

To: Students in CJ Graduate Theories of Crime and Deviance – Fall 2008

FROM: R. B. Taylor

DATE: 10/26/08

RE: Feedback on first in-class exam

This memo contains several things.

First, immediately below is the scheme for translating the number grades you will receive into letter grades. In case no one has told you, we will be talking about the different grading schemes used in graduate school. **I have set up a Wiki on Bboard if you want to make appts. to talk this week – sign up.**

90.6	A
86.2	A-
82.2	B+/A-
81.6	B+/A-
80.4	B+/A-
80	B+/A-
79.8	B++
79.8	B++
79.6	B++
76.8	B+
72.6	B
63	C
58.4	C -

Immediately below follow keyed comments – the numbers for these comments may appear on your exams when they are returned.

We can talk about specific points if/as you wish

#### QUESTION 1

Numbers referred to below should be cross referenced with numbers placed on your exam.

1. In discussing Weisburd model, your answer conflates two different aspects of social position – relative status in the broader society, and relative status of their position in the society. It is important to keep these distinct because they have different impacts. Social status refers to position in society. Social class to position within organization. See p. 78
2. Fastow's position in organization denoted high social class – he became CFO. Whether his social status facilitated that, per Weisburd's model, is an interesting question you need to carefully approach. Fastow had high status in terms of dollars earned, but not in terms of the prestige of his college attended.
3. Here your answer needs to give the reader a clear, summative picture of how the processes linked to proposed theory actually explain why specific things happen.
4. LSC needs to be defined.
5. Need clearer argument and/or evidence that Fastow and/or Skillings had LSC
6. Discussion of opportunity structure in Enron case leaves out important issues about regulatory controls within and especially outside of the company.
7. A stronger answer would have defined opportunity.

8. Stronger answer would have talked about assumptions.
9. You mention some of the relevant external (lax) regulatory climate – a stronger answer would have mentioned more.
10. Discussion of opportunity within G&H makes it sound like opportunity is ALL perceived. Certainly, different LSC people evaluate the same opportunity differently but there must be some degree of opportunity PRESENT – opp structure has an existence outside the potential offender's head as well as inside.
11. Discussion of Valhalla mixes up two separate issues – profit shifting, and taking an overly risky position on future trades. Need to be clearer about the specifics of the case.
12. Answer was not completely clear about which dependent variable was being explained
13. The use of the term organizational complexity here makes it sound like it is an attribute of white collar crime and not street crime. Rather, what Weisburd et al suggest is that it can be a characteristic, to VARYING degrees, of different white collar crimes. It is not a categorical attribute, but rather something that is a variable attribute.
14. Definition of harm is incomplete – see 134 in Weisburd et al.
15. Answer in places seems to go back and forth somewhat, in terms of what is the dependent variable being explained – THAT the accounting fraud took place, or the degree.
16. G&H see crime acts as a subset of much broader deviant acts. So although all crimes come under the category of deviant acts, not all deviant acts are crimes.

### QUESTION 3

17. The way the alternate models are described does not align cleanly with the conceptual models presented by H on pp. 152-155.
18. A stronger answer would have more clearly described Hirschi's data sources – who got asked what when and how?
19. The three most relevant and most key results are missed or not stated correctly: n of delinquent peers and stakes in conformity both have independent impacts on delinquency outcome, and high stakes boys less likely to have delinquent friends and, finally, influence of delinquent peers is weaker on high stakes boys – 156 – 158.

### QUESTION 2

20. A stronger answer also would have talked about the emotional entrainment among the beating victims. As they were pursued they probably knew they were doomed and there was nothing they could do about it. Leading to emotional collapse.
21. A stronger answer would have clearly defined confrontational tension.
22. A stronger answer would have given a clear definition of forward panic.
23. A stronger answer would have more clearly highlighted that the nature of the violence is inherent in the situation.
24. A stronger answer would have better highlighted how macro-structural dominance patterns get transferred to and played out in micro-level situational dynamics.
25. Answer needs more description of data sources.
26. It is not only about the factors leading up to the situation, it is about how the situation unfolds in very specific terms.
27. Answer misses that the reason forward panic occurs following confrontational tension is that suddenly what had been a balanced power situation becomes asymmetric.

Details on the scoring schemes for the three different questions appear on the following pages.

# QUESTION 1

## Grading Rubric

SECTION: Clarity of assumptions for models

Points	Total possible
--------	----------------

Stated for one model, but only vaguely	Stated for two models, but only vaguely	Moderate clarity for assumptions of at least one model	Moderate clarity for assumptions of both models	Clearly stated, both models
2	4	6	8	10

30	10
80	30

SECTION: Definition of key concepts and processes

Some definition for one theory,		Clear for one theory, vague for another OR moderately clear for both		Both clear for both theories
5	10	15	20	30

SECTION: Evidentiary base: Description clear, complete

Evidence described a little for one theory, no mention of second	Some mention for BOTH theories but both descriptions vague or flawed	Only moderately clear and complete for both theories	Clear, correct, and complete for one theory, not clear or not completely clear for the other	Clear, correct, and complete for both theories	
1	3	5	8	10	

27	10
----	----

SECTION: Application to case study

At least ONE theory applied but either the connections are not clear or do not make for a sensible application; no mention of second theory	At least ONE theory applied and the connections make SOME sense although the connections or the nature of the relevance or the case feature are vague	SOME connections made for BOTH theories but there are serious flaws with how one of the theories is understood or applied	Concepts and processes for BOTH theories correctly & applied; applications make SOME sense theoretically and in terms of the case study	Concepts and processes for BOTH theories correctly & clearly applied in a way that makes sense theoretically and in terms of the case study	
10	20	30	40	50	

150	50
-----	----

SECTION: Overall quality - 1 extra point for each

Quality of reflection about connections between data and broader conceptual points	Discussion clearly points back to specific features of theory and case	Overall: organization of the answer	Overall: quality of writing	Overall: clarity of argument
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

0	5
---	---

## QUESTION 2

### Grading Rubric

#### SECTION: (a) Key elements - Collins' model

Not included	Included, but vague and/or more incorrect than correct	Mostly correct, some errors and/or some imprecision	Clear & Correct, not complete	Clear, correct, complete
0	6	10	12	15

Points	Total possible
--------	----------------

#### SECTION: (b) description of evidence base

Not included	Included, but vague and/or more incorrect than correct	Mostly correct, some errors and/or some imprecision	Clear & Correct, not complete	Clear, correct, complete
0	6	10	12	15

#### SECTION: (c) Key assumptions

Missing	Included but mostly vague and/or incorrect		Mostly correct but still some errors and/or fuzziness	Clear, correct, complete	
0	5	□	8	10	

#### SECTION: Application to case study

One or both entrainment loops applied, but application is largely incorrect and/or description is too vague		Only one entrainment loop clearly described and applied		Both entrainment loops correctly described and applied	
25	□	40	□	50	

#### SECTION: Answer to prediction question (check as many as apply)

Clear position taken	Strong and cogent argument	Answer is organized and logically coherent	Argument clearly supports position	
2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	

43	15
43	15
0	10
115	50
0	10