EDITED BY

BRANDON C.
WELSH
DAVID P.
FARRINGTON

The Oxford Handbook *of*
CRIME
PREVENTION

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

CRIME PREVENTION

THE OXFORD HANDBOOKS IN CRIMINOLOGY
AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

General Editor: Michael Tonry, University of Minnesota

• •

THE OXFORD HANDBOOKS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE offer authoritative, comprehensive, and critical overviews of the state of the art of criminology and criminal justice. Each volume focuses on a major area of each discipline, is edited by a distinguished group of specialists, and contains specially commissioned, original essays from leading international scholars in their respective fields. Guided by the general editorship of Michael Tonry, the series will provide an invaluable reference for scholars, students, and policy makers seeking to understand a wide range of research and policies in criminology and criminal justice.

OTHER TITLES IN THIS SERIES:

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

CRIME PREVENTION

Edited by

BRANDON C. WELSH
DAVID P. FARRINGTON

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

....

PART III: SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION

Part IV: Advancing Knowledge and Building a Safer Society

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

Crime prevention, the subject of this volume, is an important component of an overall strategy to reduce crime. It can involve early interventions to improve the life chances of children and prevent them from embarking on a life of crime (developmental prevention); programs and policies designed to ameliorate the social conditions and institutions that influence offending (community prevention); or the modification or manipulation of the physical environment, products, or systems to reduce everyday opportunities for crime (situational prevention). Here, the focus is on preventing crime or criminal offending in the first instance—before the act has been committed. Also important is that each of these strategies takes place outside of the formal criminal justice system, representing an alternative, perhaps even a socially progressive, way to reduce crime.

The main goal of the volume is to provide a comprehensive, up-to-date, and authoritative review of research on crime prevention. Specifically, it includes critical reviews of the main theories that form the basis of crime prevention and key issues that confront the prevention of crime, evidence-based reviews on the effectiveness of the most important interventions to prevent crime and criminal offending, and cross-cutting essays that examine implementation, evaluation methodology, and public policy.

For all of this volume's uniqueness and contemporary nature, it has some history. In 1995, the University of Chicago Press, as part of its *Crime and Justice* series, published *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*. Michael Tonry and David Farrington were the volume's editors. It was advertised as the "most comprehensive exposition of research and experience concerning crime prevention ever published." It more than lived up to this claim. Its only drawback is that it was never updated or duplicated by any other publishing house. *The Oxford Handbook of Crime Prevention* is to some extent the sequel to this highly successful volume. The present volume builds on the earlier one's conceptual advances in the study of crime prevention, its comprehensive coverage of different types of crime-prevention research, and its rigorous scholarship and policy analysis. With our great cast of contributors, we set out to make this Handbook the most authoritative and scholarly resource on crime prevention in the United States and across the Western world.

The volume is divided into four parts. Parts I, II, and III are organized around the three major crime-prevention strategies: developmental, community, and situational. Each of these parts includes chapters on the prevention strategy's theoretical foundations, core issues, and evidence-based reviews on the effectiveness of the most important interventions. Part IV is focused on advancing knowledge and on the role of crime prevention in contributing to a safer, more sustainable society.

Many people made this book possible. First and foremost, we are grateful to the 44 contributors. We made them work—with tight deadlines, multiple drafts, and no doubt a great deal of nitpicking—and they delivered in brilliant fashion. It was an absolute pleasure to work with every one. While we are mindful that our acknowledgment of the next two people is verging on chronic flattery, they proved (once again) to be nothing short of indispensible on this project. Michael Tonry, the Oxford Handbooks series editor, and James Cook, editor at Oxford University Press, are simply topnotch and we are truly honored to work with them.

Brandon C. Welsh
David P. Farrington

Contributors

....

DORIS BENDER is a Senior Lecturer in the Institute of Psychology at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg.

MICHAEL L. BENSON is a Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati.

KATE J. BOWERS is a Reader in the Department of Security and Crime Science at University College London.

ANTHONY A. BRAGA is a Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at Rutgers University and a Senior Research Fellow in the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management at Harvard University.

JULIA BURDICK-WILL is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago.

RONALD V. CLARKE is University Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

PHILIP J. COOK is ITT/Sanford Professor of Public Policy in the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University.

FRANCIS T. CULLEN is Distinguished Research Professor of Criminal Justice and Sociology at the University of Cincinnati.

JOHN E. ECK is a Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati.

PAUL EKBLOM is Professor of Design Against Crime at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design at University of the Arts London.

ABIGAIL A. FAGAN is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina.

GRAHAM FARRELL is a Professor of Criminology at Loughborough University and a Visiting Professor in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University.

DAVID P. FARRINGTON is Professor of Psychological Criminology in the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University.

DEBORAH GORMAN-SMITH is a Research Fellow at Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.

DENISE C. GOTTFREDSON is a Professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland at College Park.

LOUISE GROVE is a Lecturer in Criminology at Loughborough University.

ROB T. GUERETTE is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice in the School of International and Public Affairs at Florida International University.

ROSS HASTINGS is a Professor of Criminology and Director of the Institute for the Prevention of Crime at the University of Ottawa.

J. DAVID HAWKINS is an Endowed Professor of Prevention in the Social Development Research Group, School of Social Work, at the University of Washington.

JOSHUA C. HINKLE is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at Georgia State University.

ROSS HOMEL is Foundation Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Griffith University.

PETER HOMEL is Research Manager for Crime Reduction and Analysis for the Australian Institute of Criminology and Adjunct Professor at Griffith University.

WESLEY G. JENNINGS is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Criminology at the University of South Florida.

DARRICK JOLLIFFE is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Criminology at the University of Leicester.

SHANE D. JOHNSON is a Reader in the Department of Security and Crime Science at University College London.

ROLF LOEBER is Distinguished Professor of Psychiatry and Professor of Psychology and Epidemiology at the University of Pittsburgh, and Professor of Juvenile Delinquency and Social Development at Free University of Amsterdam.

FRIEDRICH LÖSEL is Director of and a Professor in the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University.

JENS LUDWIG is McCormick Foundation Professor of Social Service Administration, Law, and Public Policy at the University of Chicago.

DORIS LAYTON MACKENZIE is a Professor in the Crime, Law, and Justice Program and Director of the Justice Center for Research at Pennsylvania State University.

MATTHEW D. MAKARIOS is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside.

STEVEN F. MESSNER is Distinguished Teaching Professor of Sociology at the University at Albany, State University of New York.

CHONGMIN NA is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland at College Park.

ALEX R. PIQUERO is Ashbel Smith Professor of Criminology at the University of Texas at Dallas.

JULIAN V. ROBERTS is a Professor in the Centre for Criminology at Oxford University.

DENNIS P. ROSENBAUM is a Professor of Criminology and Psychology and Director of the Center for Research in Law and Justice at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

HOLLY S. SCHINDLER is a Project Director at Harvard University's Center on the Developing Child and a Lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

AMIE M. SCHUCK is an Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

WESLEY G. SKOGAN is a Professor of Political Science and a member of the research faculty of the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University.

MARTHA J. SMITH is an Associate Professor in the School of Community Affairs at Wichita State University.

CHRISTOPHER J. SULLIVAN is an Assistant Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati.

MARIA M. TTOFI is Leverhulme and Newton Trust Postdoctoral Fellow in the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University.

ALANA M. VIVOLO is a Public Health Advisor and Project Officer in the Division of Violence Prevention at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

DAVID WEISBURD is Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law and Criminal Justice at the Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law at The Hebrew University, and a Distinguished Professor in the Department of Criminology, Law, and Society at George Mason University.

BRANDON C. WELSH is an Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Northeastern University and Senior Research Fellow at the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement.

HIROKAZU YOSHIKAWA is a Professor of Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

GREGORY M. ZIMMERMAN is an Assistant Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Northeastern University.

This page intentionally left blank

CRIME PREVENTION

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 1

....

CRIME PREVENTION AND PUBLIC POLICY

....

BRANDON C. WELSH AND
DAVID P. FARRINGTON

CRIME prevention has come to mean many different things to many different people. Programs and policies designed to prevent crime can include the police making an arrest as part of an operation to deal with gang problems, a court sanction to a secure correctional facility, or, in the extreme, a death penalty sentence. These measures are more correctly referred to as crime control or repression. More often, though, crime prevention refers to efforts to prevent crime or criminal offending in the first instance—before the act has been committed. Both forms of crime prevention share a common goal of trying to prevent the occurrence of a future criminal act, but what further distinguishes crime prevention from crime control is that prevention takes place outside of the confines of the formal justice system.[1] In this respect, prevention is considered the fourth pillar of crime reduction, alongside the institutions of police, courts, and corrections (Waller 2006). This distinction draws attention to crime prevention as an alternative approach to these more traditional responses to crime.

In one of the first scholarly attempts to differentiate crime prevention from crime control, Peter Lejins (1967, p. 2) espoused the following: "If societal action is motivated by an offense that has already taken place, we are dealing with control; if the offense is only anticipated, we are dealing with prevention." What Lejins was trying to indicate was the notion of "pure" prevention, a view that had long existed in the scholarship and practice of American criminology (Welsh and Pfeffer 2011). It is this notion of crime prevention that is the chief concern of this volume.

There are many possible ways of classifying crime prevention programs.[2] An influential scheme distinguishes four major strategies (Tonry and Farrington 1995*b*). *Developmental prevention* refers to interventions designed to prevent the development of criminal potential in individuals, especially those targeting risk and protective factors discovered in studies of human development (Tremblay and Craig 1995; Farrington and Welsh 2007). *Community prevention* refers to interventions designed to change the social conditions and institutions (e.g., families, peers, social norms, clubs, organizations) that influence offending in residential communities (Hope 1995). *Situational prevention* refers to interventions designed to prevent the occurrence of crimes by reducing opportunities and increasing the risk and difficulty of offending (Clarke 1995*b*; Cornish and Clarke 2003). *Criminal justice prevention* refers to traditional deterrent, incapacitative, and rehabilitative strategies operated by law enforcement and agencies of the criminal justice system (Blumstein, Cohen, and Nagin 1978; MacKenzie 2006).

In *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, Michael Tonry and David Farrington (1995*a*) purposely did not address criminal justice prevention in any substantial fashion. This was because this strategy had been adequately addressed in many other scholarly books and, more importantly, there was a growing consensus for the need for governments to strike a greater balance between these emerging and promising alternative forms of crime prevention and some of the more traditional responses to crime. Also important in their decision to focus exclusively on developmental, community, and situational prevention is the shared focus of the three strategies on addressing the underlying causes or motivations that lead to a criminal event or a life of crime. Crucially, each strategy operates outside of the criminal justice system, representing an alternative, perhaps even a socially progressive, way to reduce crime. For these same reasons, we have adopted a similar approach in this volume.

A chief aim of this essay is to provide some background on this view of crime prevention. It also serves as an overview of the key theories that support these three main crime-prevention strategies, important research on effectiveness, and key issues that challenge the prevention of crime. Several observations and conclusions emerge:

- Crime prevention is best viewed as an alternative approach to reducing crime, operating outside of the formal justice system. Developmental, community, and situational strategies define its scope.
- Developmental prevention has emerged as an important strategy to improve children's life chances and prevent them from embarking on a life of crime. The theoretical support for this approach is considerable and there is growing evidence based on the effectiveness of a range of intervention modalities.
- Community crime prevention benefits from a sound theoretical base. It seemingly holds much promise for preventing crime, but less is known about its effectiveness. Advancing knowledge on this front is a top priority. Nevertheless, there are a wide range of effective models in community-based substance-use prevention and school-based crime prevention.

