The Fictional Reality and Criminology: An Ontology of Theory and Exemplary Pedagogical Practice

Jon Frauley*

Abstract

A history of ideas model characterises the dominant pedagogical approach to criminological theory. This model, however, is hampered by implicit assumptions about the ontological status of theories and concepts. These ontological assumptions operate as epistemological obstacles to both: (1) the stimulating of what is argued to be a craft-practice in theoretical analysis and; (2) the reproducing of a broadly theoretically informed and reflexive criminology. This article advances a craft-enterprise model for understanding theorising and the ontological status of sociological and criminological concepts. It exploits the space carved out by recent criminological interest in film and literature to explore how we might craft an exemplary pedagogical practice which utilises the fictional reality as a pedagogical tool. This model and practice are envisioned as contributions toward strengthening the social scientific and disciplinary status of both criminal justice studies and criminology.

> The teaching of a *métier*, a craft, a trade, or to speak like Durkheim, a social 'art' understood as 'pure practice without theory,' requires a pedagogy which is completely different from that suited to the teaching of knowledge (*savoirs*) (Bourdieu 1992:222, emphasis in original, references omitted).

Introduction

There is a growing but fragmented body of literature within criminology and criminal justice studies that takes fiction as its object of enquiry. On the one hand, there is an exploration of representations of popular attitudes toward crime or how criminological themes and issues are reflected in film and literature (Fiddler 2007; Gehrke 2001; O'Brien et al 2005; Pearce 1978; Rafter 2006, 2007; Ruggiero 2002, 2003; Tzanelli et al 2005). On the other hand, literature has been explored for how it might be used to exemplify sociological and criminological concepts (Engel 2003; Hagan and Benekos 2002; Laz 1996; West 2005). The

* Jon Frauley is Assistant Professor of Criminology at the University of Ottawa (Canada). He is primarily interested in social theory, epistemology, governance and regulation. He has edited (with Frank Pearce) and contributed to, *Critical Realism and the Social Sciences: Heterodox Elaborations* (2007) and has published in a number of anthologies and journals including the *British Journal of Criminology* and *Critical Criminology*. He is currently working on a monograph, *Criminology, Deviance, and the Silver Screen* for Palgrave Macmillan. Correspondence to: Jon Frauley, Department of Criminology, 25 University Street, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada, K1N 6N5. Email: jfrauley@uottawa.ca.

first approach to what I term the *fictional reality* explores the intersection of criminology and popular culture to push the boundaries of criminological theory, research and understanding.[1] The second approach explores how criminological research, theory, and understanding can be represented to non-specialists such as students.

These studies have helped to legitimate investigation of fictional realities as objects of criminological enquiry. In particular, Ruggiero's (2003) path-breaking sociological treatment of classic literature and its representations of crime and criminality and Tzanelli et al (2005) and Rafter's (2006, 2007) investigations of cinematic depictions of crime and the popular attitudes these reflect have done much to put fictional realities on the criminological map, so to speak. This literature and avenue of enquiry is especially valuable for the contribution it can make to criminological theorising. Unfortunately, as Ruggiero (2003:1) has noted, 'While some sociologists and criminologists do have time to read fiction, few use it to clarify concepts to themselves, discuss them with colleagues and transmit them to students.' Likewise, Rafter (2006:4) has observed, 'Even though film plays a central role in generating representations and understandings of crime, criminologists have traditionally ignored it, clinging to a narrow social science perspective that pays little attention to the interactions of crime and culture.' This article seeks to exploit the space carved out by this growing criminological and sociological interest in fictional realities to explore their pedagogical value for criminological theorising.[2]

This article argues that the value of the fictional reality lies in its potential to illustrate and to sharpen the craft enterprise of theorising, to demonstrate systematic analysis, and to enable explication of analytic concepts. Because the fictional reality is a diverse and multifaceted social object and is a ready-made and engaging empirical referent, it is a useful tool around which we can build an *exemplary* pedagogical practice. The article first questions the adequacy of the pervasive 'history of ideas' approach to theory and pedagogical practice and contrasts this with what I term the 'craft-enterprise' model. It is argued that the latter is best suited to build an exemplary pedagogical practice. This argument is developed by attending to both the ontological aspect of analytic concepts and the type of intellectual practice that is enabled by this model. Second, the article discusses the *fictional reality* as a social object for analysis and, last, offers a brief illustration of the pedagogical practice advocated.

