


# Has Criminology Awakened From Its “Androcentric Slumber”?

Feminist Criminology  
2016, Vol. 11(4) 334–353  
© The Author(s) 2016  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1557085116660437  
fcx.sagepub.com  


**Kimberly J. Cook<sup>1</sup>**

## **Abstract**

This is a decades-old question. In 1988, Daly and Chesney-Lind suggested that criminology was awakening from its “androcentric slumber” thanks to feminist critiques. This article looks at the history of criminology in terms of when gender analysis was or was not introduced; in particular, a series of “missed opportunities” concerning gender are explored the work of Sutherland and that of Cohen, Sampson, and others. In some of this classical criminological scholarship, gender was initially identified as a major cause of crime but thereafter overlooked. The article also analyzes how critical criminologists continued to under-emphasize the importance of gender despite advancing the discipline through significant examinations of social inequalities and crime. The article also turns to contemporary challenges to the mainstream that emerged from later critical and feminist criminologists who have proffered innovative advances about gender and intersectional analyses regarding crime. The article concludes with thoughts about moving feminist criminology forward toward a more intellectually diverse and complete discipline.

## **Keywords**

feminist criminology, gender and crime, intersectionality and crime, critical criminology

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this article is to trace some of the foundations and impacts of feminist criminology within the field. Doing so is prompted by two factors: the 30th anniversary of the American Society of Criminology (ASC; [www.asc41.com](http://www.asc41.com)) Division on

---

<sup>1</sup>University of North Carolina Wilmington, USA

### **Corresponding Author:**

Kimberly J. Cook, University of North Carolina Wilmington, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, NC 28403, USA.

Email: [cookk@uncw.edu](mailto:cookk@uncw.edu)

Women and Crime (DWC; <http://ascdwc.com>), and the 10th anniversary of our journal *Feminist Criminology*. Others have documented the history of the DWC (Rasche, 2014), and during the 2014 conference, many special sessions were devoted to our 30th anniversary. One of the crowning achievements of the DWC (so far) is our journal launched in 2006 with its focus on feminist research within criminology. I have been active in the ASC/DWC since 1989 and have served on many committees as an officer of the DWC since that time. Feminist criminology has been largely motivated by the acknowledgment that gendered analyses of crime is vitally important to the field, and that sexism influences social life in ways that are nuanced, complex, and enduring. We are also motivated to produce knowledge that can be used to inform policy and practice related to violence against women and girls, incarcerated women and girls, gendered injustices throughout society, and impacts related to broad social policies that contribute to the oppression of women and girls. In addition, more recently, feminist criminologists have been much more explicit about examining the specific complexities of sexism and racism as companions of social inequalities overall.

The feminist critique offered here emerges from an exploration of missed opportunities within criminology to analyze gender and crime, and a marriage-of-sorts between criminology's exploration of the impacts of socioeconomic oppressions and non-dualistic feminist epistemologies (Collins, 1991). This exploration claims in effect: "Yes, social class inequality is certainly important, *and* let's also expand our scope of concern to gender inequalities, racialized inequalities, and inequalities based on sexual orientation." Conventional quantitative criminology is deeply invested in large datasets that help to measure the impacts of theoretically framed independent variables on dependent variables while controlling for multiple other independent variables. Conventional approaches have much to offer and still have a long way to go when it comes to analyzing how gender, race, social class, and heteronormativity impact crime. Rather than ask if gender, race, class, or other social characteristics are more important, feminist criminologists have been saying "yes, and . . ." to these findings. Yes, it is important to study social class and crime *and* we need to expand our conceptualizations of crime to more fully so as to examine gender, race, socioeconomic class, heteronormativity, and their impacts on crime. This article offers a reflection on lost chances and an appreciation for the emergence of feminist intersectional criminology. It is also a plea for continuing to expand our analysis of these social dynamics in criminology. As the field evolves, the *yes/and* scholars push the research into new directions that interrogate and illuminate complex impacts on crime and crime control.

### *Criminological Theory on Gender and Crime: A History of Missed Opportunities*

When Edwin Sutherland first defined criminology in 1924 as the study of law-making, law-breaking, and social reaction to it (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974), criminology was already established through the work of classical scholars mainly concerned with

the techniques of control and punishment (Garland, 1990). Main arenas of concern included how to punish men to dissuade them from committing crime (deterrence theory from Beccaria and Bentham; Beirne, 1993). Early scholars focused almost exclusively on men as criminals and as inmates, and it was—and in some cases remains—taken for granted that men and boys were the objects of study in most generalizable criminological research. Yet this empirical pattern alone has rarely been interrogated. Problems of gendered and racialized patterns of criminal offending have been apparent from the start of the discipline but, until the emergence of feminist criminology, were rarely analyzed as conceptual subjects in and of themselves. Sutherland and Cressey (1974) offer their view on the “sex ratio” of criminal offending:

. . . no other trait has as great a statistical importance as does sex in differentiating criminals from noncriminals. But no one feels that he [*sic*] has an explanation of criminality when he learns that the criminal is male. . . The variations in the sex ratio in crime are so great that it can be concluded that maleness is *not* significant in the causation of crime in itself but only as it indicates social position, supervision, and other social relations. Moreover, since boys and girls live in the same homes, in equal poverty, and with equally ignorant parents, and live in the same neighborhoods, which are equally lacking in facilities for organized recreation, these conditions of the social environment *cannot* be considered causes of delinquency. . . Probably the most important difference is that girls are supervised more carefully and behave in accordance with anti-criminal behavior patterns taught to them with greater care and consistency than in the case of boys. (pp. 129-130, emphasis added)

Their explanation for this sex ratio difference is found in gendered familial supervision strategies of parents. And so, with the stroke of the pen, Sutherland and Cressey proclaim that the leading predictor of crime is inconsequential to understanding the causes of crime, and amputated gender from serious consideration by the scholarly community for decades to come.

