really cared." These are the reviews you look forward to, which makes the challenges of the semester all worth it.

### **Be Real With Your Students...You Are Still Young!**

Use your youth to your advantage. Most would agree that a young teacher is able to connect to college students on a different level than an older professor. Not to say we do not appreciate the wisdom they provide, but young teachers have yet to be tainted by the multitude of students' excuses, or the daily grind of research, teaching, and service. We are intimately familiar with and can more easily incorporate discussions of things this generation is most comfortable with: texting, Facebook, pop culture, etc. We understand their language, communication and learning styles, and most importantly their trickery! We are not that far off from college and we know that many, if not most students, never read the material, cram the night before, and write research papers using Google and Wikipedia.

Use this to your advantage and be real with them. I tell my students I will not accept any papers using a .com website and I tell them it is obvious when their writing is not their own. Because we are young, we are able to connect with them in a more "casual" way, while also having a few laughs with them.

Although it has its challenges, teaching is a great way to get a break from your own classes or dissertation work, branch out and be creative, learn more about yourself and criminology, and is a very nice addition to your CV. Good luck and be yourself! Find your healthy balance and have fun!

\*Check out the syllabi collection page on the ASC website: [http://www.asc41.com/Syllabi\\_Collection/Syllabi\\_Collection\\_home.html](http://www.asc41.com/Syllabi_Collection/Syllabi_Collection_home.html)

Also check out the syllabi collection page in the Division on Women and Crime online newsletter ([www.hts.gatech.edu/dwc](http://www.hts.gatech.edu/dwc)), in the "Resources" section: [http://www.hts.gatech.edu/dwc/images/stories/DWC\\_syllabi\\_11.pdf](http://www.hts.gatech.edu/dwc/images/stories/DWC_syllabi_11.pdf)

*Submissions of future "Doctoral Student Forum" columns are encouraged.  
Please contact Bianca Bersani: [bianca.bersani@umb.edu](mailto:bianca.bersani@umb.edu) (Chair of the Student Affairs Committee)*

---

## **A VIEW FROM THE FIELD: WHAT'S HAPPENING OUTSIDE OF ACADEMIA**

*We encourage submissions of future "A View from the Field" columns.  
Please contact Carolyn Rebecca Block: [crblock@rcn.com](mailto:crblock@rcn.com).*

### **FOSTERING RESEARCHER-PRACTITIONER COLLABORATION**

**Angela Moore**, National Institute of Justice

#### **Introduction**

Collaborations between academic researchers and practitioners are a hallmark of the work of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the research, development and evaluation agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. A longstanding tradition, collaboration has been encouraged and fostered by NIJ through the peer review process, at the Annual Conference, through research initiatives, and as a continuing participant in collaborative projects at the federal level. These collaborations are integral to ensuring that exemplary research and best practices are provided to the criminal justice community. In this article, I describe the ways NIJ promotes and nurtures collaboration.

#### **Peer Review**

NIJ includes both academic researchers and practitioners in external peer review of applications submitted to the myriad solicitations released each fiscal year. Academic researchers particularly inform NIJ about potential contributions to the literature, soundness of the proposed methods and analytical and technical approach, and potential to advance science or technology. Practitioners particularly weigh in on the feasibility of the proposed study, potential pitfalls, and relevance for improving criminal justice practice and policy. At the conclusion of projects, academic researchers gauge the scientific rigor of studies, and often recommend ways the research can be enhanced, perhaps by the conduct of additional analyses. Practitioners evaluate the study's utility for policy or practice, and if dissemination to policy and practice communities is warranted, recommend the best ways to do it.

In an effort to enhance the external peer review of research applications, in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012, NIJ piloted Standing Peer Review Panels (SRPs). These panels are modeled after the peer review of other federal science agencies, such as the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA). The SRPs supplement NIJ's traditional peer review panels. While the ratio of researchers to practitioners serving on the SRPs increased from up to 3:1 as compared to 1:1 for traditional panels, practitioners still remain an integral part of NIJ's peer review process. (For more information about SRPs see <http://www.nij.gov/nij/funding/reviews/scientific-review-panels.htm> )

#### **Annual NIJ Conference**

In addition to participating in NIJ's external peer review process, practitioners and researchers have always been included as panelists during NIJ's annual conference. The conference brings together scholars, practitioners and policymakers at the federal, state and local levels to discuss recent research results. While researchers present findings primarily from NIJ-funded studies, practitioners often serve as panel discussants or featured plenary speakers. As discussants, practitioners often address "so what" questions, such as:

- How is the presented research relevant for practice and policy?
- What are the implications?
- How can the research be used to enhance the administration of justice and improve public safety?

For collaborative projects, the lead researcher and practitioner may co-present both the study's findings and the challenges they faced in conducting the research collaboratively. For examples of researcher-practitioner partnerships highlighted at the NIJ conference, see <http://nij.ncjrs.gov/multimedia/video-nijconf2012-opening-plenary.htm>. To learn about the NIJ conference, go to [http://www.nij.gov/nij/events/nij\\_conference/welcome.htm](http://www.nij.gov/nij/events/nij_conference/welcome.htm).

Due to budgetary limitations, NIJ will convene a bi-annual rather than an annual conference. Nevertheless, NIJ still intends to disseminate the results of research it funds, particularly to practitioner and policy audiences, by partnering with various constituent organizations to sponsor panels, plenaries, workshops, research tracks and other types of meetings at conferences they host. Examples of such collaborations include End Violence Against Women, the International Associations of Chiefs of Police, the International Association of Crime Analysts, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, and the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies.