---

1 The term 'fictional reality' is discussed throughout the article. The term is used to signify a fictional social reality that is diverse and multifaceted. As a social object (as opposed to a natural or psychological object) it is a 'ready-made' and engaging empirical referent that offers a complex of relations to be analytically delineated through social science craft work.

2 Although many social scientists utilise films, television shows, and literature in their courses, a 'criminological and sociological interest' in fictional realities is taken to be more than the convenient use of these as aids to illustrate sociological or criminological ideas, as will be demonstrated. In other words, the argument is not for the use of fiction as a stock of examples or illustrations of analytic concepts but for its use as an empirical referent for illustrating the process of theorising and operating of concepts.

Modelling theory: history of ideas and craft-enterprise

My immediate concern is with what we can term the 'internal reproduction' aspect of pedagogy; that is, its role within the criminological field itself rather than as an external object. This attention to the reproduction aspect and transformative capacity of pedagogical practice is partially an attempt to heed calls by criminologists for reflexivity and theoretical sophistication, and partially driven by dissatisfaction over the dominant approach to theory and theorising within the criminological field. The remainder of this section sets out some important differences between the history of ideas model of theory and what I am calling the 'craft-enterprise model', with special attention to the ontological aspect of theoretical concepts.

The object-like character of analytic concepts

The pedagogical model advanced here follows a view of theory as a system of interconnected sets of analytic lenses that are operated to produce interpretations, descriptions, explanations, and experiences of social phenomena. Such a view can be found in work that subscribes to what can be described as a 'realist ontology' of analytic concepts (see, eg, Currie, Maclean and Milovanovic 1992; Hunt 1993; Pearce 1989; Woodiwiss 1990, 2001). The reference to realism is not to suggest 'left realism' or 'criminological realism', concepts which may be familiar to readers. Rather, it is to denote that concepts are object-like entities: analytic tools or intellectual technologies that exist independently of the mind of the researcher which can be operated and refined to grant researchers a more penetrating view of their objects of study. Another way of putting this is to say that concepts have a 'coercive facticity' (discussed below): they have a reproductive and transformative capacity which impacts the persons operating them and the practices that characterise the criminological field.

This realist conceptualisation is different from that found within positivist and interpretivist/interactionist social science. For the former concepts are held to be abstractions requiring operationalising so that empirical indicators of them might be identified and measured. Some concepts, such as 'validity', 'reliability', 'replication' and 'generalisation' are not held to be concepts at all, but rather factual aspects of the scientific method. On the other hand, much interactionist social science evinces a form of idealism in that the interest with the 'perspectives' constructed by social actors through the latter's use of concepts situates concepts as the perspectives of actors.[3] In neither case are concepts taken to be technologies that can be acted on and which have transformative effects. The analogy of the telescope will help us make sense of what I am calling the realist position.

The telescope tube can be thought of as the frame or structure of a theoretical system, the lenses the analytic concepts that we must peer through in order to produce a description, explanation or understanding of an object. The immediate concern is to develop a pedagogical corollary; that is, a pedagogical practice that follows from the position that theoretical concepts must be crafted, operated, refined, reformulated and/or possibly discarded, that this process is akin to a craft enterprise, and that such a practise must be undertaken relative to an empirical referent in order to avoid theoreticism and

---

[3] See Blaikie (2000), Bryman (1988) and Sayer (1992) for discussion of the different conceptions of the nature and role of concepts.

representationalism, both of which plague much postivist and interactionist social science.[4] Even where one escapes such trappings within one's research, it is a different matter altogether to find or develop a workable pedagogical practice that can exemplify this.

The pedagogical practice proposed here is an exemplary practice that emphasises both the craft-element in the construction and operation of analytic concepts and their object-like status. It is valuable for criminology and sociology because it provides an alternative pedagogical model and strategy through which to communicate and picture the nature of theory and theorising, one that complements but also moves beyond the dominant 'history of ideas' approach. It also serves to provide an alternative model of the role of concepts in empirical research. The use of fictional realities is advocated as a strategy for cultivating analytical and reasoning abilities within criminology because they provide for a 'hands on' approach to theorising. That is, they can be utilised as the necessary empirical referent to puzzle over and to actively engage with, one which is manageable in a laboratory setting.[5]