They were more inclined to acknowledge that racial bias exists within the crime control apparatus in the United States:

Numerous studies have shown that African-Americans are more likely to be arrested, indicted, convicted, and committed to an institution than are whites who commit the same offenses, and many other studies have shown that blacks have a poorer chance than whites to receive probation, a suspended sentence, parole, commutation of a death sentence, or pardon. (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974, p. 133)

They continued with a review of research findings on racial bias as it relates to Black Americans, including reference to a study from which they concluded that in “urban Negro communities the problems of divergent mores, real or assumed, are most apparent at the police level” (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974, p. 134). They go on to examine official crime statistics relating to “White, Negro, Indian, Chinese, and Japanese” people who were arrested. And, finally, they offer cross-tabulations of arrest rates by

race and gender. About these trends, Sutherland and Cressey (1974) argue that “they can be explained only by social interaction. The specific theory of social interaction which explains these racial ratios in crime has not been determined” (p. 140).

Taking those social interactions more seriously, for example, let us turn to the classic study *Delinquent Boys* by Albert Cohen (1955). As evidenced by its title, Cohen understood that he was examining delinquency among urban boys—not girls, not women—and, yet, he did not take issues of gender *qua* gender as serious contributing factors affecting the crime experiences of these boys. We can applaud his sensitivity to the social class issues associated with boys’ delinquency (particularly the “middle-class measuring rod”) and regret that criminology did not benefit as much from his intellect where masculinity is concerned. When gender rose to the level of his concern, he wrote,

Social class status, we observed, is a status position shared by members of a family; that, in turn, is determined primarily by the lineage, wealth, personal qualities and, above all, the occupational achievement of the husband and father. . . The wife and children, by improper behavior, can seriously “reflect on the family” and thus deprive it of some of the status to which it might otherwise be entitled. . . Furthermore, it is the male who carries the largest share of the *moral responsibility* for his family’s status. His wife and children may feel shame if the family’s position falls because of the father’s unemployment, business failure, or other occupational or financial reverses, but the “fault” is likely to be imputed to the father and the burden of guilt to rest most heavily on him. . . The woman has more to gain by “marrying up” and more to lose by “marrying down.” (Cohen, 1955, p. 141)<sup>1</sup>

Cohen alludes to aspects of ethnic backgrounds as examples of “subcultures” but does not fully employ the concepts associated with racial inequality to examine boys’ delinquency. Early in the book, Cohen (1955) writes that “the contrasting ways of Hindus, Chinese and Navahos are for the most part a matter of indoctrination into a different culture” (p. 12). It is within subcultures then that, according to Cohen (1955), “boys’ gangs flourish most conspicuously in [] our larger American cities . . .” (p. 13). From there, he moves on to social class differences and his famous exploration of the “middle-class measuring rod”:

Systematic class-linked differences in the ability to achieve will relegate to the bottom of the status pyramid those children belonging to the most disadvantaged classes, not by virtue of their position as such but by virtue of their lack of the requisite personal qualifications resulting from their class-linked handicaps. (Cohen, 1955, p. 86)

Cohen’s contributions are classics in the field, and he deserves a great deal of credit for exploring the impacts of social inequalities on the problem of juvenile crime. It is from this platform that he created a perspective that later generations of scholars would continue to shape, particularly within the broader area of critical criminology. Still, while Cohen’s focus was adolescent boys, gender and race as contributing social conditions in and of themselves were not central to his analysis, resulting in another

missed opportunity. Similar points could be made regarding other classics in criminology (i.e., Shaw & McKay, 1942; Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918/1974), though it is beyond the capacity of this article to fully document this theme in those works.

### *Mainstream Contemporary Criminology*

I focus now on two types of mainstream criminological theory as illustrated in the books *A General Theory of Crime* (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) and *Lifecourse Theory* (Sampson & Laub, 1993). Both claim to offer generalizable explanations of criminal offending. My rationale for exploring these two stems from an empirical trend I have observed anecdotally and statistically over 22 years as a faculty member with experience in hiring (including 10 as a chair), and over 27 years attending ASC conferences, hundreds of dissertation titles, conference presentations, and papers have been written by scholars concerned with control and lifecourse theories. In this context, *A General Theory of Crime* is arguably influential indeed for empirical research, having inspired quantitative analyses frequently used in doctoral dissertations and published research. Furthermore, one could contend that this theoretical orientation has attracted funding central for doctoral training in criminology. Searching online produces over 177,000 scholarly articles and 57 books associated with *A General Theory of Crime*.<sup>2</sup> Second, I consider lifecourse theory as another important perspective within mainstream criminology that has provided rich analyses of crime causation over a lifetime. Here, a quick search online produces more than 600 scholarly articles and two books related to “lifecourse theory of crime.” Both theoretical traditions document that men/boys are most actively engaged in criminal offending, but neither digs deeply into gender as an analytical frame. Another scholar may have chosen different traditions to explore for equally valid reasons.

In the preface to their book, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) pose the question “why are men, adolescents, and minorities more likely than their counterparts to commit criminal acts?” (p. xvi). Clearly this indicates that the examination presented incorporates gender and race, in addition to age, which has been this theory’s most enduring contribution. They broaden the conception of crime beyond the legalistic definition to include “acts of force or fraud undertaken in pursuit of pleasure” (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990, p. 15). Operationalizing these forms of force and fraud revolves largely around the standard Uniform Crime Report’s conception of conventional crime: burglary, robbery, homicide, rape, and embezzlement; it also includes white-collar crime and substance abuse-related crimes. Criminality arises as a consequence of “low self-control,” and people with low self-control are more likely to be “versatile” in their criminality where “offenders commit a wide variety of criminal acts” instead of “specializing” in specific types of crimes (p. 91). According to Gottfredson and Hirschi, “ineffective child-rearing” is the main cause of low self-control and includes parental failures to monitor, recognize, and punish deviant behavior (p. 97). Ultimately, they argue that “single-parent families” are “among the most powerful predictors of crime rates” (p. 103). They point out that the single parent “(usually a woman)” (p. 104) is less able to monitor, recognize, and punish deviant behavior. Observing gendered

patterns of criminal offending, they write that “men are always and everywhere more likely than women to commit criminal acts” (p. 143), and ultimately they imply that women, especially single mothers, are responsible for the problem while not excavating these patterns. As for race/ethnic patterns associated with criminal offending, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) dispute the “inequality thesis” (p. 152) and argue that race and crime is also a consequence of low self-control rather than merely a consequence of system bias or social discrimination; they contend this is a “fruitless” effort (p. 153).