*(Continued on page 27)*

(Continued from page 26)

## Funding and Nurturing Collaborative Projects

NIJ solicitations often encourage collaboration and the equal involvement of academic researcher and practitioner in project planning, execution, and application to real-life situations. Further, many years of experience have taught NIJ ways to nurture and encourage collaboration in projects that have been funded and are in the field.

### *Solicitations for Collaborative Research Proposals*

Financial support for collaboration is critical, and may even be considered necessary to the existence of collaborative projects in which academic researcher and practitioner are equal partners in the entire research enterprise. From developing the research question, to deciding whose name will be on any publications, and everything else in between, all parties to the collaboration have an equal say in the conduct of the study. These collaborative partnerships take substantial time to develop and maintain, and require human and financial resources. Funding of these collaborations is where NIJ has been a key player.

Historically, academics generally were not rewarded for collaborating with practitioners; only scholarly publications in peer reviewed journals and research funds obtained counted towards the tenure process. Usually, academic researchers who live off of “soft money” are on to their next research project before they complete the final report or submit an article for publication from their previous study. Thus, scholars normally operate under a framework that is not conducive to collaboration.

Likewise, many research organizations depend on financial support from federal, state and local governments and private foundations for their very existence. As a result, what matters most is bringing in funds. Salaries have to be covered. Staff time has to be accounted for and charged to a project. The continual pursuit for the next research award or contract may leave little time to engage in long-term collaboration with practice based agencies.

If academics and scholars in research organizations have little time to engage in collaboration, practitioners have even less. Practice agencies, particularly community based nonprofits, are primarily focused on service delivery. Generally their demands far exceed their resources. Engaging in research collaboration means that some other critical agency work is not being done. Exigencies of the day take precedence over collaboration. Yet many practice organizations recognize the importance of research to their work and their own bottom line. They are willing to collaborate with researchers, but compensation and human resources are needed.

Though NIJ has a long history as a major supporter of collaboration between researchers and practitioners, it was not until FY 2009 that it issued the first solicitation specifically welcoming collaborative proposals, *Building and Enhancing Criminal Justice Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships*. The hard work, dedication and commitment of one of NIJ’s newest aspiring social science analysts at the time, Bethany Backes, brought this about, and she continues to manage the program developed to promote and foster such collaborations. The original solicitation summed up its goals:

“NIJ has always acknowledged the importance of researcher-practitioner partnerships and the involvement of the practitioner throughout the research process—from formulating research questions and accessing data to advising a study as it progresses and helping to ensure practical perspectives in the analysis of data and report writing. Such partnerships have frequently been encouraged in solicitations for research. However, there is a need for intentional activities that capture and build on previous work on partnerships and that provide opportunities for creating, enhancing, and improving criminal justice researcher-practitioner partnerships.” (<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/sl000884.pdf>, p.3)

That first researcher-practitioner partnership solicitation had the following foci:

1. It requested articles on past, current and continuing partnerships that incorporated electronic media accounts. The media accounts would be used to develop a toolkit to inform others about how to develop, manage and sustain such collaborations.
2. The junior faculty grant program, recognizing that graduate degree programs usually do not teach students how to engage in researcher-practitioner partnerships, sought to grow the field by pairing junior faculty members with senior faculty who have extensive experience working with practitioner organizations, and who could mentor the junior faculty.
3. The criminal justice researcher- practitioner fellowship placement program was designed to provide researchers with a first-hand account of how practice organizations function by imbedding them within these agencies.

Since FY 2010, *the Building and Enhancing Criminal Justice Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships* has had two foci: the junior faculty grant program, and the fellowship placement program.

(Continued on page 28)

(Continued from page 27)

### *Encouraging and Assessing a Proposal's Plans for Collaboration*

Depending upon their specific nature, solicitations require Memoranda of Understanding (MOAs) between the research entity and practice organization, which must clearly delineate the role of all parties involved, how the workload is to be distributed, and allocation of funds for the practitioner partner(s).

Not surprisingly, at the heart of the researcher-practitioner partnership program at NIJ is the development and sustenance of these collaborations. But equally important is the conduct of a research study of relevance to both the researcher and practitioner partners. At the onset of the program and still to some extent today, applicants to the solicitation had difficulty accomplishing both of these objectives. Usually the latter would take a back seat to the former. To this end, NIJ has made it explicit in subsequent solicitations that proposals had to include clear research questions, design, methods and analyses. (See <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/sl000978.pdf>, page 4, for how NIJ addressed this issue).

The key to success with the researcher-practitioner partnership solicitation is to not wait until the solicitation is issued to begin developing the partnership or the research question(s) to be addressed. Since all expired solicitations since 1996 are maintained on NIJ's website, potential applicants can have a good sense of what NIJ will be requesting, specifically as it relates to the researcher-practitioner partnership solicitation, by viewing solicitations from previous fiscal years.

### *Nurturing Collaboration in Funded Projects*

Collaboration between researchers and practitioners is needed to enhance criminal justice policy and practice. However it is not easy for practitioners and researchers to work together. Each group has their own culture, their own language, and their own methods for achieving their objectives. Researchers and practitioners operate under very different paradigms.