- The theoretical origins of situational crime prevention are wide ranging and robust. The strategy boasts a growing evidence base of effective programs and many more that are promising. There is also evidence that crime displacement is a rare occurrence.
- Crime prevention is an important component of an overall strategy to reduce crime and is widely supported by the public over place and time. A special focus on implementation science and higher quality evaluation designs will further advance crime-prevention knowledge and practice. Striking a greater balance between crime prevention and crime control will go a long way toward building a safer, more sustainable society.

The organization of this essay is as follows. Section I looks at key historical events that have influenced the development of crime prevention in America. Sections II, III, and IV introduce, respectively, the major crime-prevention strategies of developmental, community, and situational prevention. Section V discusses a number of important cross-cutting issues.

I. A Short History of Crime Prevention in America

The modern-day history of crime prevention in America is closely linked with a loss of faith in the criminal justice system that occurred in the wake of the dramatic increase in crime rates in the 1960s. This loss of faith was caused by a confluence of factors, including declining public support for the criminal justice system, increasing levels of fear of crime, and criminological research that demonstrated that many of the traditional modes of crime control were ineffective and inefficient in reducing crime and improving the safety of communities (Curtis 1987). For example, research studies on motorized preventive patrol, rapid response, and criminal investigations—the staples of law enforcement—showed that they had little or no effect on crime (Visher and Weisburd 1998). It was becoming readily apparent among researchers and public officials alike that a criminal justice response on its own was insufficient for the task of reducing crime. This observation applied not only to law enforcement but also to the courts and prisons (Tonry and Farrington 1995b). Interestingly, this loss of faith in the justice system was not unique to the United States. Similar developments were taking place in Canada, the United Kingdom, and other Western European countries, and for some of the same reasons (Waller 1990; Bennett 1998).

Writing in the mid-1980s, the observations of American urban affairs scholar Paul Lavrakas perhaps best captures this need to move beyond the sole reliance on the criminal justice system:

> Until we change the emphasis of our public policies away from considering the police, courts, and prisons to be the primary mechanisms for reducing crime, I believe that we will continue to experience the tragic levels of victimization with which our citizens now live. These criminal justice agencies are our means of *reacting* to crime—they should not be expected to *prevent* it by themselves. (1985, p. 110, emphasis in original)

These events, coupled with recommendations of presidential crime commissions of the day—the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967), chaired by Nicholas Katzenbach, and the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (1969), chaired by Milton S. Eisenhower—ushered in an era of innovation of alternative approaches to addressing crime. A few years later, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) sought to reaffirm the role of the community in preventing crime. Operating outside of the purview of the justice system, crime prevention came to be defined as an alternative, non–criminal justice means of reducing crime.

A focus on neighborhood, family, and employment was at the heart of this new approach to addressing crime, with a special emphasis on the most impoverished inner-city communities. Nonprofit organizations were the main vehicle used to deliver programs in these substantive areas. A number of situational or opportunity-reducing measures were also implemented to ensure the immediate safety of residents. Some of these programs included neighborhood patrols and block watches (Curtis 1987, p. 11). By some accounts, this urban crime-prevention and reconstruction movement produced a number of models of success and many more promising programs (see Curtis 1985, 1987).

This mode of crime prevention also came to be known as *community-based crime prevention*, an amalgam of social and situational measures (see Rosenbaum 1986, 1988). The approach was popularized with a number of large-scale, multi-site programs referred to as *comprehensive community initiatives* (Hope 1995; Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998). Examples included T-CAP (Texas City Action Plan to Prevent Crime) and PACT (Pulling America's Communities Together).

The roots of this comprehensive approach—on the social side, at least—go as far back as the early 1930s, with Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay's Chicago Area Project (CAP; Shaw and McKay 1942). The CAP was designed to produce social change in communities that suffered from high delinquency rates and gang activity. Local civic leaders coordinated social service centers that promoted community solidarity and counteracted social disorganization, and they developed other programs for youths, including school-related activities and recreation. Some evaluations indicated desirable results, but others showed that CAP efforts did little to reduce delinquency (see Schlossman and Sedlak 1983).

The New York City–based Mobilization for Youth (MOBY) program of the 1960s is another example of this type of crime-prevention initiative. Funded by more than $50 million, MOBY attempted an integrated approach to community

development (Short 1974). Based on Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin's (1960) concept of providing opportunities for legitimate success, MOBY created employment opportunities in the community, coordinated social services, and sponsored social-action groups such as tenants' committees, legal-action services, and voter registration. But the program ended for lack of funding amid questions about its utility and use of funds.

A newer generation of these programs, which includes the well-established Communities That Care (CTC) strategy developed by David Hawkins and Richard Catalano (1992), incorporates principles of public health and prevention science—identifying key risk factors for offending and implementing evidence-based prevention methods designed to counteract them. The CTC has become the best developed and tested of these prevention systems.

By the early 1990s, crime prevention found itself in the national spotlight, although not always to the liking of its supporters. This came about during the lead up to and subsequent passage of the federal crime bill of 1994—the most expensive initiative in history (Donziger 1996). Known officially as the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, it ultimately became famous for its authorization of funding to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets, as well as infamous for making 60 more federal crimes eligible for the death penalty and authorizing $10 billion for new prison construction. Crime-prevention programs (in the broadest sense) were allocated a sizable $7 billion, but most of this was used on existing federal programs like Head Start in order to keep them afloat (Gest 2001).

From the beginning of the bill's debate on Capitol Hill and across the country, crime prevention—especially programs for at-risk youth—was heavily criticized. The growing political thirst to get tough on juvenile and adult criminals alike, with an array of punitive measures, sought to paint prevention and its supporters as soft on crime. Midnight basketball became their scapegoat. Prevention was characterized as nothing more than pork-barreling—wasteful spending of taxpayer dollars. The end result of all of this was mixed: crime prevention had received substantial funding, but it had been relegated to the margins in the public discourse on crime (Mendel 1995).

In more recent years, crime prevention has emerged as an important component of an overall strategy to reduce crime. One reason for this is the widely held view of the need to strike a greater balance between prevention and punishment (Waller 2006). Another key reason has to do with a growing body of scientific evidence showing that many different types of crime-prevention programs are effective (Sherman et al. 1997, 2006; Welsh and Farrington 2006) and many of these programs save money (Drake, Aos, and Miller 2009). Not surprisingly, the economic argument for prevention has attracted a great deal of interest from policymakers and political leaders (Greenwood 2006; Mears 2010). The recent evidence-based movement (see Welsh and Farrington 2011) has figured prominently in these developments in raising the profile of crime prevention.

II. DEVELOPMENTAL CRIME PREVENTION

The developmental perspective postulates that criminal offending in adolescence and adulthood is influenced by "behavioral and attitudinal patterns that have been learned during an individual's development" (Tremblay and Craig 1995, p. 151). The early years of the life course are most influential in shaping later experiences. As Greg Duncan and Katherine Magnuson (2004, p. 101) note: "Principles of developmental science suggest that although beneficial changes are possible at any point in life, interventions early on may be more effective at promoting well-being and competencies compared with interventions undertaken later in life." They further state that: "early childhood may provide an unusual window of opportunity for interventions because young children are uniquely receptive to enriching and supportive environments. . . . As individuals age, they gain the independence and ability to shape their environments, rendering intervention efforts more complicated and costly" (pp. 102–103).

Developmental prevention is informed generally by motivational or human development and life-course theories on criminal behavior, as well as by longitudinal studies that follow samples of young persons from their early childhood experiences to the peak of their involvement with crime in their teens and twenties. Developmental prevention aims to influence the scientifically identified risk factors or "root causes" of delinquency and later criminal offending.

The theoretical foundation of developmental prevention is robust, and is the subject of the two opening essays of this volume. Frank Cullen, Michael Benson, and Matthew Makarios overview the major developmental and life-course theories of offending, with a special interest in how the theories explain why some individuals "are placed on a pathway, or trajectory, toward a life in antisocial conduct and crime." David Farrington, Rolf Loeber, and Maria Ttofi summarize the most important risk and protective factors for offending. They conclude that impulsiveness, school achievement, child-rearing methods, young mothers, child abuse, parental conflict, disrupted families, poverty, delinquent peers, and deprived neighborhoods are the most important factors that should be targeted in intervention research.

Richard Tremblay and Wendy Craig's (1995) classic, sweeping review of developmental crime prevention documented its importance as a major strategy in preventing delinquency and later offending. It also identified three key characteristics of effective developmental prevention programs: (1) they lasted for a sufficient duration—at least one year; (2) they were multimodal, meaning that multiple risk factors were targeted with different interventions; and (3) they were implemented before adolescence. Since then, many other reviews have been carried out to assess the effectiveness of developmental prevention, often focusing on a specific intervention modality. This is the approach taken in the next three essays.

Holly Schindler and Hirokazu Yoshikawa review the evidence on preschool intellectual enrichment programs. They find that preschool interventions focused specifically on child-relevant processes (i.e., cognitive skills, behavior problems, or

executive functioning) have shown impressive results. Equally desirable effects on long-term behavioral outcomes, including crime, have been demonstrated by what they call "two-generation" preschool programs, which also include a focus on parenting skills or offer comprehensive family services.

A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of parent training for children up to age five years, by Alex Piquero and Wesley Jennings, shows that this intervention is effective in reducing antisocial behavior and delinquency. The authors also find that parent-training programs produce a wide range of other important benefits for families, including improved school readiness and school performance on the part of children and greater employment and educational opportunities for parents. Training in child social skills, also known as social competence, is the subject of another systematic review and meta-analysis by Friedrich Lösel and Doris Bender. This type of intervention generally targets the risk factors of impulsivity, low empathy, and egocentrism. The authors find that the overall effect of skills training is desirable and that the most effective programs used a cognitive-behavioral approach and were implemented with older children and higher risk groups who were already exhibiting some behavioral problems.

In the final essay in this section, Deborah Gorman-Smith and Alana Vivolo take on the much broader subject of the prevention of female offending through a developmental approach. This is important because little is known about what may work for this population. Their review of prevention programs confirms that most studies continue to focus on male offending; the mostly poor evaluation designs of existing programs for girls and adolescent females prohibit a valid assessment of effectiveness, and a gendered analysis of mixed programs is often lacking.

III. Community Crime Prevention

More often than not, community-based efforts to prevent crime are thought to be some combination of developmental and situational prevention. Unlike these two crime-prevention strategies, there is little agreement in the academic literature on the definition of community prevention and the types of programs that fall within it. This stems from its early conceptions, with one view focused on the social conditions of crime and the ability of the community to regulate them, and another that "it operates at the level of whole communities regardless of the types of mechanisms involved" (Bennett 1996, p. 169).