Gottfredson and Hirschi perpetuate androcentric conceptions within criminology (Potter, 2015). Potter (2015) documents that Gottfredson and Hirschi “did not consider differential socioeconomic effects and cultural, racial, or religious dynamics” contributing to crime and therefore the analysis they present “appears to be based on . . . a colonialist, White, middle-class framework” (p. 92). Consequently, they dismiss volumes of criminological research documenting that gender is the leading predictor of crime (Braithwaite, 1989; Flavin, 2001). Like Sutherland and Cressy, and Cohen, again, they miss (or ignore) another important opportunity to advance our understanding of gender and crime.

Sampson and Laub (1993) present a highly regarded mainstream criminological exploration of crime; they use rich longitudinal data from the famous Glueck and Glueck studies of juvenile delinquency among males. A quick scan of the index indicates that issues of gender and crime do not factor into their main points as there are no entries for the following concepts: sex or sex ratio, gender, masculinity, males, females, or femininity. Similarly, race and ethnicity include merely three page references in the index. Sampson and Laub (1993) conduct extensive follow-up interviews with the Gluecks’s original participants and document experiences of crime throughout their lives. Employing lessons from Hirschi’s original social bond theory, particularly as it relates to the observed patterns associated with age and crime, Sampson and Laub are mainly interested in how crime continues to impact their lives, and advance the field by documenting long-term consequences. Their exploration of these men’s life histories offers a significant methodological contribution to the field that should not be overlooked. But, as one reads their analysis, it is obvious that the men are “gendered beings” even if the scholars themselves do not interrogate this meaning. For instance, in the case of Candil, Sampson and Laub document Candil’s violent behavior toward his wife. They write that the

source of the trouble appeared to be that the subject drank excessively, which led to much arguing in the home. . . He accused his wife of being a “tramp” when he married her . . . the marital relationship involved a fair share of bickering and arguing and was marked by temporary separations, neglect, and assault. (Sampson & Laub, 1993, p. 208)

By claiming that the source of the violence was from excessive alcohol use, the authors missed an opportunity to explore the facets of masculinity that, by 1993, had been well documented in the research on violence against women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Martin, 1976; Pizzey, 1977), and after the “drunken-bum” theory of violence against women had been debunked (Kantor & Straus, 1987).

As for racial/ethnic patterns associated with their (White) subjects' experiences with crime, Sampson and Laub (1993) argue that

the Glueck data allow us to discuss crime in a "deracialized" and, we hope, depoliticized context. . . we believe that the causes of crime across the life course are not rooted in race<sup>3</sup>. . . but rather in structural disadvantage, weakened by informal social bonds to family, school, and work, and the disruption of social relations between individuals and institutions that provide social capital. (pp. 254-255)

Still, one needs to bear in mind that at the time the Gluecks were collecting their data, ethnic differences among Whites included contours of structural disadvantage: Irish and Italian identities, for instance, were not considered "White" in the same way we conceive this today (Ignatiev, 1995). They venture into the policy/political realm in the next paragraph by acknowledging structural disadvantages:

imprisonment may have powerful negative effects on the prospects of future employment and job stability. In turn, low income, unemployment, and underemployment are themselves linked to heightened risks of family disruption. Through its negative effects on male employment, imprisonment may thus lead indirectly through family disruption to increase in future rates of crime and violence. The extremely high incarceration rate of young black males [] renders this scenario very real. (p. 255)

This early acknowledgment of gender/race/economic class disadvantage may be an indication that lifecourse theory helps criminology interrogate gender, race, class, and heteronormativity. But Sampson and Laub do not extend their analysis to such questions. Unfortunately, they continue to argue that their findings "can be applied to all individuals" (Potter, 2015, p. 105). Thus, while we can applaud the lessons of their analysis, particularly regarding structural disadvantages, it is regrettable that these criminologists continued the historical story of missed opportunities to analyze gender and racial as well as class-based dynamics. One might expect that within critical criminology, the examination of gender and race would be more central. Let us turn to this question next.

### *Turning to Critical Criminology*

Whereas lifecourse theory explicitly "deracialized" and "depoliticized" crime, critical criminology began to embrace, explain, and expand policy-oriented critiques of crime and its control. Still, the social realities of gender remained largely invisible to the visionaries in critical criminology; until the 21st century, androcentrism continued without in-depth study of power dynamics associated with gender. On the contrary, critical criminology proffered keen analyses of power dynamics: Its scholarship has been geared toward promoting progressive political agendas to combat social class and racialized inequalities (DeKeseredy, 2011). According to DeKeseredy (2011), "critical criminology is defined as a perspective that views the major sources of crime as the unequal class, race/ethnic, and gender relations that control our society" (p. 7).

DeKeseredy (2011), citing Gelsthorpe and Morris (1988), acknowledges that early critical criminology was “gender-blind” (p. 27), and that androcentrism remains a problem within some of the critical criminological studies published.