Contrasting models

To adequately contextualise why such an approach is advocated it is necessary to draw a clear distinction between a 'history of ideas' model and what I term the 'craft-enterprise' model. The two models of theory enable different experiences and descriptions of theory and its role and place within social science.[6] A history of ideas model advocates an idealist notion of theory in that sets of concepts are treated as ideas or perspectives to be relayed and expressed in narrative format.[7] Theory, when treated as a perspective, is aligned with the notions that one holds in one's mind. This is similar to holding theory to be merely

---

4 Theoreticism, according to Pearce (1989:14), occurs when theories are developed in a manner apart from any reference to an empirical referent; in turn empirical examples are marshalled only to illustrate concepts. The problem, according to Pearce, is that this form of theory construction and subsequent manner of illustrating concepts amounts to a substitute for investigating or exploring the complexity of social phenomena. Bourdieu (1992:224) has suggested that such a process is one of 'theoretical compilation' which is 'entirely foreign to any application'. Important for the current discussion of pedagogy is Bourdieu's (1992:224) provocative assertion that theoreticism is, 'Born of the necessities of teaching, such eclectic classificatory compilations are good for teaching, but for no other purpose.' Related to this is what Woodiwiss (1990:6–11, 2001) has termed 'representationalism'. Representationalist theory attempts to reduce what he calls the 'irreducible' things of social science (ie, the concepts and categories worked with) to their referents (ie, the material that exists independently of the concept and the process of reference). This is to say that a representationalist theory conflates knowledge of reality and reality itself. This happens when social scientists erroneously hold that theories and concepts *correspond* to their object of analysis instead of understanding that theories are used to make (an only ever partial) *reference* to their object.

5 'Laboratory setting' is used here because it suggests for theory and theorising a setting for discovery, experiment and active, practice-based analytical and systematic endeavours.

6 Importantly, I am not wanting to argue or suggest that history of ideas is inherently interactionist/constructionist or positivist, but only that this dominant model of theory and its role and place within social science has affinities with the two dominant models of social science enquiry (interactional and postivist).

7 This pertains to the narratives of research subjects, as discussed above, and also to how theory is packaged for consumption rather than use. A great many social theory texts relay a narrative account of the development of the major ideas of particular thinkers; for example Downes and Rock (2003), Morrison (1995), Ritzer and Goodman (2004), Seidman (2007). What is at issue is not the accuracy of the content but the format and what this implicitly communicates about the nature and operation of theoretical concepts. Contrast these accounts of theory with that of Wright Mills (1959), Layder (1993), Bourdieu (1992), Pearce (1989), Woodiwiss (2001), and Einstadter and Henry (2006).

ideology, conjecture or belief. From within this model theories are not recognised as systems of analytic concepts with object-like characteristics that delimit what can be reasonably and intelligently stated about one's object. Pedagogically, this model aims to communicate an interpretation of the *content* of existing theories without explicating the concept-construction and interpretive process. Discussion of content is substituted for explication of how existing theories were crafted, how new sets of concepts can be constructed, existing ones reformulated, or how such systems might be put to work in analysis. As Alan Hunt (1989:147) has argued for legal studies, which applies equally well in our case:

> a self-conscious heuristic use of conceptualisation and abstraction [is necessary] in order to achieve the pedagogical objective of facilitating an understanding of the implications that flow from alternative concepts and discourses and to provide the means of making sustainable choices between these alternatives.

A history of ideas approach does not draw attention to or illustrate concept formation, the operation of concepts, that choices are made between alternative sets of concepts or that these concepts through our choices shape our understanding of our practice and what is significant about our object of study. The limitations of the history of ideas model stem in large part from its concern with only the outcome of such processes.

In his discussion of theorising, Ian Craib (1984) usefully contrasts two ways of approaching theory: as an active process of thinking analytically and conceptually and the more or less passive reception of what are outcomes of the process of theorising. This captures the distinction being made between a craft-enterprise model and the history of ideas model: the former emphasises active production and thinking theoretically while the latter concerns reception of content. Focus only on the latter leaves opaque the process of concept formation and the analytic tools utilised for the production of criminological knowledge remain esoteric. A great many theoretical texts are excellent examples of the ubiquity of the history of ideas model. Although there are some very good texts that seek to explicate the principal concepts of theoretical frameworks and the implications of their use these are rare.