Tim Hope's (1995) definition that community crime prevention involves actions designed to change the social conditions and institutions that influence offending in residential communities is by far the most informative. This is not just because it distinguishes community prevention from developmental and situational prevention, but also because it highlights the strength of the community to address the sometimes intractable social problems that lead to crime and violence. This focus on

the social factors leaves aside physical redesign concepts, including Oscar Newman's (1972) defensible space and C. Ray Jeffery's (1971) crime prevention through environmental design. Ron Clarke (1992, 1995*b*) describes how these important concepts are more correctly viewed as contributing to the early development of situational crime prevention.

Numerous theories have been advanced over the years to explain community-level influences on crime and offending and that serve as the basis of community crime-prevention programs (for excellent reviews, see Reiss and Tonry 1986; Farrington 1993; Sampson and Lauritsen 1994; Wikström 1998). Steven Messner and Gregory Zimmerman's essay makes a unique contribution to this body of knowledge. Through a macro-sociological lens, the authors elucidate the distinguishing features and evolution of the community–crime link. In a separate essay, Wesley Skogan expounds on the nature of disorderly behavior and its relevance to crime, communities, and prevention. Of particular importance is the role that disorder may play in the destabilization and decline of neighborhoods.

While there is a rich theoretical and empirical literature on communities and crime, up until recently less was known about the effectiveness of community crime-prevention programs. Review after review on this subject—going back to Rosenbaum's (1988) and Hope's (1995) classics—have consistently reported that there are no program types with proven effectiveness in preventing crime. Importantly, this was not a claim that nothing works and that community crime prevention should be abandoned (Sherman 1997; Welsh and Hoshi 2006). Some program types were judged to be promising.[3]

More recent research finds that some community-based programs can make a difference in preventing crime. Jens Ludwig and Julia Burdick-Will report on the effects of the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program, which gave vouchers to low-socioeconomic status (often, minority) families to enable them to move to better areas. The large-scale experimental test of the program, which involved 4,600 families in five cities across the country, showed that it was particularly effective in reducing violent crime by youths. The authors also discuss another similar poverty-deconcentration experiment in Chicago that was equally effective.

Christopher Sullivan and Darrick Jolliffe review the effectiveness of two well-known community-based crime-prevention modalities: peer influence and mentoring. They find that programs designed to influence peer risk factors for delinquency are somewhat promising, while mentoring, where the evaluation research is more extensive and robust, can be effective in preventing delinquency. In one systematic review and meta-analysis it was found that mentoring was more effective in reducing offending when the average duration of each contact between mentor and mentee was greater, in smaller scale studies, and when mentoring was combined with other interventions.

Important to all forms of crime prevention, but implicit in community prevention, is the element of partnerships among stakeholder agencies and individuals. Dennis Rosenbaum and Amie Schuck review and assess the literature on comprehensive community partnerships in the context of community crime prevention. They

offer several key conclusions, including that these partnerships have wide public appeal, can be difficult to implement because of their complexity, and are most effective when there is a commitment to prevention science and evidence-based practice.

The next two essays diverge slightly from our focus on communities and the prevention of crime, but their importance to the field and this volume cannot be overstated. Abigail Fagan and David Hawkins review the evidence of the effectiveness of community-based substance-use prevention initiatives, while Denise Gottfredson, Philip Cook, and Chongmin Na summarize the evidence of the effectiveness of school-based crime-prevention programs. In both cases, the authors report on a number of successful preventive interventions for youths.

IV. Situational Crime Prevention

Situational prevention stands apart from the other crime-prevention strategies by its special focus on the setting or place in which criminal acts take place, as well as its crime-specific focus. No less important is situational prevention's concern with products (e.g., installation of immobilizers on new cars in some parts of Europe, action taken to eliminate cellphone cloning in the United States) and on large-scale systems such as improvements in the banking system to reduce money laundering (Clarke 2009).

Situational crime prevention has been defined as "a preventive approach that relies, not upon improving society or its institutions, but simply upon reducing opportunities for crime" (Clarke 1992, p. 3). Reducing opportunities for crime is achieved essentially through some modification or manipulation of the physical environment, products, or systems in order to directly affect offenders' perceptions of increased risks and effort and decreased rewards, provocations, and excuses (Cornish and Clarke 2003). These different approaches serve as the basis of a highly detailed classification system of situational crime prevention, which can further be divided into 25 separate techniques, each with any number of examples of programs (Cornish and Clarke 2003). Part of Martha Smith and Ron Clarke's essay is devoted to an overview of the current classification scheme, as well as the theoretical and practical developments that led to its present form.

The theoretical origins of situational crime prevention are wide-ranging (see Newman, Clarke, and Shoham 1997; Garland 2000), but it is largely informed by opportunity theory. This theory holds that the offender is "heavily influenced by environmental inducements and opportunities and as being highly adaptable to changes in the situation" (Clarke 1995a, p. 57). Opportunity theory is made up of several more specific theories, including the rational-choice perspective, the routine-activity approach, and crime-pattern theory. According to Smith and Clarke, these three theories have had the greatest influence on the research and practice of situational crime prevention, and they are described in detail in their essay.

Also important to the theoretical basis and the practical utility of situational prevention is the widely held finding that crime is not randomly distributed across a city or community but is, instead, highly concentrated at certain places known as crime "hot spots" (Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger 1989). For example, it is estimated that across the United States, 10 percent of the places are sites for around 60 percent of the crimes (Eck 2006, p. 242). In the same way that individuals can have criminal careers, there are criminal careers for places (Sherman 1995). The essay by Anthony Braga reviews the empirical and theoretical evidence on the concentration of crime at places, times, and among offenders.

Fairly or unfairly, situational crime prevention often raises concerns over the displacement of crime. This is the notion that offenders simply move around the corner or resort to different methods to commit crimes once a crime-prevention project has been introduced.[4] Thirty years ago, Thomas Reppetto (1976) identified five different forms of displacement: temporal (change in time), tactical (change in method), target (change in victim), territorial (change in place), and functional (change in type of crime).

What Clarke (1995b) and many others (e.g., Gabor 1990; Hesseling 1995) have found and rightly note is that displacement is never 100 percent. Furthermore, a growing body of research has shown that situational measures may instead result in a diffusion of crime-prevention benefits or the "complete reverse" of displacement (Clarke and Weisburd 1994). Instead of a crime-prevention project displacing crime, the project's crime-prevention benefits are diffused to the surrounding area, for example. The essay by Shane Johnson, Rob Guerette, and Kate Bowers, which reports on a meta-analysis of displacement and diffusion, provides confirmatory evidence for these general points. They also find that a "diffusion of benefit is at least as likely as crime displacement."

Like the other crime-prevention strategies, numerous reviews have been carried out over the years to assess the effectiveness of situational crime-prevention programs. By far the most comprehensive reviews have been conducted by John Eck (1997, 2006). They focused on the full range of place-based situational measures implemented in both public and private settings. In keeping with their evidence-based approach, the reviews included only the highest quality evaluations in arriving at conclusions about what works, what does not work, and what is promising. This had the effect of excluding many situational measures with demonstrated preventive effects—including steering-column locks, redesigned credit cards, and exact-change policies (see Clarke 1997). Some of these first-generation situational prevention measures were assessed in weak evaluations that could not convincingly support the assertion that the program produced the reported effect.

John Eck and Rob Guerette's esssay presents an updated and slightly modified review of place-based crime prevention. They assess the evidence for the effectiveness of various situational measures implemented in five common types of places: residences, outside/public, retail, transportation, and recreation. They find a range of situational measures that are effective in preventing different crimes in each of these settings.

Two other essays review the effectiveness of situational measures applied in other contexts. Paul Ekblom looks at the role of the private sector in designing products that work against crime. A number of successful programs are profiled and critical issues discussed in what the author calls the "arms race" between preventers and offenders. Louise Grove and Graham Farrell review the effectiveness of situational measures designed to prevent repeat victimization of residential and commercial burglary and domestic and sexual violence. The authors find that a number of different measures are effective in preventing repeat victimization, especially of residential and commercial burglary.

V. Advancing Knowledge and Building a Safer Society

The final section of this volume looks at a number of key issues that cut across the three crime-prevention strategies. The first of these concerns implementation. Ross Homel and Peter Homel cover the complexities and challenges of implementing crime-prevention programs, as well as the process of moving from small-scale projects to large-scale dissemination and how to mitigate the attenuation of program effects. As with the science of the effectiveness of crime prevention, the authors call for a science of implementation that conforms with principles of good governance.

The second of these key issues concerns evaluation. An evaluation of a crime-prevention program is considered to be rigorous if it possesses a high degree of internal, construct, and statistical conclusion validity[5] (Cook and Campbell 1979; Shadish, Cook, and Campbell 2002). Put another way, we can have a great deal of confidence in the observed effects of an intervention if it has been evaluated using a design that controls for the major threats to these forms of validity. Experimental and quasi-experimental research methods are the types of designs that can best achieve this, and the randomized controlled experiment is the most convincing method of evaluating crime-prevention programs. This is the subject of David Weisburd and Joshua Hinkle's essay. Among the many benefits of randomized experiments, the authors note that randomization is the only method of assignment that controls for unknown and unmeasured confounders, as well as those that are known and measured. They also note that the randomized experiment is no panacea and may not be feasible in every instance, and in these cases other high-quality evaluation designs should be employed.

The next essay by Doris MacKenzie, on the effectiveness of correctional treatment, represents a departure from our focus on alternative, non–criminal justice approaches to preventing crime. Its inclusion in this volume is meant to be an important reminder of a key policy conclusion in our field: it is never too early and never

too late to effectively intervene to reduce criminal offending (Loeber and Farrington 1998, forthcoming). While we maintain that it is far more socially worthwhile and just as well as sustainable to intervene before harm is inflicted on a victim and the offender is under the supervision of the justice system, it is important to recognize that this is not always possible; prevention programs are by no means foolproof.

Public opinion on crime prevention is also important to its future development and practice. Encouragingly, there appears to be a great deal of public support for the kinds of crime prevention covered here. Traditional and economic-based opinion polls consistently show that the public supports government spending on crime prevention rather than on more punitive responses, including building more prisons (Cullen et al. 2007), and that the public is willing to pay more in taxes if people know that the money will be directed toward crime prevention rather than crime control (Cohen, Rust, and Steen 2006; Nagin et al. 2006). These and other important findings are at the center of Julian Roberts and Ross Hastings's review of international trends in public opinion concerning crime prevention.

In the final essay of the volume we set out our modest proposal for a new crime-prevention policy to help build a safer, more sustainable society. Among its central features are the need to overcome the "short-termism" politics of the day; to ensure that the highest quality scientific research is at center stage in political and policy decisions; and to strike a greater balance between crime prevention and crime control.

NOTES

1. Crime-prevention programs are not designed with the intention of excluding justice personnel. Many types of prevention programs, especially those that focus on adolescents, involve justice personnel such as police or probation officers. In these cases, justice personnel work in close collaboration with those from such areas as education, health care, recreation, and social services.

2. Among the most well known classification schemes include those by Brantingham and Faust (1976), van Dijk and de Waard (1991), and Ekblom (1994).

3. Promising programs are those where the level of certainty from the available scientific evidence is too low to support generalizable conclusions, but where there is some empirical basis for predicting that further research could support such conclusions (Farrington et al. 2006).