Taking on the challenge of economic analyses, early critical criminologists theoretically established links between social class inequality and crime (Chambliss, 1975; Spitzer, 1975; Taylor, Walton, & Young, 1973). In doing so, they identified a major area of concern and began to explore the contours of racial inequality present in crime/justice issues. A key accomplishment of critical criminology included commitment to being proximal to the subjects whose lives they were documenting (DeKeseredy, 2011). By prioritizing analyses of the exercise of unequal power, critical criminologists exposed vastly different worlds associated with street crime versus corporate crime (Chambliss, 1975; Christie, 1977, 1993; Friedrichs, 1996; Michalowski, 1985). They showed, among other studies, how political economy determines so much about crimes’ definition and prosecution (Chambliss, 1975); how the state has the power to “steal” our experiences of crime and render us voiceless when pursuing redress (Christie, 1977); how a vast industry of crime control emerged in modern Western societies (Christie, 1993); how analogous social injury is serious injury, and real people suffer real harms even when inflicted by the powerful through corporate violence (Michalowski, 1985); and how “trusted criminals” can be far more dangerous than stereotypical criminals (Friedrichs, 1996).

Moreover, critical criminologist Raymond Michalowski (1985) can be credited for writing a section of one chapter that examined gender and crimes of the powerless. He focused on women as offenders in property crimes, and tackles debates over “sex-roles” and crime using available research literature at the time. According to Michalowski, “while many women may be more psychologically prepared to participate in formerly ‘masculine’ property crimes as a result of sex-role changes, an equally important factor is the deteriorating economic position of women” (Michalowski, 1985, p. 304). He went on to offer additional points regarding socioeconomic patterns associated with women’s involvement in property crimes. Feminist criminologists would react to such points by saying “yes, that’s a good point” and “let’s not overlook that men are gendered beings too, so let’s extend the ideas of inequality to consider masculinity.”

Roger Matthews and Jock Young (1992) directly tackled feminist critiques of criminology; they expressed support for more feminist research on gender and crime as well as consternation with then-current debates in the field. For instance, “there can be little doubt that the impact of feminists on criminological thinking has been one of the most productive and progressive inputs into the subject over the last decade or so” (p. 14). Matthews and Young moved on to summarize “two broad trajectories” of feminist criminology, the political and epistemological. The former includes classification of feminist theories as liberal, Marxist, radical, or socialist; the latter includes “postmodernist, standpoint feminist and empiricist” criminology, to which they devote deeper consideration. They cite Maureen Cain as an example of standpoint feminist criminology and query “that people from the same standpoint do not speak with the same voice but often speak with competing and oppositional voices. How do we know which voices are authentic?” (Matthews & Young, 1992, p. 15). This desire to ascertain what



is authentic, true, and accurate stems from quests for certain knowledge. The epistemological frame is based on the binary notion that if one truth is accurate, then the other is false: Allegedly, one perspective or experience is “true” and the other not. One of the most important lessons of feminist criminology, though, is that all voices are—or at least can be—authentic. Moreover, different voices reveal varying experiences with common problems, all of which are “real” to those experience myriad oppressions. Using Patricia Hill Collins (1991), I would suggest that in this sense, the work of Matthews and Young was insufficiently multi-dimensional and could have benefited from feminist insights using “both/and” rather than “either/or” frameworks of analysis and understanding. It is the “both/and” framework, more than “either/or” perspectives, that come closer to approximating the lived experiences of ordinary people who have been crime victims and/or offenders.

### *Feminist Contributions and Clarifications*

In 1988, Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988) explore the foundations and contours of feminist theory and its applicability to criminology; they argued “criminologists should begin to appreciate that their discipline and its questions are a product of White, economically privileged men’s experiences” (p. 506). Observing that Canadian and British criminologists were documenting gendered patterns of crime, Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988) write that “their work signaled an awakening of criminology from its androcentric slumber” (p. 507). Five years later, Renzetti (1993) writes about similar needs for the discipline to take gender and race more seriously, and in frustration asked “why should I have to make this case *again*?” (p. 232, emphasis in the original). Hannon and Dufour (1998) document androcentrism within criminological research. They were specifically interested in measuring if criminological research with men-only samples generalized their findings to “all” crimes (male-bias in generalizability), and if research with women-only samples also suggested their findings were generalizable to “all” crimes. Their findings showed, in part, that “male only studies typically overgeneralized their titles, and [] almost all female only studies specified the limits of generalizability in their titles” (p. 69). Other scholars have documented androcentrism within criminology as well (Baro & Eigenberg, 1993; Eigenberg & Baro, 1992). Britton (2000) bluntly states that “[g]iven men’s overrepresentation as offenders and victims, the screaming silence in criminology around the connection between masculinity and crime has always been something of a paradox” (p. 73).

Jeanne Flavin (2001) invites mainstream criminologists to appreciate and embrace feminist insights within criminology as “[g]ender is the strongest predictor of criminal involvement: boys and men perpetrate more, and more serious crimes than do girls and women” (p. 273). She argued that gender and race biases within the field led to epistemological blind spots that do not appreciate the complex nuances of crime. She rightly points out that

recognition of the importance of epistemology and the biases of scientific method lies at the core of transforming the discipline. Gaining a better understanding of gender and

crime requires not only filling in gaps in knowledge but also challenging the assumptions upon which existing knowledge is based. (Flavin, 2001, p. 275)

In addition, Flavin (2001) argues that “feminism challenges criminology to reject androcentric thinking” and to be “thoughtful and relevant” (p. 281). When these concerns are overlooked or rejected, she insists, the discipline loses opportunities for sharper analysis on relevant social interactions that perpetuate crime and victimization; moreover, we lose opportunities to improve social policy and practice.