By funding, supporting and managing numerous collaborations over time, NIJ has gleaned various strategies for successful research collaboration. These include:

- Build in enough resources – human, financial and otherwise - to support the collaboration.
- Determine at the outset how each aspect of the research enterprise will be managed and how decision making will be shared. Codify this information.
- Communicate early and often. Regularly scheduled meetings to keep all parties involved in the collaboration abreast of the research are essential.
- Use language that is accessible to all. Practitioners don't appreciate being "talked down to" with research jargon and academics don't appreciate inside talk by practitioners that they don't understand. No one is happy when their training, whether academic or practical, is viewed as irrelevant.
- Plan for staff turnover. Reeducation and retraining will be necessary. Make sure that, as newcomers join the collaboration, they are fully informed of what the partnership entails. Don't assume information flow.
- Understand that practitioners and researchers often do not operate on the same schedule. Practitioners may not be able to implement the study according to the timeline specified in the research proposal. Researchers cannot "speed up" the study.
- Manage expectations. Plan for what will happen when results are not what was anticipated.
- Provide agreed upon results as soon as possible. Interim deliverables can help to maintain momentum.
- When bad things happen, and they often do, don't quit unless it is not possible to maintain the collaboration.
- Make the collaboration beneficial to all partners. Practitioners can gain practice- and policy-relevant information, while researchers can gain deeper knowledge of what the measurements really mean.

### **Collaboration at the Federal Level**

As NIJ has been a major supporter of researcher-practitioner partnerships in the criminal justice field, we recognize the value of partnering with programmatic agencies within the Department of Justice and with other federal agencies. NIJ has and continues to partner with the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, the Office on Violence Against Women and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking, among others, to oversee the conduct of research and program evaluations. Examples of programmatic evaluations done in concert with federal partners include: Evaluations of the Second Chance Act Demonstration Projects (<http://www.nij.gov/nij/topics/corrections/reentry/evaluation-second-chance.htm>); Evaluation of the Implementation of the Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/sl001012.pdf>); and Evaluation of the Office for Victims of Crime Wraparound Victim Legal Assistance Network Demonstration Project (<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/sl001019.pdf>).

(Continued on page 29)

(Continued from page 28)

Increasingly, these collaborations have taken the form of demonstration field experiments, in which researchers, practitioners and often technical assistance providers collaborate at the jurisdiction level to implement and evaluate the field test, and NIJ and the federal program office collaborate to develop and implement across jurisdictions the demonstration field experiment. Because they occur at multiple levels, managing these partnerships and keeping the field tests on track is a considerable challenge for the social science analysts at NIJ who manage these projects. Yet they continue to do this work admirably and incredibly well. For an example of a current demonstration field experiment, see <http://www.nij.gov/nij/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/hawaii-hope.htm>, [http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/newsroom/pressreleases/2011/OJP\\_PR-101811.pdf](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/newsroom/pressreleases/2011/OJP_PR-101811.pdf), <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/hopesol.htm>

NIJ partners with agencies across the federal government, including organizations within the Departments of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Education, and the Office of National Drug Control Policy, as well as a host of state, local, tribal and private associations. (For a review of NIJ's interagency collaboration with the National Science Foundation, see the January/February edition of *The Criminologist*, [Volume 38, No 1, page 42].)

Collaboration and coordination with other organizations are essential to NIJ's work, enabling it to better leverage limited resources and to avoid duplication of efforts. NIJ continues to pursue opportunities for collaboration through the Office of Research Partnerships, which was created in September 2011. Learn more about the Office of Research Partnerships from an article in the [March 2012 JRSA Forum \(pdf, 12 pages\)](#), newsletter of the Justice Research and Statistics Association. As stated on its website, "Partnerships with other agencies and organizations, public and private, are essential to NIJ's success." <http://www.nij.gov/nij/about/welcome.htm>

## Conclusion

NIJ continues to support and promote researcher-practitioner collaboration. Doing so helps to fulfill the organization's mission to provide objective and independent knowledge and tools to reduce crime and promote justice, particularly at the state and local levels.

<sup>1</sup>Division Director, Justice Systems Research, Office of Research and Evaluation, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

<sup>2</sup>The opinions, points of view, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.



## Beyond "Punitiveness": Crime and Crime Control in Europe in a Comparative Perspective



13th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology

Budapest, Hungary, 4-7 September, 2013.

The **Eurocrim2013** Conference will be attended by experts in criminology and related disciplines from every region of the world offering an excellent opportunity for networking and building collaborations among scientists from diverse regions of the world as well as discussion between disciplines that contribute to the science and practice of criminology.

### Venue: ELTE University, Faculty of Law

The venue is located in the heart of the City, which is a historical and touristic attraction of Budapest. The city, which is beautifully situated on both sides of the River Danube, has a history dating back over 2000 years. There are ruins from the times of the Roman Empire as well as from the Middle Ages.

### Important Dates

Deadline for Abstract Submission for Panels, Papers and Posters: **1 June, 2013**

Deadline for Early Bird Registration: **1 July, 2013**

Visit our website regularly for scientific program updates and useful information at  
[WWW.EUROCRIM2013.COM](http://WWW.EUROCRIM2013.COM)

---

## **COLLABORATION CORNER:** **NEWS AND NOTES ABOUT RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS**

Compiled by Carolyn Rebecca Block

*Please send your research collaboration news to Carolyn Rebecca Block*  
[crblock@rcn.com](mailto:crblock@rcn.com)

### **Support for Collaborations between Mental Health and Criminal Justice**

To help support the continuing effort to increase the quality of justice experienced by people who with a mental illness, John Petril and Hallie Fader-Towel have written a guidebook on “Information Sharing in Criminal Justice-Mental Health Collaborations: Working with HIPAA and Other Privacy Laws.” It is “intended to help criminal justice officials work with health professionals to better use both systems' information, when appropriate, to reduce criminal justice involvement among people with mental illnesses and provide better links to treatment.” The document was produced by the Council of State Governments Justice Center, which coordinates the Criminal Justice/Mental Health Consensus Project, and funded by a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance. For more information, see [http://consensusproject.org/jc\\_publications/info-sharing](http://consensusproject.org/jc_publications/info-sharing).