4. See Barr and Pease (1990) for a discussion of "benign" or desirable effects of displacement.

5. *Internal validity* refers to how well the study unambiguously demonstrates that an intervention had an effect on an outcome. *Construct validity* refers to the adequacy of the operational definition and measurement of the theoretical constructs that underlie the intervention and the outcome. *Statistical conclusion validity* is concerned with whether the presumed cause (the intervention) and the presumed effect (the outcome) are related.

REFERENCES

Barr, Robert, and Ken Pease. 1990. "Crime Placement, Displacement, and Deflection." In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, vol. 12, edited by Michael Tonry and Norval Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bennett, Trevor H. 1996. "Community Crime Prevention in Britain." In *Kommunale Kriminalprävention: Paradigmenwechsel und Wiederentdeckung alter Weisheiten*, edited by Thomas Trenczek and Hartmut Pfeiffer. Bonn, Germany: Forum Verlag Godesberg.

Bennett, Trevor H. 1998. "Crime Prevention." In *The Handbook of Crime and Punishment*, edited by Michael Tonry. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blumstein, Alfred, Jacqueline Cohen, and Daniel S. Nagin, eds. 1978. *Deterrence and Incapacitation*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brantingham, Paul J., and Frederick L. Faust. 1976. "A Conceptual Model of Crime Prevention." *Crime and Delinquency* 22:284–96.

Clarke, Ronald V. 1992. Introduction. In *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, edited by Ronald V. Clarke. Albany, NY: Harrow and Heston.

Clarke, Ronald V. 1995a. "Opportunity-Reducing Crime Prevention Strategies and the Role of Motivation." In *Integrating Crime Prevention Strategies: Propensity and Opportunity*, edited by Per-Olof H. Wikström, Ronald V. Clarke, and Joan McCord. Stockholm, Sweden: National Council for Crime Prevention.

Clarke, Ronald V. 1995b. "Situational Crime Prevention." In *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, edited by Michael Tonry and David P. Farrington. Vol. 19 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clarke, Ronald V., ed. 1997. *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, 2nd ed. Guilderland, NY: Harrow and Heston.

Clarke, Ronald V. 2009. "Situational Crime Prevention: Theoretical Background and Current Practice." In *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*, edited by Marvin D. Krohn, Alan J. Lizotte, and Gina Penly Hall. New York: Springer.

Clarke, Ronald V., and David Weisburd. 1994. "Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits: Observations on the Reverse of Displacement." In *Crime Prevention Studies*, vol. 2, edited by Ronald V. Clarke. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Cloward, Richard, and Lloyd Ohlin. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, Mark A., Ronald T. Rust, and Sara Steen. 2006. "Prevention, Crime Control or Cash? Public Preferences toward Criminal Justice Spending Priorities." *Justice Quarterly* 23:317–35.

Cook, Thomas D., and Donald T. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Cornish, Derek B., and Ronald V. Clarke. 2003. "Opportunities, Precipitators and Criminal Decisions: A Reply to Wortley's Critique of Situational Crime Prevention." In *Theory for Practice in Situational Crime Prevention*, edited by Martha J. Smith and Derek B. Cornish. Vol. 16 of *Crime Prevention Studies*, edited by Ronald V. Clarke. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Cullen, Francis T., Brenda A. Vose, Cheryl N. L. Jonson, and James D. Unnever. 2007. "Public Support for Early Intervention: Is Child Saving a 'Habit of the Heart'?" *Victims and Offenders* 2:109–24.

Curtis, Lynn A. 1985. "Neighborhood, Family, and Employment: Toward a New Public Policy against Violence." In *American Violence and Public Policy: An Update of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*, edited by Lynn A. Curtis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Curtis, Lynn A. 1987. Preface. "Policies to Prevent Crime: Neighborhood, Family, and Employment Strategies." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 494:9–18.

Donziger, Steven R., ed. 1996. *The Real War on Crime: The Report of the National Criminal Justice Commission*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Drake, Elizabeth K., Steve Aos, and Marna G. Miller. 2009. "Evidence-Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Crime and Criminal Justice Costs: Implications in Washington State." *Victims and Offenders* 4:170–96.

Duncan, Greg J., and Katherine Magnuson. 2004. "Individual and Parent-Based Intervention Strategies for Promoting Human Capital and Positive Behavior." In *Human Development Across Lives and Generations: The Potential for Change*, edited by P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale, Kathleen Kiernan, and Ruth J. Friedman. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eck, John E. 1997. "Preventing Crime at Places." In *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, Lawrence W. Sherman, Denise C. Gottfredson, Doris L. MacKenzie, John E. Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn D. Bushway. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Eck, John E. 2006. "Preventing Crime at Places." In *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*, rev. ed., edited by Lawrence W. Sherman, David P. Farrington, Brandon C. Welsh, and Doris L. MacKenzie. New York: Routledge.

Ekblom, Paul. 1994. "Proximal Circumstances: A Mechanism-Based Classification of Crime Prevention." In *Crime Prevention Studies*, vol. 2, edited by Ronald V. Clarke. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Farrington, David P. 1993. "Have Any Individual, Family or Neighbourhood Influences on Offending Been Demonstrated Conclusively?" In *Integrating Individual and Ecological Aspects of Crime*, edited by David P. Farrington, Robert J. Sampson, and Per-Olof H. Wikström. Stockholm, Sweden: National Council for Crime Prevention.

Farrington, David P., Denise C. Gottfredson, Lawrence W. Sherman, and Brandon C. Welsh. 2006. "The Maryland Scientific Methods Scale." In *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*, rev. ed., edited by Lawrence W. Sherman, David P. Farrington, Brandon C. Welsh, and Doris L. MacKenzie. New York: Routledge.

Farrington, David P., and Brandon C. Welsh. 2007. *Saving Children from a Life of Crime: Early Risk Factors and Effective Interventions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gabor, Thomas. 1990. "Crime Displacement and Situational Prevention." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 32:41–74.

Garland, David. 2000. "Ideas, Institutions and Situational Crime Prevention." In *Ethical and Social Perspectives on Situational Crime Prevention*, edited by Andrew von Hirsch, David Garland, and Alison Wakefield. Oxford, UK: Hart.

Gest, Ted. 2001. *Crime and Politics: Big Government's Erratic Campaign for Law and Order*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenwood, Peter W. 2006. *Changing Lives: Delinquency Prevention as Crime-Control Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hawkins, J. David, and Richard F. Catalano. 1992. *Communities That Care: Action for Drug Abuse Prevention*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hesseling, René. 1995. "Theft from Cars: Reduced or Displaced?" *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 3(3): 79–92.

Hope, Tim. 1995. "Community Crime Prevention." In *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, edited by Michael Tonry and David P. Farrington. Vol. 19 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jeffrey, C. Ray. 1971. *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lavrakas, Paul J. 1985. "Citizen Self-Help and Neighborhood Crime Prevention Policy." In *American Violence and Public Policy: An Update of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*, edited by Lynn A. Curtis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lejins, Peter P. 1967. "The Field of Prevention." In *Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice*, edited by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Loeber, Rolf, and David P. Farrington, eds. 1998. *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Loeber, Rolf, and David P. Farrington, eds. Forthcoming. *Transitions from Juvenile Delinquency to Adult Crime*. New York: Oxford University Press.

MacKenzie, Doris L. 2006. *What Works in Corrections: Reducing the Criminal Activities of Offenders and Delinquents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mears, Daniel P. 2010. *American Criminal Justice Policy: An Evaluation Approach to Increasing Accountability and Effectiveness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mendel, Richard A. 1995. *Prevention or Pork? A Hard-Headed Look at Youth-Oriented Anti-Crime Programs*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.

Nagin, Daniel S., Alex R. Piquero, Elizabeth S. Scott, and Laurence Steinberg. 2006. "Public Preferences for Rehabilitation versus Incarceration of Juvenile Offenders: Evidence from a Contingent Valuation Survey." *Criminology and Public Policy* 5:627–52.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. 1973. *Report on Community Crime Prevention*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. 1969. *To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility, Final Report*. Washington, DC: US. Government Printing Office.

Newman, Oscar. 1972. *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*. New York: Macmillan.

Newman, Graeme, Ronald V. Clarke, and Shlomo Giora Shoham, eds. 1997. *Rational Choice and Situational Crime Prevention: Theoretical Foundations*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate/Dartmouth.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. 1967. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr., and Michael Tonry, eds. 1986. *Communities and Crime*. Vol. 8 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reppetto, Thomas A. 1976. "Crime Prevention and the Displacement Phenomenon." *Crime and Delinquency* 22:166–77.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P., ed. 1986. *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P. 1988. "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature." *Justice Quarterly* 5:323–95.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P., Arthur J. Lurigio, and Robert C. Davis. 1998. *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sampson, Robert J., and Janet Lauritsen. 1994. "Violent Victimization and Offending: Individual-, Situational-, and Community-Level Risk Factors." In *Understanding and Preventing Violence. Social Influences*, vol. 3, edited by Albert J. Reiss, Jr. and Jeffrey A. Roth. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Schlossman, Steven, and Michael Sedlak. 1983. "The Chicago Area Project Revisited." *Crime and Delinquency* 29:398–462.

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Shaw, Clifford R., and Henry D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas: A Study of Rates of Delinquents in Relation to Differential Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sherman, Lawrence W. 1995. "Hot Spots of Crime and Criminal Careers of Places." In *Crime and Place*, edited by John E. Eck and David Weisburd. Vol. 4 of *Crime Prevention Studies*, edited by Ronald V. Clarke. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Sherman, Lawrence W. 1997. "Communities and Crime Prevention." In *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, Lawrence W. Sherman, Denise C. Gottfredson, Doris L. MacKenzie, John E. Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn D. Bushway. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Sherman, Lawrence W., David P. Farrington, Brandon C. Welsh, and Doris L. MacKenzie, eds. 2006. *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*, rev. ed. New York: Routledge.

Sherman, Lawrence W., Patrick R. Gartin, and Michael E. Buerger. 1989. "Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place." *Criminology* 27:27–55.

Sherman, Lawrence W., Denise C. Gottfredson, Doris L. MacKenzie, John E. Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn D. Bushway. 1997. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Short, James F. 1974. "The Natural History of an Applied Theory: Differential Opportunity and 'Mobilization for Youth.'" In *Social Policy and Sociology*, edited by Nicholas J. Demerath, Otto Larsen, and Karl F. Schuessler. New York: Seminar Press.

Tonry, Michael, and David P. Farrington, eds. 1995a. *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*. Vol. 19 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tonry, Michael, and David P. Farrington. 1995b. "Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention." In *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, edited by Michael Tonry and David P. Farrington. Vol. 19 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tremblay, Richard E., and Wendy M. Craig. 1995. "Developmental Crime Prevention." In *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, edited by Michael Tonry and David P. Farrington. Vol. 19 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

van Dijk, Jan J. M., and Jaap de Waard. 1991. "A Two-Dimensional Typology of Crime Prevention Projects; with a Bibliography." *Criminal Justice Abstracts* 23: 483–503.

Visher, Christy A., and David Weisburd. 1998. "Identifying What Works: Recent Trends in Crime Prevention Strategies." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 28: 223–42.

Waller, Irvin. 1990. "With National Leadership Canada Could Turn the Tide on Crime." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 32:185–90.