Within sociology as well as criminology, theories of “doing gender” and of intersectionality have also moved the study of gender and crime beyond the androcentric past. A paradigm shift occurred in feminist theory when West and Zimmerman (1987) published their now-famous article “Doing Gender.” Renzetti (2013) documents this as the most widely cited article published in *Gender and Society* with its vivid description of a “fluid, dynamic conceptualization of gender as accomplishment” (p. 51).<sup>4</sup> Later, West and Fenstermaker (1995) expand the concept beyond gender alone, positing that we do gender as much as we do ethnicity, race, and social class. Within criminology, this theoretical advance has contributed significant knowledge to understanding crime and victimization (Cook, 2006; Messerschmidt, 1993, 1997; Miller, 2002). Within criminology, a cornerstone of this approach has been Messerschmidt’s (1997) argument that crime is “resource” for doing gender (specifically masculinity): men and boys use crime to demonstrate their masculinities. A critique of doing gender theory, though, is that it reinforces rather than challenges gendered binaries (Renzetti, 2013). It is a critique applied and presented by Jody Miller (2002), who writes that “recognizing gender as a *situated* action allows for recognition of agency, but does so in a way thoroughly grounded in the contexts of structural inequalities such as those of gender, sexuality, race, class and age” (p. 434). Jody Miller’s (2001, 2002, 2008) work has advanced this theoretical insight into the realm of women and girls’ criminal offending beyond a gendered binary. Renzetti (2013) suggests that this theoretical framework has helped to expose “a multitude of masculinities and femininities as well as the agency that social actors exercise in constructing these multiple identities” (p. 56).

An additional component to “doing gender” and/or “doing difference” is accountability—that is, being held accountable by others to gender, race, class, heteronormative scripts that are meant to guide behavior (Cook, 2006). While observing restorative justice diversionary conferences in Australia and New Zealand, I noted that the dynamics of accountability are heavily gendered, raced, and classed. In social life, people are expected to behave in ways that conforms to gendered scripts and are held accountable for failing to do so. For example, Connell (cited by Cook, 2006) outlines the concept of gender projects, stating that “men and boys accomplish their gender projects by aspiring towards hegemonic masculine practice, whereas girls and women typically aspire towards emphasized feminine practice” (p. 108). In other words, through social life, we learn to “be a man” or “act like a lady” and when we fail, or refuse, we are held accountable for this failure or refusal. Furthermore,

accountability . . . is the *process* of questioning someone's behavior and the *power* to command an answer from that person. . . [it is] a structural and cultural process of scrutiny juxtaposed to the obligation of the persons being scrutinized to explain their behaviours. (Cook, 2006, pp. 108-109)

Specifically,

[f]or theories of gender, difference and restorative justice, understanding and examining the dynamics of accountability illuminates how social structure is "accomplished." Class, gender and ethnicity are prisms of scrutiny . . . where [] the socially constructed categories of difference are not eliminated, but instead are used as subtle devices of domination. (Cook, 2006, p. 120)

While the lessons learned from theories of doing difference are significant, there is room for their expansion within criminology. The framework can be applied more thoroughly to a variety of mainstream criminology's arenas of concern: How is "low self-control" impacted by the situated accomplishments of gender, race, social class, and heteronormative expectations? How can we document the situated lifecourse dynamics of doing difference and accountability in longitudinal research? Certainly, some good efforts are being made in this direction through narrative criminology (Presser & Sandberg, 2015).

Another illuminating advance within feminist criminology focuses on the intersection of gender, race, sexuality, and social class as they impact social patterns of crime offending and victimization (Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Chesney-Lind, 2006; Crenshaw, 1991; Potter, 2006, 2015). Crenshaw (1991) launches her analysis by pointing out that "[c]ontemporary feminist and antiracist discourses have failed to consider intersectional identities such as women of color" (pp. 1242-1243). By documenting women of color's experiences with gendered violence, Crenshaw explodes the idea that all women experience violence similarly. She emphasizes that where

systems of race, gender, and class domination converge, as they do in the experiences of battered women of color, intervention strategies based solely on the experiences of women who do not share the same class or race backgrounds will be of limited help to women who because of race and class face different obstacles. (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1246)

Indeed Potter (2015) and others (Donnelly, Cook, Van Ausdale, & Foley, 2005; Donnelly, Cook, & Wilson, 1999; Potter, 2008; West, 1999) provide much more detail on this issue than can be covered here; suffice it to say that Crenshaw has had a profound and inspiring impact on feminist criminology.

In 2006, Amanda Burgess-Proctor declared "the future of feminist criminology lies in our willingness to embrace a theoretical framework that recognizes multiple, intersecting inequalities" (p. 28). She provides a rich history and detailed coverage of how criminology overall has benefited, and will continue to gain from feminist intersectional research. Because the interaction of power and privilege shape social life at the

individual and institutional levels, it is incumbent on contemporary feminists to pursue this line of scholarly inquiry.

Like feminist theory and action writ large, feminist criminology has been the target of considerable backlash (Chesney-Lind, 2006), and our efforts to promote culturally and structurally relevant analyses of crime have generated some heated reactions. While documenting the media reaction to research on women and girls involved in criminal offending, Chesney-Lind (2006) points out that when “experts” are interviewed in the media, they usually offer individualistic analyses rather than criticizing structural inequalities. She provides an example from the *Boston Globe* about “BAD GIRLS” engaging in violence that had been exclusively the province of men, a journalistic story then supported by “experts” who say that girls/women are “calling the shots” (p. 12). In addition, Chesney-Lind (2006) highlights how the conventional criminological view that “women are as violent as men” has resulted in very real, and brutal, consequences in terms of higher rates of women being arrested and incarcerated. She concludes by calling for more progressive social action by feminist criminologists because “feminist criminology is uniquely positioned to do important work to challenge the current political backlash . . . [and to] engage in exploration of the interface between systems of oppression based on gender, race, and class” (Chesney-Lind, 2006, p. 21). This is not a frivolous academic exercise; rather, the work we do has real “flesh and blood” consequences (Flavin, 2009), and feminist criminologists have long advocated for turning analyses and evidence into actions and agendas.

Potter (2006) brilliantly weaves together strands of contemporary feminist theory with critical race theory and produces Black Feminist Criminology that “extends beyond traditional feminist criminology so as to view African American women (and conceivably, other women of color) from their multiple marginalized and dominated positions in society, culture, community, and families” (p. 107). By explicitly examining the experiences of Black women who have been battered, Potter illuminates multiple structural inequalities that contaminate the lives of these women and affects their access to safety and security. As criminologists, this is exactly the sort of research and theorizing that ought to be central to, rather than marginalized within, our discipline. Such research also helps to identify needed reforms in our legal system so that as a society, we can move toward humane and comprehensive remedies for social inequalities caused by or productive of crime.