You also may be interested in the Bureau of Justice Assistance 2011 brochure, *Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program*, which can be downloaded at:  
[http://consensusproject.org/jc\\_publications/2011-jmhcp-brochure/2011\\_JMHCP\\_Brochure.pdf](http://consensusproject.org/jc_publications/2011-jmhcp-brochure/2011_JMHCP_Brochure.pdf)

### **Partners in Research: Lessons Learned in Los Angeles**

The next issue of *NIJ Journal* (Issue 272, June 2013) will highlight the work of an academic/law enforcement team in which the participants describe the challenges and rewards of this type of collaborative work and give advice for other researcher-practitioner partnerships. The discussion, in the format of a Question and Answer, is with Cassia Spohn, Arizona State University; Katharine Tellis, California State University, Los Angeles; Assistant Chief Michel Moore of the Los Angeles Police Department and Captain Tom Zuniga (Ret.) of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

The study examined the processing and outcomes of sexual assault cases and focused specifically on case attrition, unfounded cases (those determined through investigation to be false or baseless), and cases cleared by exceptional means. The research team collected and analyzed data on male-female rapes from 2005 through 2009, and also conducted in-depth interviews with law enforcement officers involved in responding to and investigating sexual assaults.

For insight into a researcher-practitioner partnership, see the upcoming *NIJ Journal* [<http://www.nij.gov/journals/welcome.htm>]. The article will be online in mid-May. See also the team's presentation at the *NIJ Conference* in June 2012 [<http://www.nij.gov/multimedia/welcome.htm#nijconf2011-collaboration>]. The final report from the study is available at: [www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237582.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237582.pdf).

### **Did you know?**

The National Girls Collaborative Project (NGCP) has 28 collaboratives serving 38 states, and plans to expand to at least an additional three states in upcoming years. The NGCP's goal is to bring together organizations throughout the United States that are committed to informing and encouraging girls to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). For more information, see <http://www.ngcproject.org/about-ngcp>.

---

## CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD

*If you have news, views, reviews, or announcements relating to international or comparative criminology, please send it here! We appreciate brevity (always under 1,000 words), and welcome your input and feedback. – Jay Albanese, Chair, ASC Division of International Criminology - jsalbane@vcu.edu*

### **THE EUROGANG PROGRAM OF RESEARCH**

**Finn-Aage Esbensen**, University of Missouri-St. Louis

**Cheryl L. Maxson**, University of California, Irvine



Eurogang researchers at their meeting in Germany, 2010

The Eurogang Project (more formally the Eurogang Program of Research) has the primary goal of fostering multi-site, multi-method, comparative research on street gangs. Over the past decade, this group of more than 200 scholars has convened twelve international workshops in Belgium, Denmark, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the U.S (the 13th is scheduled to meet in June in Canterbury, UK). The Eurogang (EG) group has developed common definitional approaches, an integrated research design, and model research instruments. The process has spawned several retrospective cross-national studies, articles in professional journals, four edited volumes of scholarship, and a manual that provides a history of the group and its guiding principles as well as information on the development and use of the five Eurogang research instruments (i.e., city-level descriptors, expert survey, youth survey, ethnography guidelines and prevention/intervention program inventory). The Eurogang Program Manual is available on the Eurogang website, along with the instruments. We invite all that are interested to visit our website (<http://www.umsl.edu/ccj/eurogang/euroganghome.html>) and to join our listserv by contacting Hans- Juergen Kerner at [hans-juergen.kerner@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:hans-juergen.kerner@uni-tuebingen.de).

The Eurogang Project is a loosely knit network of researchers and policy makers with an interest in better understanding troublesome youth groups. While the group is guided by a Steering Committee (Judith Aldridge, University of Manchester, UK; Finn-Aage Esbensen, University of Missouri-St. Louis; Frank van Gemert, Free University, Amsterdam; Cheryl Maxson, University of California, Irvine; Juanjo Medina, University of Manchester, UK; Frank Weerman, Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement), that is the extent of the organizational structure. Members of the network volunteer to host the website, maintain the listserv, organize workshops, and engage in research that adopts the Eurogang definition, instruments, and methodologies.

*(Continued on page 32)*

## **CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD**

The Eurogang Project had its inception in 1997 when Mac Klein and a few other international scholars met to discuss whether “American-type youth gangs” were emerging in Europe. That initial meeting led to the first EG Workshop held in Schmitten, Germany in September of 1998. That meeting generated considerable interest in further efforts to explore the similarities and differences in American youth gangs and European troublesome youth groups; there was considerable reluctance on the part of European researchers to use the “g” word either for fear of contributing to a moral panic or because of their firm belief that the European groups were not like the American groups. This latter argument became known as the Eurogang Paradox since most American youth gangs did not resemble the stereotypical youth gangs depicted in the mass media. Subsequent workshops consisted of presentations of new research but with a clear focus on developing a research framework that would foster multi-site, multi-method research utilizing a standard definition and instruments. Over the course of five years (1999 – 2003) and five workshops (in Oslo, Norway; Leuven, Belgium; Egmond aan Zee, the Netherlands; and two meetings in Straubing, Germany), we were able to agree on an operational definition of youth gangs; we developed, translated, and pre-tested youth and expert survey instruments (with careful attention for consistency between the two instruments); qualitative researchers crafted a model for collecting the type of information that would allow for cross-site comparisons; we reached a consensus on the types of city-level descriptors that would provide important local contexts; and finally, we constructed a survey of gang programs. These instruments are all available on the EG website.