Waller, Irvin. 2006. *Less Law, More Order: The Truth about Reducing Crime*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Welsh, Brandon C., and David P. Farrington, eds. 2006. *Preventing Crime: What Works for Children, Offenders, Victims, and Places*. New York: Springer.

Welsh, Brandon C., and David P. Farrington. 2011. "Evidence-Based Crime Policy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Crime and Criminal Justice*, edited by Michael Tonry. New York: Oxford University Press.

Welsh, Brandon C., and Akemi Hoshi. 2006. "Communities and Crime Prevention." In *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention,* rev. ed., edited by Lawrence W. Sherman, David P. Farrington, Brandon C. Welsh, and Doris L. MacKenzie. New York: Routledge.

Welsh, Brandon C., and Rebecca D. Pfeffer. 2011. "Reclaiming Crime Prevention: A Revisionist American History." Paper, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Northeastern University.

Wikström, Per-Olof H. 1998. "Communities and Crime." In *The Handbook of Crime and Punishment*, edited by Michael Tonry. New York: Oxford University Press.

This page intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENTAL CRIME PREVENTION

This page intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENTAL AND LIFE-COURSE THEORIES OF OFFENDING

FRANCIS T. CULLEN, MICHAEL L. BENSON, AND MATTHEW D. MAKARIOS

THEORIES perform three useful functions. First, amid the many potential risk factors for crime, they identify which ones are most salient. Second, they delineate the relationships among or sequencing of these criminogenic risk factors. And third, they propose the origins of these risk factors. If true, theories thus enrich our understanding of criminal behavior. But they also carry two limitations—one obvious and one not so obvious. On the one hand, if theories identify risk factors that are either unrelated or only weakly related to crime, they mislead scholars and misguide practitioners' intervention efforts. On the other hand, there is a less obvious difficulty: even if substantially accurate, theories restrict our vision as to the possible sources of criminal conduct. Similar to a flashlight in the night, theories shine a concentrated light on and thus allow us to see the importance of certain risk factors, but in doing so, they leave other factors in the dark and outside our consideration.

Many traditional theories of crime—those that directed our thinking about crime for the better part of the 20th century—focused their beam primarily on one stage in life: the teenage years. As a result, criminology was replete with a roster of "theories of delinquency." Scholars pointed their theoretical lights on this stage in life for criminological and practical reasons. Criminologically, adolescence appeared to be a time during which participation in illegal activities skyrocketed. The hump

of the bell curve of crime was centered on the teenage years for most offenses (a bit later for serious violent offenses). This was also the point in life at which individuals joined together to form gangs, including those heavily involved in drugs and violence. Practically, youths were easily studied. It was possible to survey most teenagers in a community by distributing questionnaires in junior and senior high schools. By contrast, children were too young to fill out such questionnaires and adults rarely congregated in one place where they might be polled.

This approach—theorizing about and collecting data on teenagers—contributed many important insights to our understanding of crime causation. Even so, it was an approach that left too much about life in the dark—outside what criminologists would see and study. Although criminologists never argued that childhood was irrelevant to crime, they ignored the beginning stages of life and focused their attention on the post-childhood years. Implicitly, their theories assumed that most youngsters arrived at the teenage years as blank slates, at which time they either conformed or were driven, encouraged, or permitted to break the law. After the teenage years, it was assumed, again mostly in unspoken terms, that those in trouble as adults would be drawn from those in trouble as juveniles. Little direct investigation was undertaken of the unique aspects of adulthood that might encourage or discourage criminal involvement.

Beginning in the 1990s, however, a relatively small group of scholars questioned the implicit assumptions of mainstream criminology. They pointed out something that most parents worry about: that what happens in childhood—indeed, in the womb—may be a precursor to what comes later in life. That is, risk factors for delinquency may not be limited exclusively to the teenage years. Rather, they might well emerge early in life and, at that time, determine who will grow up to be a serious offender. An even smaller group of scholars looked at the back two-thirds of life—the adult years. They cautioned that what occurs in adulthood is affected by childhood factors and by life events that are unique to being a grown-up.

These simple insights had profound implications. First, they suggested that most existing theories were limited, if not simply incorrect (we use the term "misspecified"). They left out too many important risk factors at other stages of life to provide an accurate and complete understanding of the criminal enterprise. Second, these insights created fresh opportunities for thinking about how to prevent crime. If risk factors for crime were found across the life course, then it made sense that interventions aimed at preventing criminal behavior could be designed for distinct stages of the life course (Farrington and Welsh 2007).

Importantly, over the past two decades, theories have emerged to address these issues. These perspectives are like shining two or three flashlights, rather than a single one, so that an entire dark room can be illuminated. Thus, with these newer theories, we can see multiple dimensions of life simultaneously, allowing our criminological eyes to scan the life course from "womb to tomb." Freed from a narrow focus on the juvenile years, we are able to consider how individuals grow into and out of crime. This opportunity to see broadly, however, has not made our scholarly lives easier. With our field of vision expanded, there is now more to see and more to try to make sense of.

In this regard, the theories discussed in this essay assist in the daunting task of trying to understand crime across people's lives. Some scholars use the constructs of *developmental* and *life-course* as synonyms—that is, to refer to theories that try to explain criminal involvement across life. Other scholars, however, use the terms in a more technical way so as to show how these criminological approaches differ. Thus, in this debate, *developmental* theories assume that people grow up or "develop" as humans in predictable ways, going through standard stages in life. Most youngsters are on a prosocial or "normal" pathway, but others are not; they are headed into crime. Even here, these youngsters also grow up or develop in a predictable way—albeit one that is antisocial. By contrast, *life-course* theories portray the growth process as a messier affair. People do not flower like a plant in ways that can be neatly and confidently predicted. Rather, they head along trajectories—either conformist or criminal—until some event redirects their lives. In this view, going into and out of crime can be explained by pointing to risk and protective factors, but the precise timing of changes in life for any individual is virtually random.

In this essay, our concern is not with the technical distinctions between developmental and life-course theories. This debate is useful to keep in mind, but our assigned task lies elsewhere. Specifically, our goal is to present an overview of the major developmental *and* life-course theories. In doing so, our special interest is in explaining how different theories explain why some individuals—typically starting in childhood—are placed on a pathway or trajectory toward a life in antisocial conduct and crime. Some theories also have something to say about change—how offenders extricate themselves from a criminal pathway. Where relevant, the issue of change is highlighted.

Having a firm grasp of the prevailing developmental and life-course theories is essential because the future investigations of crime will be shaped intimately by these competing perspectives. In a real sense, today's criminology is life-course criminology. But sound theoretical knowledge also is relevant to this handbook because these perspectives identify key points in the life course where interventions might be targeted and key processes through which crime prevention might naturally occur in the social world. In the end, the apparent gulf between theory and intervention—the esoteric and the practical—is more myth than reality. To use our flashlight metaphor a final time, theories illuminate for practitioners the risk factors that should be targeted for intervention.

This essay provides a tour of developmental and life-course theories and thus is not arranged to derive empirical insights. Still, it is possible to demarcate several key lessons from the theoretical discussion that follows:

- Traits or propensities conducive to antisocial conduct and crime develop in the womb and early in childhood. The roots of crime thus extend over the life course.
- Antisocial orientations and behavior will be deepened if at-risk youngsters travel through family, peer, school, and community contexts that are troubled and criminogenic.

- Punitive, stigmatizing criminal justice sanctions, including imprisonment, likely deepen criminal propensities.
- Desistance from crime in adulthood requires not only social opportunities for change but also cognitive orientations that inspire offenders to forfeit a life in crime.
- The sources of continuity in offending are often robust—which is why criminal careers persist over a number of years—but many also are amenable to change. Theoretically informed, evidence-based, and carefully planned interventions thus are likely to save many at-risk youngsters and adults from life-course-persistent offending.

The remainder of the essay is divided into eight sections. Section I examines Gottfredson and Hirschi's claim that stable criminal behavior across life is due to low self-control, a propensity established in childhood. Section II reviews Moffitt's insight that life unfolds in two distinct developmental pathways, including one that involves life-course-persistent offending. Section III discusses Hawkins and Catalano's sociological theory of why youngsters develop along a delinquent as opposed to a prosocial pathway and how this information has been used to save youngsters from a criminal future. Section IV shows how Farrington has used empirical information on risk factors to formulate an integrated developmental theory of offending. Section V focuses on a perspective, labeling theory, often not defined as a life-course or developmental theory. Labeling theory is significant precisely because it cautions that attempts, especially by the criminal justice system, to dissuade people from offending can have the unanticipated consequence of increasing their criminality. Section VI highlights Hagan's efforts to unravel why youngsters become embedded in a criminal trajectory. His special contribution is in revealing the necessity to take into account the criminogenic community contexts in which troubled youths are so often enmeshed. Section VII presents Sampson and Laub's life-course theory that argues that the absence of social bonds explains why persistent offending occurs and the presence of social bonds explains how criminals desist from crime. They also assert that leaving crime involves something they call human agency, which roughly means that offenders exercise the will to halt their illegal conduct. Finally, building on the research of Maruna and of Giordano and colleagues, section VIII conveys another view of why offenders desist: they experience a cognitive transformation.

I. It's Usually Too Late: Gottfredson and Hirschi's Self-Control Theory

The developers of self-control theory, Michael Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi, assume that the precursors to crime are laid down early in the life course (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990). Indeed, according to this theory, by the time children

reach the ages of 11 or 12, the most important developmental events have already occurred. After children have passed that age, whatever remains in the way of human developmental stages is not particularly important for criminologists. So, what are the important developmental events? They can be found in the relationships and interactions that children have with their parents in the first decade of life. Depending on how parents treat their children early in the life course, the children will develop in one of two ways. If the parents do the "right" things, their children will become normal, conforming, and prosocial individuals. However, if the parents do the "wrong" thing, their children will develop into self-centered, impulsive, and anti-social individuals.

Good parents—that is, parents who do the right things—are strongly attached to their children. They care about their children and want them to develop as positively as possible. As a result of that caring and attachment, they monitor their children for signs of misbehavior, recognize misbehavior when it occurs, and punish such behavior in a firm and consistent manner. Treated in such a way, children will gradually develop self-control. People with self-control are not impulsive; they learn from experience; they are sensitive to the rights and feelings of others; and they think about the potential long-term consequences of their actions. It is important to note that in the eyes of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990, pp. 94–95), self-control is not something that people are born with or something that develops naturally over time. Rather, self-control results only from the positive actions of parents. It must be built into children.

Ineffective parents can fail in one or more ways. They may not be attached to their children, in which case nothing else matters. Even if they do care about their children, they may fail to monitor, recognize, or punish their deviant behavior. When parents consistently fail to perform these actions early in the life course, their children will not develop self-control. Rather, they will become people who are "impulsive, insensitive, physical (as opposed to mental), short-sighted, and non-verbal" (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990, p. 90). That is, they will have low self-control.

People with low self-control are attracted to crime because it offers quick and relatively certain rewards. Most crimes do not require a lot of planning or effort. They are easy to carry out, potentially rewarding, fun, and exciting. People with low self-control are attracted to all of these characteristics. The fact that crimes hurt other people and do not pay off in the long run does not bother them.