Finally, pushing criminology even further, Carrie Buist and Emily Lenning (2016) articulate “queer criminology” that “moves beyond the traditional deviance framework and shifts the spotlight from the rule breakers to the rule makers” (p. 4). Among the vital lessons they draw from queer criminology is that, given certain laws, structural barriers, cultural beliefs, and customs, some people’s very existence is treated as criminal simply because of sexual/gender identity. As Buist and Lenning (2016) posit, “We cannot be complacent to the injustices and terrors that Queer people face around the world every single day based solely on their sexual orientation and/or gender identity” (p. 17). Here then, in contemporary feminist scholarship, is a good example of the “yes/and” approach that draws on criminological knowledge to document, analyze, and *resist* the systems of oppression that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender

(LGBT) people endure throughout the lives. Buist and Lenning rightly show needs within the field for further research that includes better data collection to ensure accurate information and analysis, better documentation of LGBT experiences with crime and the legal system, and thereafter improved policy reforms that acknowledge and understand queer realities. They argue that

by failing to recognize sexuality and gender identity as integral to one's experiences in the same manner in which we recognize the significance of race or social class, we reinforce the stereotype that being Queer is a deviant act as opposed to an inherent part of one's self and something that has bearing on experiences and outcomes in the criminal legal system. (p. 120)

In advocating for improved policy, Buist and Lenning focus on laws that criminalize consensual adult sexual behavior, limit or ban specific gendered expressions from public life, and improve treatment of hate crime victims and their cases. They also call for more sensitive and supportive care for queer prisoners, and for better treatment of LGBT employees in the legal system and throughout society. Last but not least, they urge criminologists to continue the legacy of action/activist oriented scholarship and quote Audre Lorde's conclusion that "there is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives" (cited in Buist & Lenning, 2016, p. 123). Exactly.

These critiques of the field offer conceptual roadmaps for learning about inequalities and crimes. By endorsing Cohen's early acknowledgment that social class differences matter, and by expanding that concern to sexism, racism, and heterosexism, we have a richer and more complete criminology awakening from a slumber that was both androcentric *and* biased in terms of race and sexualities.

### *Moving Forward*

So where do we go from here? The path forward includes the need for much more research on the intersectionality of crime and crime control; more serious inclusion of gender, race, sexual orientation, and social class into mainstream criminology; and a discussion at the organizational level about how we collaborate in the field.

Potter (2015) argues that expanding intersectionality in the field can and ought to revolutionize criminology. She also provides an excellent list of recent criminological research that demonstrates the value of feminist intersectional approaches. I invite readers to speculate on what criminology might have looked like had Sutherland and Cressey emphasized instead of amputated gendered inequalities. Imagine if they had written this instead:

The variations in the sex ratio in crime are so great that it can be concluded that maleness is *the most significant factor, along with racial, social class, and sexual orientation biases*, in the causation of crime *because* it indicates social position, supervision, and other social relations. Moreover, since boys and girls live in the same homes, in equal poverty, and with equally *oppressed/marginalized* parents, and live in the same

neighborhoods, which are equally lacking in facilities for organized recreation, these conditions of the social environment *must* be considered causes of delinquency. (emphasis added)

We will never know how criminologists in previous eras would have reacted to this restatement. Perhaps they would have been ignored, or perhaps they would have inspired a different series of doctoral dissertations and developments in the field that took criminological research in a different direction decades earlier. Or perhaps later perspectives, like social control theory, would have taken these issues much more seriously. Imagine if the missed opportunities had been taken up at the time they were presented? They were not, however, necessitating that we take stock now and move forward from here.

Organizationally, within the ASC, much attention has been given to varying forms of social inequalities as they impact the study of crime. We have celebrated the 30th Anniversary of the DWC whose pioneers include Betsy Stanko, Nicole Hahn Rafter, Chris Rasche, CoraMae Richey Mann, Ruth Petersen, and many others. Scholars who are interested in gender and crime likely gravitate to the DWC. Scholars interested in globalization and crime may associate with the Division on International Criminology. Scholars interested in the political economy and crime may move toward the Division on Critical Criminology; scholars with interests in racial oppressions and crime may join and work within the Division on People of Color and Crime. These are just a few of the specialized structures within the field that exist organizationally to help build collaboration and share interests. At first blush, we might say these sections demonstrate our mutual commitment to multiple lenses of inquiry. At closer examination, though, one might conclude that such “divisions” are divisive and in fact create exclusionary silos rather than avenues for connection. My view is that it largely depends on how people use their membership in the Society and within/throughout the divisions. Many scholars are members of more than one division, which speaks to the larger claim that the avenues of collaboration and networking are fluid. Certainly within the DWC, we are deliberately and conscientiously welcoming to new scholars; when criticized for being too “White women” oriented, we have taken steps to remedy that condition. I am also aware that on campuses around the country, “women’s studies” programs have mostly been re-named to “Women’s and Gender Studies” to expand the scope of concern. Feminist criminology is not only about women anymore, nor is it only about gender. What we, as a Division, do about this (if anything) remains to be seen.<sup>5</sup>

Combining our scholarly interest with policy advocacy renders feminist criminology relevant to the modern conundrum of crime; too many examples exist to possibly be able to cite them all. My own research has been profoundly shaped by feminist research methods, feminist theory, and has resulted in policy-relevant insights (Baumgartner, Westervelt, & Cook, 2014; Cook, 2006; Cook, Westervelt, & Maruna, 2014; Donnelly et al., 2005; Donnelly et al., 1999; Westervelt & Cook, 2010, 2012). We cannot simply publish our findings and let the policy chips fall where they may; feminist scholars have a long legacy of advocating social change analogously with the

political edge that currently also marks critical criminology. Within the ASC, members of the DWC help support each other in our efforts to translate feminist theory into action with the annual “Feminist Theory in Action” workshop held on the Tuesday afternoon prior to the first sessions at the conference. This tradition was launched by Mona Danner (Old Dominion University) and Nancy Wonders (Northern Arizona University) in the 1990s. The workshop is a place to share activist ideas, policy goals, research challenges, and constructive solutions to oppressive social problems related to criminology. In recent years, thanks in part to the success of this journal and to the generosity of Professor Larry Siegel, we have been able to support excellent graduate student work focused on gender and crime; this deliberate cultivation of feminist scholarship is vital to the on-going awakening from traditionally androcentric criminology.