Once the goal of developing a research framework was achieved, the group continued interaction and collaboration through organizing thematic workshops at which researchers presented new findings from research attempting to adopt the EG definition and instruments. Based on these presentations, the group has produced four edited volumes:

Malcolm Klein, Hans-Jurgen Kerner, Cheryl Maxson, and Elmar Weitekamp. 2001. *The Eurogang Paradox: Street Gangs and Youth Groups in the U.S. and Europe*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Press.

Scott H. Decker and Frank W. Weerman. 2005. *European Street Gangs and Troublesome Youth Groups*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Frank van Gemert, Dana Peterson, and Inger-Lise Lien. 2008. *Street Gangs, Migration, and Ethnicity*. Cullompton, Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Finn-Aage Esbensen and Cheryl Maxson. 2012. *Youth Gangs in International Perspective: Results from the Eurogang Program of Research*. New York, NY: Springer.

Importantly, all of our three-day workshops have included not only stimulating presentations and discussions but attempts are also made to include visits to relevant historical, cultural, and topical sites. For instance, we have had the opportunity to visit the maximum security prison in Bavaria, meet with gang members incarcerated in a Danish prison, take walking tours of gang areas in Brussels and Oslo, visit castles and wineries, and tour cathedrals. We truly believe in the importance of appreciating the social and historical contexts of the locations we visit.

To borrow from Star Wars, this ragtag group of researchers provides an example of how much can be done with few resources. The EG Project does not have a steady funding source; however, over the years various network members have written proposals for funding to government agencies, sought support from non-profit organizations, and requested funding from their universities. These efforts have resulted in sufficient funding to pay for lodging and meals at all of the workshops and, in some instances, to reimburse participants for all of their travel expenses. These fund raising efforts have made it possible for graduate students and young scholars to be active participants in the workshops. This last point is important to highlight; one goal from the outset of the EG was to introduce a new generation of researchers to the benefits (and challenges) of multi-site, multi-method research on youth gangs.

To date, the Eurogang program has received financial support from a number of sources, including the following agencies, universities, and foundations: Arizona State University; Danish Crime Prevention Council; Dutch Ministry of the Interior; Dutch Ministry of Justice; E. Desmond Lee Collaboration – University of Missouri-St. Louis; Economic and Social Research Council (UK); German Ministry of Justice; Jerry Lee Foundation; Municipality of Oslo; National Consortium of Violence Research (NCOVR); Norwegian Ministry of Children and Family; Norwegian Research Council; Norwegian Ministry of Justice; Stockholm Gang Intervention and Prevention Project; University of Illinois-Chicago; University of Missouri – St. Louis; University of Nebraska – Omaha; University of Southern California; US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice; US Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

*(Continued on page 33)*

## CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD

In addition to the intellectual and personal rewards associated with membership in the EG Project is the obvious side benefit of visiting beautiful locations. To date, the Eurogang Program of Research has held meetings in the following locations:

- EG I: September 1998 – Schmitten, Germany
- EG II: September 1999 – Oslo, Norway
- EG III: October 1999 – Leuven, Belgium
- EG IV: September, 2000 – Egmond an Zee, the Netherlands
- EG V: July 2002 – Straubing, Germany
- EG VI: July, 2003 – Straubing, Germany
- EG VII: July, 2004 – Albany, New York, USA
- EG VIII: May, 2005, Oñati, Spain
- EG IX: May, 2008, Los Angeles, CA, USA
- EG X: June, 2010, Neustadt an der Weinstrasse, Germany
- EG XI: September, 2011, Hillerod, Denmark
- EG XII: May, 2012, Stockholm, Sweden
- EG XIII: June, 2013, Canterbury, Kent, UK
- EG XIV: TBD

We close by encouraging you to visit the EG website and invite you to join the EG listserv.

### NEWS AND NOTES

#### **Public Radio International Features International Web Discussion: Are we in the midst of a global movement for women’s safety?**



Rosemary Barberet

When a woman in Delhi was raped and murdered in December, people in India were outraged. But did India’s protesters help galvanize the world? Last month, PRI’s 'The World' hosted a Google+ Hangout designed to ask those working in the field to dive into the question: Is this truly a global movement for women’s safety? The Panel moderator was Jeb Sharp, producer for The World. She is also a longtime correspondent with a focus on human rights.

Joining her were Rosemary Barberet, a sociology professor at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice and former chair of the ASC Division of International Criminology and member of the ACJS International Section. Also part of the conversation were representatives from Tsinghua University in Beijing, UC San Diego, the Save Wiyabi Project (an advocacy group), the Women in War Program for Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, the Beijing correspondent for The Word, the social media manager at Public Radio International (PRI). This discussion lasted 38 minutes and can be found at: <http://www.theworld.org/2013/02/discussion-womens-safety/>

## **CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD**

### **ASC UN Representative**

Did you know that the American Society of Criminology is a non-governmental organization recognized by the United Nations? The ASC Executive Board appoints a representative to gather information about UN activities related to crime and justice, especially involving the UN Crime Commission, which meets annually in Vienna, Austria. Representatives serve two years. The current UN representative is Aaron Fichtelberg, whose term ends in November, 2013. Aaron will give a report on UN activities at the Division of International Criminology Awards Reception in Atlanta. The reception is free and open to all ASC meeting participants. Past UN representatives were Ineke Marshall (2005-2011), Rosemary Barberet (2004-2005), and Paul Friday and Nancy Grosselfinger (2002-2004).