Thus, in developmental terms, self-control theory is a propensity theory. It assumes that people have a more or less stable propensity to commit crime. This propensity is established early in the life course and does not change over time. That is, it is not influenced by later events that may happen in the life course. According to Gottfredson and Hirschi, then, there are only two main trajectories in crime—criminal or not—and they are established early as a result of the type of parenting the individual receives. Once a person has low self-control, it is too late to change him or her.

II. Focusing on Life-Course-Persistent Offenders: Moffitt's Taxonomy Theory

In contrast to Gottfredson and Hirschi, Terrie Moffitt (1993) does not assume that criminal propensity is gradational, with people aligning on a continuum that ranges from a lot of self-control to no self-control. Rather, she has offered a taxonomy that divides youngsters into two very distinct groups that develop in quite different ways. Most children, she claims, engage in *adolescence-limited* offending. They are prosocial during childhood, get into trouble in adolescence, and then mature and leave crime behind. A smaller group of children, however, start life on a pathway to *life-course-persistent* offending. These individuals engage in a wide variety of criminal and antisocial behaviors throughout the life course. Thus, like Gottfredson and Hirschi, Moffitt believes that antisocial behavior remains stable in some individuals from very early childhood to adulthood. Accordingly, her theory of life-course persistence focuses on factors present at the very earliest moments in the life course. But here the two theories depart in their explanation of what occurs in childhood and beyond.

Moffitt contends that the life-course-persistent pattern of antisocial behavior arises out of the combination of a "vulnerable and difficult infant with an adverse rearing context" (Moffitt 1997, p. 17). She envisions a child with a difficult temperament who is born to parents who are ill-equipped to handle the child's problems. The child's difficult temperament flows from what Moffitt calls neuropsychological deficits. These deficits may be genetically based or they may be caused by unhealthy prenatal conditions, such as poor nutrition, inadequate health care, and alcohol or drug use during pregnancy. Deficits in neuropsychological conditions and processes may affect temperament in such areas as activity level and emotional reactivity; behavioral development in speech, motor coordination, and impulse control; and cognitive abilities in attention, language, and reasoning (Moffitt 1997, p. 18).

Children who suffer from neuropsychological deficits and who are born into disadvantaged or troubled families undergo negative encounters with their parents. The parents do not recognize or know how to properly respond to the child's problems. In interactions with the child, they do the wrong thing at the wrong time. Over time, this "chain of failed parent/child encounters" aggravates the behavioral problems or tendencies that flow from the child's neuropsychological deficits. Thus, a child with a neuropsychological deficit that promotes impulsivity grows up to be very impulsive because parents have not taken steps to help the child handle or ameliorate the behavioral effects of the condition. Thus, life-course-persistent antisocial behavior begins with the interaction between problem children and problem parents.

The early pattern of antisocial behavior persists into adolescence and later into adulthood. In part, this persistence is caused by the behavioral style that the individual developed as a child and carries over into later stages in the life course. The hyperactive child with poor self-control and limited cognitive abilities becomes an

overactive adult who is self-indulgent and not very smart. When the person is a child, this constellation of traits leads to trouble, and it continues to do so as the person ages, producing continuous contemporary consequences. At each stage of the life course, this person's behavioral style gets him or her into trouble with others.

Persistence in antisocial behavior, and specifically criminal behavior, also results from the cumulating effects of problems and failure over time. Beginning early in life, individuals on a life-course-persistent trajectory behave in ways that limit their future opportunities. Because they are so bothersome to be around, life-course-persistent individuals are often rejected and avoided by others. They have difficulty learning how to behave in a prosocial manner and so have few prosocial friends and little opportunity to practice conventional social skills. They do poorly in school and so never attain basic math and reading skills. Without these skills, their opportunities for legitimate employment are curtailed. Involvement in crime and delinquency leads to arrests and incarcerations, which further diminish opportunities for success in a conventional lifestyle. Cumulating consequences eventually ensnare the life-course-persistent individual in a deviant lifestyle from which escape becomes ever more difficult as time passes (Moffitt 1997, pp. 21–23).

Like Gottfredson and Hirschi, Moffitt (1997) is not hopeful about the life-course-persistent individual's chances for reform and reintegration into normal life. Her theory assumes that in regard to crime and antisocial behavior, there are a limited number of developmental paths or templates available for individuals to follow. Once a person is set upon one path early in life, there is little possibility that the person will change or develop in a different way. Her theory differs from low self-control theory in that she asserts that biological and genetic conditions play an important role in influencing developmental trajectories.

III. Social Development and Crime: Hawkins and Catalano's Theory

David Hawkins, Richard Catalano, and their colleagues in the School of Social Work at the University of Washington designed their social development theory specifically to guide the creation of the Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP). Reflecting their background in social work, the SSDP was an early prevention intervention, with a research component, implemented in elementary schools that served high crime areas (Hawkins et al. 2007). It sought to target a variety of social factors in the individual youths, in their homes, and in their classrooms (Hawkins et al. 2007). Social-development theory was designed by identifying protective factors that promote prosocial development and thus sought to explain both prosocial and antisocial development (for a thorough review, see Catalano and Hawkins 1996).

Social development theory specifies how protective factors and risk factors interact to encourage either prosocial or antisocial development (Hawkins et al. 2007). It suggests that as individuals socially develop from early childhood to adolescence, prosocial and antisocial influences have a cumulative effect on behavioral tendencies. As its name suggests, the theory is *developmental*, arguing that youngsters take one of two possible pathways: prosocial or antisocial. Also as its name suggests, the causal factors are seen as primarily *social*, which means that youths on the antisocial pathway can be saved if exposed to a new set of social experiences. This is unlike the more dismal views of self-control theory and Moffitt's taxonomy perspective that locate antisocial propensities in more resistant individual traits.

Social development theory is an integrated perspective, drawing ideas mainly from social bond theory and differential association/social learning theory. According to this model, individuals are presented with opportunities to engage in various activities and to interact with certain people. If individuals have the skills to participate with others, they are positively reinforced. They then form attachments or bonds to these people. These bonds are a conduit for embracing moral beliefs, which then direct behavioral choices (Catalano et al. 2005).

This sequence characterizes both the prosocial and antisocial developmental pathways. Youths on the prosocial trajectory have opportunities to develop prosocial associations. If they are skilled, they are reinforced during these interactions (e.g., praised, accepted by peers) and form bonds to prosocial others. They come to believe in the conventional moral order and thus engage in conventional conduct. By contrast, some youngsters have access to antisocial opportunities for interaction. Again, if skilled in these engagements, they are positively reinforced, develop close social bonds with deviant others, and thus internalize antisocial values. The result is antisocial behavior.

Importantly, most theories do not include the variable of "skills for interaction" (Catalano et al. 2005). This is a key insight because it means that simple exposure to prosocial influences may not ensure a healthy social development if youngsters lack the skills to interact with prosocial peers and succeed in school. Youths lacking effective social and emotional skills thus risk rejection and failure and might then seek out antisocial peers.

A critical issue is what determines why, early in life, some youngsters are presented with an abundance of prosocial opportunities whereas others have easy access to antisocial opportunities. The causal model proposed by social development theory specifies three "exogenous" factors that push children in one direction or another. The first is position in the social structure, which places youngsters in contexts that provide differential opportunity (e.g., an inner city marked by concentrated disadvantage versus an affluent neighborhood). The second factor is captured by the construct of external constraints. By this, Hawkins and colleagues mean the extent to which youths confront laws, norms, and expectations that promote prosocial conduct. Prosocial constraints might be more available in middle-class areas, but they can flourish as well within families and classrooms within at-risk communities. This is why interventions that improve parental and

classroom management skills can foster prosocial behavior. The third factor is termed individual constitutional factors, such as hyperactivity and difficult temperament. Youths with these traits are, without intervention, less likely to be successful in prosocial interactions and find more reinforcement and attractive bonds from antisocial peers (Catalano et al. 2005; Hawkins et al. 2003; Hawkins et al. 2007).

Finally, social development theory is dynamic, not static. It assumes that development is ongoing and that what happens at one life stage affects what happens at later stages. In particular, the model proposes a "recursive process in which behavioral outcomes at each age affect developmental trajectories by affecting the subsequent opportunities encountered by the individual" (Hawkins et al. 2003, p. 274). In this way, antisocial behavior tends to trap youngsters on an antisocial pathway where they will stay unless an intervention is forthcoming.

In this regard, based on social development theory, SSDP was implemented to encourage the exposure of youths to protective factors and to discourage the exposure of youths to risk factors. Social development theory suggests that prosocial development is affected by individual, family, and school-based factors. As a result, the intervention provided social and emotional skill development programming for children, child behavioral management training programming for parents, and classroom instruction and management programming for teachers (Hawkins et al. 2007). The intervention's evaluation employed a longitudinal panel design, which was able to track youths on a variety of social development factors throughout the course of their lives. The evaluation research has shown that youths who received the full treatment from the intervention were more likely to score higher on measures of prosocial development and to score lower on measures of antisocial development at many stages in the study, including during the intervention (age 12) and years after the intervention ended (ages 18 and 21) (see Hawkins, Von Cleve, and Catalano 1991; Hawkins et al. 1999; Hawkins et al. 2005).

IV. Explaining Criminal Tendencies and Criminal Events: Farrington's Integrated Cognitive Antisocial Potential Theory

As the long-term director of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development and investigator of criminal careers, David Farrington developed a broad and deep knowledge of criminogenic risk factors and how they cause wayward behavior (Farrington 2003). With this empirical knowledge, he finally ventured forth to formulate a developmental/life-course theory, which he calls an Integrated Cognitive Antisocial Potential Theory (IACP Theory) (Farrington 2005a). The Cambridge Study allowed Farrington to examine the development of delinquency in a sample

of 411 males from South London for 40 years. In the process, Farrington became interested in the identification and measurement of a variety of short- and long-term influences of delinquency (for a review, see Farrington 2003).

Farrington (1996) developed his theory in an integrative fashion in order to explain the risk factors that had been shown to have the most support in explaining crime and criminal behavior. Incorporating concepts from social learning theory, cognitive theory, strain theory, several control theories, labeling theory, and routine activity theory, Farrington (1996) sought to explain the causation of both crime and criminals. The empirically established risk factors (Farrington 2003) can be categorized into one of two types: first, long-term risk factors that encouraged the development of criminal tendencies; and, second, short-term environmental risk factors that immediately encourage criminal events.

Farrington (2005a) suggested that to adequately explain criminal behavior, it is necessary to address two different questions: (1) "Why do people become criminals?"; (2) "Why do people commit offenses?" (Farrington 2005a, p. 73). That is, the explanation of criminal behavior must be concerned with the interactions between individual long-term developmental tendencies and short-term environmental factors. Similar to other life-course research, Farrington's theory focuses on how stable characteristics between individuals and short-term characteristics within individuals interact to produce crime (see, e.g., Horney, Osgood, and Marshall 1995).

Long-term risk factors are those that are related to the development of stable, individual differences in the likelihood to offend. These factors can be categorized as energizing, modeling, and socialization. Energizing factors—such as desires for material items, status, excitement, or sexual activity—produce drives that can be satisfied in an antisocial manner. Farrington (2005a) suggested that antisocial role models also are a factor in producing antisocial tendencies because they model and reinforce the antisocial means of meeting their energizing drives. Socialization is thought to discourage antisocial behavior by producing attachments to prosocial parents and developing self-control with the consistent use of discipline (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990; Sampson and Laub 1993). The failure to develop prosocial attachments or forming attachments to antisocial individuals thus encourages long-term antisocial development.

