4141 Week 3: From correlates to causal models:
(a) Finish self-report & victim data (Wk 2)
(b) Age, Careers, Life Course
(c) Rational Choice and Deterrence

Rios 2: Dreams Deferred
• Methods
  – “shadowing” 40 young men (20 Latino/ 20 Af. Am.) for 3 years
  – 30 had been arrested; snowball sampling
  – Not an “O.G.” or “gang leader”
  – Biases?
• Themes
  – Marginality, masculinity, defiance, resistance
  – What is the “moral panic” around youth?

overcoming pessimism
• “Prevention projects don’t work and they waste money, violate the rights of juveniles and their families, inspire bizarre suggestions and programs, and fail to affect the known correlates of urban delinquency” -Lundman 1993:245
• Need a theory, or set of related ideas about causes of delinquency, to prevent or control it
• More optimism about “what works”
Preventing Crime, What Works, What Doesn’t, What’s Promising

- Where did this report come from? Who did it?
- What works?
  - E.g., Perry preschool (1962); Nurse home visits (’90s)
- Not working?
  - E.g., gun buybacks, DARE, ISP, boot camps
- Promising?
  - E.g., family counseling; esp. multi-systemic therapy (MST) for serious and chronic offenders; voc-ed
- Why do some programs persist without any evidence that they reduce crime?
- Are there common features or principles of more effective programs?

individual treatment

“We don’t need no stinking theories...”

- 1915 Chicago: Healy’s individualized treatment
  - Early identification, classification, and treatment
- Prevention: The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study (1937-1945) for at-risk youth
  - Assigned well-meaning adult counselors to help kids any way they could
  - No difference in school, personality & family functioning
  - No diff in delinquency (29% experimental versus 28% control at follow-up)

theory

- Why not skip all the boring theories and just deal with the real?
  - Movies or documentaries about delinquency
  - “War stories”
  - Journalistic/descriptive accounts
- What are the criteria for good theories?
  - Logical consistency
  - Generality
  - Testability
  - Empirical Validity
  - Parsimony
  - Usefulness!
levels

- What are we trying to explain?
- Which level of analysis is most important?
  - Individual
  - Group
  - Society
  - Time
  - Situation or event
- Basic criteria for establishing causality?
  - Association (correlation)
  - Temporal order (cause precedes effect)
  - Lack of spuriousness (or 3rd factor)
  - Other?

biology and psychology

- Origins: Biological positivism and Cesare Lombroso (1905)
  - Quote from Parmelee's 1908 text
  - Darwin's Origins (1859) and Descent (1871)
  - Criminals resemble 'primitive races'
    - overt racism in early criminology
- Today: twin studies and interactions between heredity and environment
  - biology yes, racism no, but concerns linger
  - perception, maturation, and neuropsychology (Cohen et al. 2016)

age, cognition and "prefrontal circuitry" (2016)

Cognitive performance under stress
- Ages 13-18; 18-21; 22+
Moffitt’s insight: a 2-group view of the age–crime curve

Terrie Moffit’s (1993) Typology

- “Life-course persistent” (LCP) vs “adolescent-limited” (AL)
  - Delinquency is normative in adolescence
- Onset of LCP is (way) earlier
  - Tie to deficit disorder, learning problems
  - Neuropsychology + environment
- AL follow age-crime curve
  - Fewer deficits, more opportunities
- Complicated picture today
  - Antisocial Personality Disorder in DSM-5

Taking Stock (CWB)

- Author reviews decade of tests
  - Lots of studies (“string” citations)
  - P. 278 “nutshell” summary
- H1: early neuro-developmental and family adversity -> LCP
  - 3rd group: low-level chronics?
  - 4th group: adult onset? (<4%)
- H2: “maturity gap” and social mimicry -> AL
- H3: abstainers are rare (<10%)
- H4: LCP -> serious offending in adulthood
- H5: LCP persist and AL desist (fig 10.1)
  - Sampson & Laub critique (all desist eventually)
Rwanda & genocide as crime
(Nyseth Brehm/Gasanabo; JCCJ, Criminology)

- ~1 million killed in 1994
  - Murder rate went from ~5/100k to ~9600/100k (+1900%)
  - survivor, perpetrator, rescuer
- crim Qs: who commits and how to punish?
  - 61K plan (25-30)
  - 577K kill (10-15+cs)
  - 1.3M loot (fine, TIG)
- restorative/punitive
  - gacaca courts
  - 10,000 courts, 2 million cases