### **Launch of the All Africa Criminal Justice Society**

The All Africa Conference on Organized Crime and Contemporary Criminal Justice Issues was held near Polokwane, South Africa last June. At that meeting, on June 29, 2012, the All Africa Criminal Justice Society (ACJUS) was launched. Justice R. J. Raulinga from the Gauteng North High Court was elected as the first President. The aims of the Society are to:

- promote and coordinate criminal justice on the African continent and to facilitate coordination between academics and practitioners but interact with any academic discipline focusing on phenomena related to crime and justice through study and academic interaction research, practice and community service;
- co-operate with interested local, regional and international institutions;
- seek affiliated and/or associate membership of regional, continental and international societies/associations serving criminal justice
- create mediums for the publishing of, among other things, research results;
- promote and stimulate the academic and practical interests of its members;
- inform the African community about criminal justice issues; and
- influence criminal justice policies for the continent.

Prof R. J. Gunpath from Mauritius University was selected to serve as the Editor-in-Chief of the Society's journal. For more information about the ACJUS, contact Cornelis Roelofse (Cornelis.Roelofse@ul.ac.za).

### **Illicit Trafficking of Waste: an International Emergency**

An international conference on Environmental Crime: Current and Emerging Threats took place in Rome on October 29 and 30, 2012. Sponsored by the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), in partnership with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), along with the Italian Ministry for the Environment and with the support of the Italian Ministry of Justice, and chaired by Jonathan Lucas, Director of UNICRI, the conference assembled 130 experts from around the world, and brought together representatives from governmental authorities, environmental and law enforcement agencies, civil society organizations, and prominent scholars in the field. One of the issues discussed, for example, was illicit trafficking of waste (including toxic waste, e-waste, plastic, etc.). Participants presented data and case studies and developed specific recommendations about illicit trafficking in waste as an emerging international threat, the increasing role of organized crime groups, and links with other serious crimes, such as counterfeiting, corruption, money laundering. For more information, see <http://unicri.it/topics/environmental/conference/>

### **2012 Asian Criminological Society Annual Meeting Report**

The 2012 annual conference of the Asian Criminological Society was held in Seoul, Republic of Korea last August. Some 600 persons were in attendance from 21 countries, including her Royal Highness Princess Bajrakitiyabha Mahidol of Thailand.

The theme was "Development and Security: Rethinking Crime and Criminal Policies in Asia." Topics discussed at the conference ranged from the trafficking of women from South East Asia in to Thailand to the illegal wildlife trade to counterfeit consumer goods, but all of the varying topics highlighted why security, justice, and the furthering of human rights are vital for any nation to prosper. The 2013 meetings were held in April and a report of that meeting will appear in the next issue of *The Criminologist*. The 2014 meetings will be held in Japan in August. For more information about the upcoming meetings, contact Huan Gao (hgao@csustan.edu).

---

## **CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD**

### **International Criminology Meetings and Conferences**

10-12 June, 2013

The Stockholm Criminology Symposium, Stockholm, Sweden: [www.criminologysymposium.com](http://www.criminologysymposium.com)

18-20 June, 2013

First International Conference on Missing Children and Adults, Portsmouth, United Kingdom: [www.port.ac.uk/departments/academic/icjs/csmc/conference/](http://www.port.ac.uk/departments/academic/icjs/csmc/conference/)

20-21 June, 2013

The World Crime Forum. Seoul, Korea.

25-26 June, 2013

9th International Conference on Law and Politics, Barcelona, Spain.: <http://edcp.uoc.edu/symposia/idp2013/registration/>

2-4 July, 2013

British Society of Criminology – Annual Conference 2013, Wolverhampton, West Midlands, UK: <http://www.britisoccrim.org/annualconference.htm>

8-11 July, 2013

Second Crime, Justice and Social Democracy Conference, Brisbane, Australia: [www.crimejusticeconference.com/](http://www.crimejusticeconference.com/)

10-12 July, 2013

International Congress on Gender Violence, Oñati, Gipuzkoa, Spain: <http://www.iisj.net/iisj/de/international-congress-on-gender-violence-intersectionalities.asp?nombre=7514&cod=7514&sesion=1347>

15-19 July, 2013

International Human Rights Network Training - Monitoring and Evaluation: Applying Human Rights Based Approaches, Maynooth, Ireland.: [http://www.ihrnetwork.org/monitoring-evaluation\\_238.htm](http://www.ihrnetwork.org/monitoring-evaluation_238.htm)

29-30 July, 2013

2nd International Serious and Organised Crime (ISOC) 2013 conference, Brisbane, Australia.