Criminologists have noted that although there are individual differences in long-term criminal tendencies, even the highest risk criminals are not engaging in crime all of the time (see Horney, Osgood, and Marshall 1995). Instead, each individual criminal interacts with short-term changes in their environment that provide opportunities and incentives to offend. These immediate environmental influences thus encourage the onset of a specific criminal event. Farrington's ICAP theory seeks to explain how criminal tendencies interact with these short-term environmental influences to produce crime.

Short-term energizing factors include anger, boredom, frustration, and intoxication. These factors produce immediate pressure (or strain) to engage in antisocial behavior. Being in environments that expose individuals to antisocial opportunities is considered a product of the routine activities of criminals (e.g., partying, drug

use) and is viewed as encouraging criminal behavior in the short term. An individual's cognitive thought process is important because it works to moderate the impact of the environment on criminal behavior. That is, when provided with a drive and opportunity to engage in crime, individuals' cognitive ability is related to how they interpret the positive and negative consequences for their actions. Finally, if individuals are rewarded for their antisocial behavior, their attitudes regarding rewards and punishment for the act could become more favorable toward the criminal act, thus encouraging future criminal behavior (Farrington 2005*a*).

Notably, Farrington has written a fair amount regarding how his theory can be used to prevent criminals and crime (for a review, see Farrington 1996). Not surprisingly, the interventions he suggests can be divided into two categories: first, early interventions that work to discourage the development of criminal tendencies; and, second, interventions that target individuals who have developed criminal tendencies and attempts to discourage them from engaging in criminal acts in the short term. Early interventions, such as prenatal nursing care, parental management classes, and early intellectual enrichment, target at-risk youth and seek to discourage the development of an individual who is predisposed to engage in antisocial behavior (Farrington and Welsh 2007). In the short term, situational crime prevention strategies and community mobilization seek to increase guardians and reduce the opportunities that provide incentives to engage in criminal behavior.

In sum, by focusing on both long-term and short-term causes of criminal behavior, Farrington's (2005*a*) ICAP theory seeks to explain the development of both criminal individuals and criminal events. He proposes that an individual's criminal tendencies are developed over time and interact with short-term environmental factors to produce criminal behavior. His theory suggests that crime can be prevented by discouraging the development of criminal tendencies and by using situational crime-prevention approaches to reduce the likelihood that criminal individuals will engage in crime.

V. Making Matters Worse: Labeling Theory

In the 1970s, labeling theory emerged as a leading explanation for criminal behavior. When people break the law, it seems logical to arrest them, to stigmatize them as an "offender," and to punish them by placing them behind bars. In fact, this is the central premise of deterrence theory—that inflicting such pain would teach offenders that crime does not pay and make them avoid illegal conduct in the future. Labeling theory, however, challenged this commonsense idea. The perspective made the provocative claim that pulling offenders deep into the criminal justice system had the unanticipated consequence of increasing their criminal propensities. In fact, publicly labeling and treating people as serious offenders only served to stabilize their

involvement in crime and to create career criminals. As Edwin Lemert (1951) argued, societal reaction could transform potentially transitory, unorganized "primary deviance" into stable, organized "secondary deviance." Importantly, because the labeling perspective appeared well before the advent of formal developmental and life-course theories, it has not often been conceptualized as contributing to our current understanding of how offenders' criminality becomes stabilized. This blind spot is unfortunate because it has led most current life-course and developmental theories to ignore or downplay the role of criminal justice intervention in further entrapping offenders in a criminal trajectory.

Labeling theorists demarcated how state intervention might make matters worse—how it might, like taking the wrong medicine, have iatrogenic effects. For this reason, they called for a policy of "radical non-intervention" (Schur 1973). In essence, they argued that labeling places people on an antisocial pathway on which their exposure to risk factors for crime is increased, not decreased. Thus, when stigmatized and treated by everyone as an offender, individuals will internalize this negative identity, make it part of their self-concept, and then shape their behavior to be consistent with it. Further, especially when imprisoned, offenders are forced into contexts where they interact with other criminals, are cut off from bonds to family and conventional society, and experience social rejection and difficulty finding employment when reentering the community as an "ex-offender" (see also Pager 2007). Any thoughts that crime should be avoided because it does not pay are overwhelmed by the daily realities of public humiliation, social exclusion, and forces pushing them toward rather than away from criminal associations.

Labeling theory lost much of its appeal when it became apparent that people could embark on a criminal career well before being detected and sanctioned by the criminal justice system. If so, then it seemed that the sources of crime lay more fully in other social experiences, including dysfunctional families, delinquent peers, and disorganized or inequitable communities. Further, it was apparent that legal sanctions did not always make offenders more criminal; the empirical research on this issue was unclear. But these observations were taken too far at times. However true, they did not mean that criminal justice labeling is not implicated in stabilizing criminal involvement, at least under some circumstances (Palamara, Cullen, and Gersten 1986).

In this regard, John Braithwaite (1989) has proposed that when offenders are shamed in a reintegrative way—when their bad acts are condemned but they are welcomed back into the community—their criminal involvement lessens. However, stigmatizing shaming—when offenders are condemned and excluded from the community—leads to more crime. Similarly, Lawrence Sherman (1993) notes that criminal sanctions foster defiance and more offending when individuals, with few existing bonds to society, perceive that they are treated unjustly and with disrespect by criminal justice officials. Finally, Don Andrews and James Bonta (2010) reveal that high-quality correctional rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism, but that punitive programs, especially when applied to low-risk offenders, produce high rates of reoffending (see also Cullen and Jonson forthcoming).

Perhaps most important, recent research has reported results supporting the labeling theory claim that justice system processing increases, rather than decreases, criminal involvement (see, e.g., Bernburg and Krohn 2003; Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera 2006; Chiricos et al. 2007). In particular, several longitudinal studies have shown that imprisonment has a criminogenic rather than a deterrent effect (Spohn and Holleran 2002; Nieuwbeerta, Nagin, and Blokland 2009; see also Nagin, Cullen, and Jonson 2009). Although this finding is typically ignored in summaries of their theory, Sampson and Laub (1993) found that imprisonment increased offending by attenuating offenders' bonds to conventional society. Given the high rate of incarceration in the United States—with approximately 2.4 million offenders behind bars on any given day—the effects of imprisonment and other forms of criminal justice labeling thus clearly warrant consideration. Phrased differently, no understanding of the development of offending over the life course will be complete unless the effects of criminal justice processing—a common experience for most persistent offenders—are systematically taken into account.

VI. Trapped in Crime: Hagan's Theory of Criminal Embeddedness

John Hagan has constructed a developmental theory of street crime in America (Hagan 1991, 1997). His theory is distinguished from most others in the life-course perspective by its explicit emphasis on historically based macro social and economic processes, most notably what he calls "capital disinvestment." Capital disinvestment is something that happened to minority communities and neighborhoods over the course of the latter half of the 20th century.

According to Hagan (1997), in the 1970s the American economy began to slow down after a long period of postwar expansion. During this slowdown, core manufacturing jobs in auto plants and steel mills began to disappear from American cities in the Northeast and Midwest. Jobs in manufacturing had provided a means of economic advancement for African Americans and other minorities. Although the economy eventually created new jobs, these jobs were located in rural and suburban areas where African Americans were not welcome. Policies of residential segregation made it difficult for African Americans to leave inner-city neighborhoods and move to the suburbs, where the economy's new jobs were being created (Hagan 1997, p. 290). Young minority males and females were, in effect, trapped in communities in which there were few opportunities in the legitimate economy (Wilson 1987).

In addition to being located in areas from which African Americans were segregated, the economy's new jobs increasingly required advanced education and high-level technical skills. It was not easy for African Americans to fulfill these requirements. Opposition to affirmative action laws gained strength during the

last quarter of the century and restricted the access of African Americans to col-
lege and to good jobs in the legitimate economy. Racial differentials in earnings
and educational achievement, which had been declining, began to grow again.
Race-linked inequality became worse after the mid-1970s. According to Hagan,
the rise in racial inequality led to feelings of "resentment, frustration, hopeless-
ness, and aggression" in America's minority youths (Hagan 1997, p. 291).

Residential segregation and racial inequality combined to create hyper-ghettos.
In hyper-ghettos, poverty is extreme and extensive. People who are lucky enough to
have good jobs and a little money leave as quickly as they can. Only the most disad-
vantaged and discouraged are left behind. As a result, poverty is concentrated in
hyper-ghettos, and the variation in economic resources becomes extremely narrow.
Everyone is poor and everyone must struggle to survive.

The processes of capital disinvestment led communities to develop alternative
forms of economic organization, called "forms of recapitalization" (Hagan 1997,
p. 296). By recapitalization, Hagan means that communities attempt to organize
whatever resources are available so that they can be used to help community mem-
bers achieve their goals. Often, according to Hagan, the only economic resources
that disadvantaged communities have at their disposal are illicit. They can offer the
outside world something that is not available via the conventional economy. They
can offer access to illegal services and commodities, such as prostitution, gam-
bling, and especially narcotic drugs. These communities become deviance service
centers for conventional society, places where illicit services and commodities are
provided for a price.

Young people who live in disadvantaged communities are drawn to the prom-
ise of the deviance service industry. In their eyes, becoming involved in the drug
economy or prostitution is a way to get ahead. It is a means for getting money, fine
clothes, and fancy cars. Jobs in the legitimate economy are not available to them or
to their parents. The prospects of going to college seem dim. The deviance service
industry is the most promising employer around, and so young people lacking
access to legitimate employment take advantage of what is available. They take
positions in the drug economy.

Hagan notes that deviance service centers are not a new urban phenomenon.
Indeed, they have a long history in America. Throughout the 19th and early part of
the 20th century, different ethnic groups used the deviance service industry as a
means of social mobility. Participation in organized crime was a way to acquire the
financial resources necessary to move out of the ghetto and into mainstream so-
ciety. But times have changed, and the deviance service industry is no longer the
mobility ladder it once was. Rather than providing a route out of the ghetto and out
of a life of crime, participation in deviance and vice is more likely to embed young
people in a criminal lifestyle.

The process of criminal embeddedness links the historical community-level
processes of capital disinvestments and recapitalization to the life-course trajec-
tories of individuals. Young people, who become involved in the deviance service
industry, and especially the drug economy, isolate themselves from conventional

employment and educational trajectories. They spend time with other criminals like themselves. Their social contacts are with others in the deviance industry and not with people who might provide access to legitimate employment or who might help them succeed in school. Cutting ties with conventional others is one aspect of criminal embeddedness. The other aspect is the high probability that the individual will eventually be arrested and be officially labeled as a criminal offender. Being labeled a criminal makes it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for young minority males and females to ever find a way out of crime and into the middle class. Their life-course trajectories are set in a downward spiral of cumulating disadvantages from which there is little hope of escape.