Age and Arrest (US)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>4.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>3.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>1.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>2.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age-genocide curve (n=1.96m)
(Nyseth Brehm, Uggen, Gasanabo 2016 Criminology)
genocide in the life course

- desistance and adult status
  - Genocidal crime as conformity to adult role expectations?
  - Youth militias and adult officials

sex comparison & “invariance”

- A general, but not “invariant” relation
  - age
  - sex
- Context and situation matter:
  - Murder, rape, looting exploded over 100 days
  - Homicide rate of 4.5 today (US=4.9)

restorative sanctions for 1.3m property

- 87% fines
  - median 7,100 RWF ($11 US), to victim or family
- 9% “agreement” (Ubwumvikane)
  - negotiated settlement between family and perpetrator
- 2% exemption (Gusonerwa)
  - perpetrator asks forgiveness, exempted from fine if victim agrees
- 1% restitution
  - return or pay back goods (wood, cow, shoes, beans, clothes, pans, etc.)
- >1% forgiveness, daily work, building house...
Lecture 3b:

rational choice and deterrence

I. Background
   - "classical school" of Beccaria & Bentham
   - Enlightenment era, social contract

II. Assumptions
   - Individuals have free will and are rational
   - Crime is natural and not learned (we would if we dared)
   - Society is held together by a social contract
   - General (normative) consensus -- shared morality

conceptual tools

- Specific Deterrence: experience of being caught and punished makes one less likely to try it again
- General Deterrence: others learn of threat
- Example: \( P \) = probability of success, not busting
  - What kind of rewards? Costs?
    - Rewards: Money, thrills, status
    - Costs: Fines, punishment, family, friends, stigma

Y = \( P \cdot \text{Reward} - (1-P) \cdot \text{Costs} \)
Y = .8($500) - .2($1000) = $400 - $200 = +200

So? Do you do it?
critique

1. Magnitude of deterrent effect
2. Decisions are moral, normative, not just rational
   - rational planning is exception, not rule
3. Impossible to control delinquency through deterrence
   - 100,000 officers
4. Many "rewards" not affected by deterrence
   - e.g. masculinity
5. Weaker version of social learning (DA)
   - (unfair) RC not deterministic

Taking stock (CWB)
meta-analysis by Pratt et al.

1. small “effect sizes” (0-.2)
   - certainty bigger, severity smaller
2. effect reduced by statistical controls
   - e.g., peers, self-control
3. sensitivity to method
   - e.g., college v. non; small effects in better studies
4. certainty best for white-collar, not juv. del.
   - “middle-class window” of shaming
5. informal/non-legal sanctions are big deterrent
   - e.g., effect of prostitution or DWI on jobs, partners
6. sensitivity to age; juv. v. 18-25 (p. 380)

Petrosino on Scared Straight

- Describe program
  - P. 55: SS increases odds of offending by 1.7:1 (1.7 treatment kids offend for every control who offends)
- A small “criminogenic” effect (why?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Crime / Treatment N</th>
<th>Crime / Control N</th>
<th>Adj. Odds Ratio (sig)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finckenauer ’82</td>
<td>19/46=41%</td>
<td>4/35=11%</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERP&amp;D 79</td>
<td>16/94</td>
<td>8/67</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis ’83</td>
<td>43/93</td>
<td>37/55</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan ’67</td>
<td>12/28</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchowsky&amp;Taylor’81</td>
<td>16/39</td>
<td>16/41</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vreeland ’81</td>
<td>14/39</td>
<td>11/40</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarborough ’79</td>
<td>27/137</td>
<td>17/90</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>147/436 = 34%</td>
<td>98/338 = 27%</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Why do harmful programs persist?
policy

• Q: Is the adult CJS based on choice theory? The JJS?
  – What are the specific policy levers?
• Next: Delinquent Associates
• A. Social Psychological Theories: Differential Association
  – Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey. "A Sociological Theory of Criminal
• B. "Moving to Opportunity"
    "Moving At-Risk Youth Out of High-Risk Neighborhoods: Why Girls Fare Better than
    Boys." American Journal of Sociology 116:1154-1189. [a big treatment]