5-7 August, 2013

2013 National Gang Crime Research Center International Gang Specialist Training Conference, Chicago, Illinois, USA: [www.ngcrc.com/2013.conference.html](http://www.ngcrc.com/2013.conference.html)

15-19 August, 2013

International Society for the Reform of Criminal Law 26th Annual Conference. Hobart, Australia: <http://www.cvent.com/events/international-responses-to-social-and-justice-challenges/event-summary-b17f4228f53049efb44568853a39af1f.aspx>

29 August – 1 September, 2013

Critical Criminology in a Changing World. Oslo, Norway: <http://www.jus.uio.no/ikrs/english/research/research/cciacw.html>

4-7 September, 2013

The 13th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, Budapest, Hungary: <http://www.eurocrim2013.com/>

23-25 September, 2013

Fifth Annual International Crime, Media & Popular Culture Studies Conference: A Cross Disciplinary Exploration, Terre Haute, Indiana: [www.indstate.edu/ccj/popcultureconference/](http://www.indstate.edu/ccj/popcultureconference/)

2-5 October, 2013

34th Canadian Congress of Criminal Justice, 21st Century Justice: The Economics of Public Safety, Vancouver, Canada: [www.ccja-acjp.ca/cong2013/en/cong\\_2013\\_call.pdf](http://www.ccja-acjp.ca/cong2013/en/cong_2013_call.pdf)

8-10 October, 2013

First World Congress on Probation. London, UK. The Congress is a “new initiative to bring together practitioners and those with an interest in probation and community justice from across the globe to share their knowledge and experience.”: [http://www.worldcongressonprobation.org/default.asp?page\\_id=372](http://www.worldcongressonprobation.org/default.asp?page_id=372)

---

## NOTES REGARDING THE ANNUAL MEETING

**69th Annual Meeting  
November 20 - 23, 2013  
Atlanta, Georgia**

*Expanding the Core: Neglected Crimes, Groups, Causes and Policy Approaches*



- The deadline for submissions has now passed.
- The Call for Papers, link to the submission site, and other Meeting information can be found on the ASC website, [www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm](http://www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm).
- Please direct all questions regarding the Program to the Program Committee email address, [asc\\_program2013@ou.edu](mailto:asc_program2013@ou.edu).
- The phone number for the Program Chairs is (404) 413-1031.
- You may register using the form on the opposite page, or using the online form on the ASC website. Registration fees are as follows:

**BEFORE OCTOBER 1**

ASC Member: **\$130**

Non-Member: **\$170**

ASC Student Member: **\$50**

Student Non-Member: **\$100**

**ON OR AFTER OCTOBER 1 OR ONSITE**

ASC Member: **\$180**

Non-Member: **\$220**

ASC Student Member: **\$60**

Student Non-Member: **\$110**

- You may register for the workshops using the form on page 38, or using the online form on the ASC website.

# The American Society of Criminology

2013 Annual Meeting Registration Form – Atlanta, GA · November 20 - 23, 2013

www.asc41.com      asc@asc41.com

Please mail to American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Rd, Ste. 212, Columbus, OH 43212, or fax to (614) 292-6767.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(your badge will be prepared with the information on the two lines above)*

City, State: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

ASC will have a smartphone app to supplement the print program this year. Is this something you are interested in using?      \_\_\_ YES    \_\_\_ NO

## REGISTRATION FEES (payable only in U.S. dollars)

***Program Participants Are Required To Preregister and Pay Registration Fee***  
 (Registration receipt will be included in registration packet)

### Postmarked or faxed BEFORE October 1

- \_\_\_ ASC Member: \$130.00
- \_\_\_ Non-Member: \$170.00
- \_\_\_ ASC Student Member: \$50.00
- \_\_\_ Student Non-Member: \$100.00

### Postmarked or faxed ON or AFTER October 1

- \_\_\_ ASC Member: \$180.00
- \_\_\_ Non-Member: \$220.00
- \_\_\_ ASC Student Member: \$60.00
- \_\_\_ Student Non-Member: \$110.00

### Optional Special Events (Schedule TBA)

<b>Division on People of Color &amp; Crime Luncheon:</b>	___ DPCC Student Member: \$30.00 ___ DPCC Member: \$35.00	___ Non DPCC Member: \$40.00
<b>Division on Women &amp; Crime Social</b>	___ All Students: \$5.00	___ Non-Students: \$15.00
<b>Minority Fellowship Dances: Hot Spots Band / A Band to be Announced (One ticket allows entry to both dances.)</b>		
	___ ASC Student Member: \$5.00 ___ Non ASC Member Student: \$10.00	___ ASC Member: \$10.00 ___ Non ASC Member: \$20.00

\*If you are paying by check or money order, please make it out to *American Society of Criminology*. (U.S. FUNDS ONLY). A service charge will be assessed for all returned checks.

\*Accepted Credit Cards: Visa, MasterCard, American Express, Discover

Credit Card #: \_\_\_\_\_

Exp. Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Security Code (on back of card): \_\_\_\_\_

Billing Address of \_\_\_\_\_

Credit Card: \_\_\_\_\_

**Refund Policy: Advance registration fees will be refunded for cancellations received up to September 30. No refunds will be made on cancellations received after this date.**

*Section to be filled out by ASC*

Total \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Check/MO # \_\_\_\_\_ Credit Card \_\_\_\_\_

REG \_\_\_\_\_ DPCC Luncheon \_\_\_\_\_ DWC Social \_\_\_\_\_ Dances \_\_\_\_\_

**THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY**

1314 Kinnear Road, Columbus, OH 43212 Phone: (614) 292-9207 Fax: (614) 292-6767  
Website: www.asc41.com E-mail: asc@asc41.com

**2013 PRE-MEETING WORKSHOPS, ATLANTA, GA – TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2013**  
**All workshops will be held at the Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel**