Overall, Hagan's theory focuses on how broad changes and patterns in the economy and social structure are linked to the life-course trajectories of individuals. Capital disinvestment has created neighborhoods and communities that have relatively little conventional social or cultural capital. The parents of children who grow up in these communities are not well equipped to help their children develop worthwhile skills. Because the parents do not have strong links to the conventional labor market, they also have few resources to help their children find decent jobs in the legitimate economy. Young people see the deviance service industry as the most promising source of employment. Individuals who succumb to the lures of the deviance industry risk becoming embedded in criminal lifestyles that isolate them from conventional educational and employment trajectories. Their trajectories in crime are characterized by continuity into adulthood. Hagan explains the severity and longevity of the criminal trajectories of urban underclass youth by emphasizing the powerful shaping force of personal and neighborhood social disadvantages. Individual-level differences in personal constitutions do not figure prominently in his theory.

VII. Firming Up Social Bonds: Sampson and Laub's Age-Graded Theory

Robert Sampson and John Laub have advanced an age-graded theory of informal social control to explain trajectories in crime and delinquency (Sampson and Laub 1993; Sampson 1997; Laub, Nagin, and Sampson 1998; Laub and Sampson 2003). As control theorists, Sampson and Laub start with the assumption that delinquency, crime, and deviance are natural. If people are not somehow controlled or prevented from following their natural inclinations, they will tend to behave in ways that society regards as antisocial or criminal. The theory of age-graded informal social control holds that the most important sources of control come from informal bonds between people.

Sampson and Laub argue that at different stages in the life course, individuals are potentially subject to different forms of informal social control. (Again, this is why their theory is *age-graded*.) For children, family and school bonds are important.

Children who are strongly bonded to their parents and who care about school are less likely to be involved in delinquency than children who have difficult relations with their parents or who do not like school. As children move through the life course, the major sources of informal social control change. Parents and school are not as important for young adults as they are for children and teenagers. For young adults, employment and marriage are potential sources of informal control. Informal social controls influence the likelihood and degree of involvement in crime and deviance at all stages of the life course.

Sampson and Laub recognize that ontogenetic differences between individuals—that is, persistent underlying differences in temperament and criminal potential—may account for some of the variation in criminal behavior. But, unlike Moffitt (1993) or Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), they place much less emphasis on the idea of stable differences in criminal propensity. Rather, they stress the importance of strong informal social controls based in family, schools, friends, and employment.

As teenagers move into young adulthood, two factors begin operating that shape adult patterns in crime. First, young adults potentially become subject to new forms of informal social control. These new forms of control include employment and marriage. Individuals who are lucky enough to find good jobs or enter good marriages or both become subjugated to new informal controls. According to Sampson and Laub, exposure to these adult forms of social control can redirect the criminal trajectories of individuals who were seriously delinquent as youths.

But the chances that a seriously delinquent youth will find a good job or marry a supportive spouse are less than ideal because of the second factor that begins operating in adulthood. Youths who are seriously delinquent accumulate disadvantages as they age. These cumulative disadvantages snowball, or pile up, over time, making it increasingly more difficult for the individual to exit from a life of crime. These disadvantages are generated most directly by official sanctions, such as arrest, conviction, and incarceration, which label and stigmatize individuals. Being officially labeled as a serious delinquent dramatically reduces future educational and employment opportunities (Sampson and Laub 1993). The individual runs the risk of becoming trapped in a cycle in which crime leads to failure in conventional activities, which in turn motivates further involvement in crime. Thus, Sampson and Laub hypothesize that there is an interaction between early criminal propensities and societal reactions that influences the adult life chances of delinquent youths. Continuity in criminal behavior is not solely the result of underlying criminal propensities; it also is caused by societal reactions.

There are two distinguishing features of Sampson and Laub's theoretical work. The first is their claim that social processes can cause even serious adult criminals to desist from crime. They argue that even for very committed offenders, change is possible and can occur relatively late in life. Developing adult social bonds to work and family can inhibit adult criminality and deviance (Sampson and Laub 1993; Laub, Nagin, and Sampson 1998). The second distinguishing feature is their use of the concept of "human agency" as an important determinant of trajectories in crime (Laub and Sampson 2003). *Agency* refers to our capacity to exercise control over our

lives. We are agents when we intentionally make things happen by our own actions (Bandura 2001). The principle of human agency holds that "individuals construct their own life course through the choices and actions they take within the opportunities and constraints of history and social circumstances" (Elder 1998, p. 4).

Sampson and Laub argue that even serious adult criminals can exercise agency. They can make changes in their lives, most notably the change of desisting from crime. A change of this sort is most likely to occur when an offender confronts some sort of turning point that provides an opportunity for the individual to redirect his or her life in a prosocial direction. Such a turning point might be finding a supportive partner of the opposite sex, obtaining a satisfying job, joining the military, or simply moving to a different neighborhood. The important thing is that the turning point presents an opportunity for the offender to "knife off" a way of life conducive to crime—that is, to break away from old patterns of behavior and become involved in new, more structured activities. Gradually this change in the structure of the offender's routine activities, coupled with new informal social controls administered by partners or employers, leads the offender away from a life in crime and toward a life of prosocial conformity.

Sampson and Laub argue that change and desistance can happen to almost all offenders and at any point in the life course. The life course is, in their view, much more indeterminate and random than conceptualized in the more developmental theories proposed by Gottfredson and Hirschi and by Moffitt. They oppose the idea that there are only a small number of fixed trajectories that people follow in regard to crime and deviance. As they see it, change, growth, and development are ever-present features of the life course.

VIII. Understanding the Change Process: Cognitive Transformation

Sampson and Laub's insights on human agency as an integral part of the desistance process suggests that, beyond life transformations—such as finding a good spouse or job—something occurs inside an offender's mind that prompts change; that is, somehow a cognitive transformation takes place. The construct of human agency seems too broad and amorphous to capture fully this internal process of rethinking one's life that appears to transpire. Other scholars, however, have begun to unravel what might be involved. Two contributions have proven most persuasive.

In his book *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*, Shadd Maruna (2001) confronted this issue when studying and interviewing 65 offenders and ex-offenders in Liverpool, England. These offenders were the living embodiment of the social development and life-course theories described in this chapter. Facing dismal futures, their lives had been marked by "poverty, child abuse, detachment from the labor force, the stigma of social sanctions, low educational

attainment, few legitimate opportunities in the community, serious addictions and dependencies, high-risk personality profiles, and, of course, long-term patterns of criminal behavior" (2001, p. 55). Maruna's conundrum was that despite virtually identical backgrounds, some interviewees were continuing in crime (as might be expected) but others were not. The risk factors that fostered and sustained their criminal careers thus could not explain this split in the sample. What, then, distinguished desisters from persisters? Maruna's answer was the narratives or "scripts" they used to describe their lives and futures.

According to Maruna, the persistent offenders thought that they were "doomed to deviance" (p. 74). Thus, they conceptualized their fate by embracing a "condemnation script" in which they felt that they were "condemned" to a life in crime by circumstances beyond their control (p. 73). Although not expressing any attraction to crime, they felt that they had no choice but to continue in their criminal careers. By contrast, those who desisted adopted the "rhetoric of redemption" (p. 85). They reinterpreted their lives through a "redemption script" in which previous criminal conduct was not seen as controlling their future. They denied that past bad acts reflected who they were "deep down"; their "real me" or "true self" was as a decent person (pp. 88–89). Previous difficult days in crime were now seen as making them stronger and as giving them a special calling to do good (e.g., to save juveniles now in trouble). They would no longer waste their lives but seek a higher purpose in helping others (p. 99). In short, the redemption script equipped offenders with a "coherent prosocial identity" that enabled them to resist criminal temptations and to "make good" in society (p. 7).

Peggy Giordano, Stephen Cernkovich, and Jennifer Rudolph (2002) were led to a similar conclusion. They interviewed a sample of 210 males and females, now in their late 20s, who they had first studied 13 years before as serious delinquents. Using both self-report and arrest data, they surprisingly did not find, as had Sampson and Laub (1993), that adult social bonds—job stability and attachment to spouse and children—were strong predictors of desistance. Rather, based on their qualitative interview data, Giordano and colleagues observed a more complex picture of desistance. For them, events such as acquiring a good job and marriage are best seen not as inevitable turning points away from crime but as potential "hooks for change" (p. 1000). These prosocial opportunities either can be latched onto or forfeited (e.g., acting badly can cause one to lose a job or a mate). Human agency, as Laub and Sampson (2003) say, is involved, but it is not a mysterious phenomenon. Rather, taking advantage of hooks for change involves a definable process that tends to involve four "types of intimately related cognitive transformations" (p. 1000).

First, the offender must possess a general openness to change. Second, the person must look favorably upon a specific hook for change and see embracing this hook (e.g., a new relationship) as being "fundamentally incompatible with continued deviation" (Giordano, Cernkovich, and Rudolph 2002, p. 1001). Third, the offender must begin to fashion a new conventional identity, what Giordano and colleagues call a "replacement self" (p. 1001). Fourth, the individual must come to see continued wayward conduct negatively. Thus, a "deviant behavior or lifestyle" is

no longer viewed as "positive, viable, or even personally relevant" (p. 1002). In this way, the motivation to deviate vanishes, and the offender's cognitive transformation into a conventional member of society is completed."

Notably, most developmental and life-course theories have been built on data drawn from longitudinal empirical studies that have uncovered the risk factors that contribute to a criminal career. Giordano and colleagues' and Maruna's work suggests, however, that such theories might profit from qualitative projects that seek to illuminate how offenders experience their worlds, in terms of both staying in and finding a way out of their lives in crime.

IX. Conclusion

Developmental and life-course theories of offending have increasingly emerged over the past two decades. It now is clear that no understanding of crime, especially persistent involvement in antisocial conduct, can be achieved without a systematic empirical and theoretical demarcation of how individuals move into and out of crime at different points in their lives (Farrington 2005*b*; Thornberry and Krohn 2003). As seen in this essay, we are fortunate that scholars have furnished a diversity of important clues about the development of criminality over the life course. However, it is perhaps possible to distill a core insight that underlies the broader theoretical paradigm into which these varied contributions fall.

Thus, upon entering this world, children might be said to board a train. For most, they will be passengers on a train that will head out into life on tracks leading to a prosocial destination. Some of these youngsters, especially in adolescence, will detour off this track. But they will have the individual traits, social supports, and prosocial influences to jump back aboard the train. A smaller group of children, however, will not be so fortunate. They will board a train destined for life-course-persistent offending. Often starting while still in the womb, they will be exposed to an array of criminogenic risk factors. They will be burdened with individual traits, such as a lack of self-control, that will make negotiating their lives challenging. They will be raised by parents with poor child-management skills and be enmeshed in communities where criminal influences are ubiquitous and conventional opportunities are scarce. They may travel through the criminal justice system, which may well just deepen their criminality. As their journey proceeds, they will find it difficult to depart their train, which may well have gathered so much momentum as to make escape unthinkable. Eventually, their train will lose speed and they will step off. But by that time, they will have been carried so far into their lives that they will have experienced much harm and, it must be added, done much harm to others.

Of course, any metaphor has its limitations, but the image of a train heading out into a prosocial or antisocial direction in life's beginning stages has its utility. Theoretically, it tells us that the roots of crime potentially extend to childhood and place