After reading Lauren Silver’s recent book (2015), I would like to see feminist criminologists work on developing what I call “survivor criminology”; similar to “convict criminology,” this would cultivate more trauma-informed research. Feminist criminologists, to varying individual degrees, are committed to conducting research that helps to push the policy arena farther along toward human rights without apologizing for the portion of feminist work that is politically relevant as well as empirically researched. Arguably, many of us in feminist criminology are already “survivors”<sup>6</sup> and thus already engage in “survivor criminology.” After all, our lives are deeply influenced by the same sexism, racism, classism, and homophobia that has influenced the field in which we work; to ignore that our personal experiences are also political would require us to amputate a significant part of our analytical capacity, a specious separation that I am not willing, like many other feminists, to endure.

Understanding the complexity of gender in the everyday lived realities of crime experiences within various settings is as complicated as it is essential: Jody Miller (2001, 2002, 2008), Lauren Silver (2015), Joanne Belknap (2014), Hillary Potter (2006, 2015), Amanda Burgess-Proctor (2006), Walter DeKeseredy (2011), James Ptacek (1999, 2016), Carrie Buist and Emily Lenning (2016) all show that crime is gendered, racialized, classed, and heteronormative. In spite of the slow uptake in mainstream criminology, scholars who do intersectional analyses of gender, race, class, and sexualities have made indelible contributions to our understandings of crime and its control. We have woken up from the androcentric slumber, and we have staked a claim that these broad social inequalities impact crime in substantial ways. Mainstream criminology may still be napping amid its androcentric history, but many of us are awake and paying careful attention.

## **Conclusion**

Scholarly research is a dynamic social process that is not free from bias, assumptions, interests, and judgment calls on the road to illuminating the social world. Good science, though, requires that such assumptions are revealed, acknowledged, and taken into consideration as the field evolves. Like other disciplines, criminology exists within a complex social environment where criminologists recycle biases, assumptions, interests,

and judgments. According to Kournay (2009), “science is a patriarchal institution, and [] the masculinist personal and social and political and economic interests and values [] influence or virtually determine its outcomes” (p. 212). Feminist standpoint theory encourages scholars to articulate and reveal these dynamics, particularly as they impact our research and interests. Citing Longino, Kournay (2009) adds that

scientists’ interests and values can and do determine which questions they investigate and which they ignore, . . . [] can and do influence the observational or experimental data they select to study and the way they interpret those data, and so on. (p. 212)

The broader scientific community in any discipline, then, is obliged to critique and remedy the knowledge that derives from assumptions and interests. It remains the case that the vast majority of leading criminologists have been White males, and that a “white racial frame” (Potter, 2015, pp. 3-4) has also often emerged within criminology insofar as many criminologists have ignored or removed gender from serious theoretical and empirical consideration. Evidence of social inequalities and their impact on crime rates emerged early on with Cohen, thereafter becoming a foundation of critical criminology. Over decades, though, increasing numbers of scholars have become interested in multi-dimensional “yes/and” approaches to understanding crime and social inequalities—from their investigation of class and racial dynamics, to recently much greater attention given to gender dynamics by feminist criminologists. By now, contemporary scholarship regularly attends to both sexism and heterosexism within and outside criminology per se. We have learned to say “yes, they all matter,” realizing that a more inclusive criminology has far more to offer and illuminate in the future than was possible in the relatively gender-blind criminological past.

### **Acknowledgments**

The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article, and to Lynn Chancer for her advice for developing this article, and for the years of invigorating friendship.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Notes**

1. Interestingly, in an endnote, Cohen references an unpublished doctoral dissertation by George H. Grosser (Harvard University) titled “Juvenile Delinquency and Contemporary American Sex Roles” completed in 1952 as “the most thorough discussion in the literature



of sex differences in delinquency” (p. 193). To my knowledge, this dissertation or its findings have not been published in criminological journals and is not referenced in criminology text books. It does lead me to wonder why Grosser’s study has not been more widely cited given Cohen’s high praise of it.

2. In contrast, comparable numbers for other theories are as follows: social learning theory (57,000), learning theory (61,000), differential association theory (29,000), and social disorganization theory (6,000).
3. Or, presumably, gender.
4. An online search produced over 323,000 scholarly articles and 169 books for “doing gender.”
5. Perhaps a new name, such as the Division on Feminist Criminology (DFC), would respond to this issue. Such a name change, of course, would require an extensive discussion within the Division to ensure inclusiveness and honoring of our history. Such a conversation would be slow and possibly difficult, nor is the change being advocated here. My point is to raise a possible point for further discussion.
6. Like others whose names will not be cited out of respect for their privacy, I am a survivor of domestic and sexual violence.