**Title:** ACCOMPLISHING AND INTERPRETING QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW RESEARCH  
**Instructors:** Jody Miller, Rutgers University and Kristin Carbone-Lopez, University of Missouri-St. Louis  
**Date & Time:** Tuesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 1 – 5 p.m. **Place:** M101, Marquis Level  
**Fee:** \$50.00 (\$25.00 for students), **Enrollment Limit:** 50  
**\*\*No laptops provided. Power strips will be available.\*\***

The strength of in-depth interviews lies in what they are: reflective accounts of social life offered from the points of view of research participants. As such, they provide two intertwined kinds of data: descriptive evidence of the nature of the phenomena under investigation – including the contexts and situations in which they emerge – and insights into the cultural frames that people use to make sense of their experiences. Interviews have long been used in criminology in an effort to enter the worlds of crime and justice actors, and they continue to be a popular technique. In this workshop, we offer a practical guide to interviews and their relevance for criminology. In particular, we will explore the following topics: What makes in-depth interviewing a particularly useful approach for criminology? How is research that utilizes interview data put to use for understanding crime and justice? How do we conduct effective interviews, especially given the sensitive nature of the types of questions we ask? Finally, what are data analysis processes we can use to turn our data into meaningful theoretical contributions for the field? Throughout, we will focus on the successful collection and use of interview-based data for preparing scholarly articles for criminology and criminal justice journals.

**Title:** ITEM RESPONSE AND GRADED RESPONSE MODELS  
**Instructors:** Gary Sweeten, Arizona State University  
**Date & Time:** Tuesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 1 – 5 p.m. **Place:** M102, Marquis Level  
**Fee:** \$50.00 (\$25.00 for students), **Enrollment Limit:** 50  
**\*\*No laptops provided. Power strips will be available.\*\***

Item response and graded response models allow responses to dichotomous or multiple category questions to be related to an underlying latent trait such as criminality. They convey information on the extent to which each question (a.k.a. “item”) is related to the latent trait as well as the “seriousness” or “difficulty” of each question with respect to the latent trait. They can also be used to generate estimates of the latent trait for each unit of analysis or incorporated into a multi-level explanatory model. This workshop covers the history and theory of item and graded response models as well as their strengths and weaknesses relative to other scaling methods. Referencing recent applications of these methods in the criminological literature (e.g. Maimon & Browning, 2010; Osgood & Schreck, 2007; Pyrooz, Sweeten & Piquero, 2012; Sweeten, 2012), this workshop will cover estimation of these models in Stata 12.

**Title:** STRATEGIES FOR DEALING WITH MISSING DATA  
**Instructors:** Robert Brame, University of South Carolina  
**Date & Time:** Tuesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 1 – 5 p.m. **Place:** M104, Marquis Level  
**Fee:** \$50.00 (\$25.00 for students), **Enrollment Limit:** 50  
**\*\*No laptops provided. Power strips will be available.\*\***

Administrative and survey databases are almost always limited by incomplete information. In this workshop, we will consider a taxonomy of the different kinds of missing data problems commonly encountered by criminologists and an overview of methods used to address these problems -- including the use of maximum likelihood, imputation, weighting, and bounding. I will illustrate the use of these methods with a series of example problems. A detailed set of slides, data sets, and R code will be provided in advance of the workshop.

*Return this form (via fax or mail) and your check (in U.S. Funds or International Money Order), or with your credit card information below (Master Card, Visa, Discover and American Express accepted). No refunds will be made on cancellations received after September 30, 2013.*  
**\*Please note that registration for a workshop is NOT registration for the Annual Meeting which begins November 20.**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Phone #:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Circle workshop of your choice:** INTERVIEW RESEARCH      RESPONSE MODELS      MISSING DATA

**Payment Total:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Circle Payment Type:** Check/Money Order      Visa      MasterCard      AmEx      Discover

**Credit Card #:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Exp. Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Security Code (on back):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Billing Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

*This page intentionally left blank.*

---

***The Criminologist***  
*Official Newsletter of the*  
*American Society of Criminology*  
 Vol. 38, No. 3

PERIODICAL  
 POSTAGE PAID  
 TOLEDO, OHIO

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

**MARK YOUR CALENDAR**  
*FUTURE ASC ANNUAL MEETING DATES*

2014	November 19 – 22	San Francisco, CA	San Francisco Marriott Marquis
2015	November 18 – 21	Washington, D.C.	Washington Hilton
2016	November 16 – 19	New Orleans, LA	New Orleans Hilton
2017	November 15 – 18	Philadelphia, PA	Philadelphia Marriott Downtown
2018	November 14 – 17	Atlanta, GA	Atlanta Marriott Marquis
2019	November 20 – 23	San Francisco, CA	San Francisco Marriott Marquis
2020	November 18 – 21	Washington, D.C.	Washington Hilton
2021	November 17 – 20	Chicago, IL	Palmer House Hilton
2022	November 16 – 19	Atlanta, GA	Atlanta Marriott Marquis

**2013 ANNUAL MEETING**

THEME: *EXPANDING THE CORE: NEGLECTED CRIMES, GROUPS, CAUSES AND POLICY APPROACHES*

**MAKE YOUR RESERVATIONS EARLY FOR ATLANTA  
 NOVEMBER 20 - 23, 2013**

***Atlanta Marriott Marquis***  
 265 Peachtree Center Avenue  
 Atlanta, Georgia 30303 USA  
 (404) 521-0000 / (877) 622-3056

\$186 single/double occupancy

YOU ***MUST*** MENTION YOU ARE WITH ASC TO OBTAIN THIS RATE