## References

- Baro, A., & Eigenberg, H. (1993). Images of gender: A content analysis of photographs in introductory criminology and criminal justice textbooks. *Women & Criminal Justice, 5*, 3-36.
- Baumgartner, F., Westervelt, S. D., & Cook, K. J. (2014). Public policy responses to wrongful convictions. In A. Redlich, J. Acker, R. Norris, & C. Bonventre (Eds.), *Examining wrongful convictions: Stepping back, moving forward* (pp. 251-266). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Beirne, P. (1993). *Inventing criminology: Essays on the rise of “Homo Criminalis.”* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Belknap, J. (2014). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Cengage Learning.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame, and reintegration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Britton, D. (2000). Feminism in criminology: Engendering the outlaw. *Annals of the American Academy of Social Sciences, 571*, 57-76.
- Buist, C., & Lenning, E. (2016). *Queer criminology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of race, class, gender, and crime: Future directions for feminist criminology. *Feminist Criminology, 1*, 27-47.
- Chambliss, W. (1975). Toward a political economy of crime. *Theory and Society, 2*, 149-170.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime, and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology, 1*, 6-26.
- Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *British Journal of Criminology, 17*, 1-15.
- Christie, N. (1993). *Crime control as industry: Towards gulags, western style*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cohen, A. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cook, K. J. (2006). Doing difference and accountability in restorative justice conferences. *Theoretical Criminology, 10*, 107-124.

- Cook, K. J., Westervelt, S., & Maruna, S. (2014). The problem of fit: Parolees, exonerees, and prisoner reentry. In A. Redlich, J. Acker, R. Norris, & C. Bonventre (Eds.), *Examining wrongful convictions: Stepping back, moving forward* (pp. 237-250). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241-1299.
- Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly*, 5, 497-538.
- DeKeseredy, W. (2011). *Contemporary critical criminology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dobash, R., & Dobash, R. E. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Donnelly, D., Cook, K. J., Van Ausdale, D., & Foley, L. (2005). White privilege, color blindness, and services to battered women. *Violence Against Women*, 11, 6-37.
- Donnelly, D., Cook, K. J., & Wilson, L. (1999). Provision and exclusion: The dual face of services to battered women in three deep south states. *Violence Against Women*, 5, 710-741.
- Eigenberg, H., & Baro, A. (1992). Women and the publication process: A content analysis of criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3, 293-314.
- Flavin, J. (2001). Feminism for the mainstream criminologist: An invitation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29, 271-285.
- Flavin, J. (2009). *Our bodies, our crimes: The policing of women's reproduction in America*. New York: New York University Press.
- Friedrichs, D. O. (1996). *Trusted criminals: White collar crime in contemporary society*. New York, NY: Wadsworth.
- Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hannon, L., & Dufour, L. R. (1998). Still just the study of men and crime? A content analysis. *Sex Roles*, 38, 63-71.
- Ignatiev, N. (1995). *How the Irish became White*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kantor, G. K., & Straus, M. (1987). The "drunken bum" theory of wife beating. *Social Problems*, 34, 213-230.
- Kournay, J. A. (2009). The place of standpoint theory in feminist science studies. *Hypatia*, 24, 209-218.
- Martin, D. (1976). *Battered wives*. San Francisco, CA: Glide Publications.
- Matthews, R., & Young, J. (1992). Reflections on realism. In J. Young & R. Matthews (Eds.), *Rethinking criminology: The realist debate*. (p. 1-23). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Messerschmidt, J. (1993). *Masculinities and crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Messerschmidt, J. (1997). *Crime as structured action: Gender, race, class, and crime in the making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Michalowski, R. (1985). *Order, law, and crime: An introduction to criminology*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Miller, J. (2001). *One of the guys: Girls, gangs, and gender*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, J. (2002). The strengths and limits of "doing gender" for understanding street crime. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6, 433-460.

- Miller, J. (2008). *Getting played: African American girls, urban inequality, and gendered violence*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pizzey, E. (1977). *Scream quietly or the neighbor's will hear*. Short Hills, NJ: Enslow.
- Potter, H. (2006). An argument for black feminist criminology: Understanding African American women's experiences with intimate partner abuse using an integrated approach. *Feminist Criminology, 1*, 106-124.
- Potter, H. (2008). *Battle cries: Black women and intimate partner abuse*. New York: New York University Press.
- Potter, H. (2015). *Intersectionality and criminology: Disrupting and revolutionizing studies of crime*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Presser, L., & Sandberg, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Narrative criminology: Understanding stories of crime*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ptacek, J. (1999). *Battered women in the courtroom: The power of judicial responses*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Ptacek, J. (2016). Rape and the continuum of sexual abuse in intimate relationships: Interviews with US women from different social classes. In K. Yllö & G. Torres (Eds.), *Marital rape: Consent, marriage and social change in global context*. (p. 123-138). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rasche, C. (2014). The ASC division on women and crime from 30 years out. *Feminist Criminology, 9*, 253-269.
- Renzetti, C. (1993). On the margins of the malestream (or, they still don't get it, do they?): Feminist analysis in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 4*, 219-234.
- Renzetti, C. (2013). *Feminist criminology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas: A study of rates of delinquency in relation to differential characteristics of local communities in American cities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Silver, L. (2015). *System kids: Adolescent mothers and the politics of regulation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Spitzer, S. (1975). Toward a Marxian theory of deviance. *Social Problems, 22*, 638-651.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1974). *Criminology* (9th ed.). New York, NY: J. B. Lippincott.
- Taylor, I., Walton, P., & Young, J. (1973). *The new criminology: For a social theory of deviance*. London, England: Routledge.
- Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. (1974). *The Polish peasant in Europe and America*. New York, NY: Octagon Books. (Original work published 1918)
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender & Society, 9*, 8-37.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*, 125-151.
- West, T. (1999). *Wounds of the spirit: Black women, violence, and resistance ethics*. New York: New York University Press.
- Westervelt, S. D., & Cook, K. J. (2010). Framing innocents: The wrongly convicted as victims of state harm. *Crime, Law, and Social Change, 53*, 259-275.
- Westervelt, S. D., & Cook, K. J. (2012). *Life after death row: Exonerates search for community and identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

**Author Biography**

**Kimberly J. Cook** is a professor of sociology and criminology at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. She earned her doctorate in sociology from the University of New Hampshire in 1994, and has been an active member in the American Society of Criminology (ASC) and the Division on Women and Crime (DWC) since 1989, most recently serving as chair of the DWC from 2013-2015. Her areas of specialization include capital punishment, wrongful convictions, restorative justice, violence against women, and feminist criminology.