Criminology, it should be stressed, is, and has, been well served by a history of ideas model for *research* (as distinct from *pedagogy*). Knowledge of historical conditions and contingencies in the development of the ideas that become dominant and subordinate within one's discipline and illustration of the incremental growth and emergence of one's field and its objects of enquiry are invaluable but more must be done in order to promote theoretical literacy within criminology. In terms of pedagogical practice, a history of ideas model is less attractive not least because it does not promote theoretical literacy. This means, among other things, it does not provide the sort of groundwork necessary for enabling a broad understanding of the scope and relevance of contributions made by theoretical systems for enabling the crafting of descriptions and explanations of the myriad objects of criminology. Especially important for theoretical literacy is the ability to go beyond the content of theoretically rich works, especially those which may not be specifically labelled as criminological. Recognising the criminological relevance of works that may not contain the familiar categories that have come to define criminology (eg, 'crime', 'criminal', 'criminality', 'justice') — such as those produced by socio-legal scholars or political economists — would be difficult without an ability to think broadly and relationally. The

value of such works do not rest on whether or not they specifically engage with something recognisable as pertaining to criminology. Their value rests on whether or not powerful analytic concepts are articulated which can lend themselves to the criminological study of the complex processes and arrangements within capitalist societies that serve to produce, reproduce or transform things of interest to criminologists. Likewise, theoretical literacy requires one to understand how concepts operate and that they are not descriptions of empirical things. The value of well-crafted theoretical concepts for empirical research is lost when concepts and theories are held to be simply a source of variables, ideas or perspectives or are approached in a theoreticist or representationalist manner.

As José López (2003:1–2) has astutely remarked, there is a penchant within the social sciences for 'doing research' or thinking that methods must be taught in a 'hands on' way. This sentiment however does not extend to 'doing theory'. This is a pedagogical issue and relates to whether or not 'theory' connotes more readily a craft-enterprise or history of ideas and why this might be. It is plausible to assume that for the majority of theory instructors it denotes a history of ideas approach because of the dominance of such an approach. An example of this dominance lies with the teaching tool of the textbook, which tends to be overly descriptive of the outcomes of theory construction. This dominance remains unchallenged for the most part because of the dearth of attention within criminology to theorising and the lack of any formalised area similar to the sociology of knowledge. If the practice element within theory is not recognised or if it is taken to be irrelevant then it would be strange indeed to ask students to theorise, especially if this is contrasted to 'research' or 'method' as it usually is. In this context Lopez's remarks seem misplaced. If, however, one is to focus on the process by which theories are produced, and hence the production of the interpretive and explanatory devices utilised by social scientists in their research, theorising becomes crucial and Lopez's remarks serve to direct us to an important oversight whose remedy will strengthen criminological practice and the field's status as social science.

Considering this dilemma, Angela West (2004) has explored the use of fiction as a pedagogical device and advocates, albeit tacitly, what I am calling the craft-enterprise model for theory and theorising. Her descriptive essay, summarising and illustrating how one might interpret a particular work of fiction, is noteworthy for its insight that providing an empirical referent for students to puzzle over and through is important. This is so not only for clarifying abstract concepts but for eliciting the process of theorising and avoiding pitfalls associated with the reception of only the end result of theorising (such as eclecticism).

> Students often have difficulty distinguishing among theories and detecting the subtle differences or distinctions among them. Helping students apply the theories to observable behaviour may clarify those distinct traits or characteristics and enhance their ability to use what they learn about these theories and how the theoretical integrates with the practical in their everyday lives.
>
> Additionally, students may have difficulty with abstract thinking. Anything having to do with 'theory' seems abstract and is often intimidating. Any concrete exercise that places the theoretical in a context that students can understand is useful (West 2004:341).

We can glean several things from West which are germane to our discussion. First, distinguishing and detecting differences between and amongst theories is to engage in diagnosis, evaluation, and assessment. Second, application can only be carried out if one has some understanding not only to what a theory's categories refer and the process of reference but also of how concepts operate together as a system for detecting in objects subtle differences, distinctions, characteristics, etc. Third, the process of application of concepts enables clarification not only of the object under investigation but also of the theoretical system being employed. Fourth, engaging in this process of abstraction, which informs the activities of distinguishing, detecting, diagnosis, evaluation, assessment, application and clarifying, is to engage in a craft-practice. Craft-practices, informed by craft-norms, are time-intensive, rigorous, and methodical practices. Learning to theorise in a considered and systematic way is to learn a craft.

When approaching theory through a craft-enterprise model, concepts appear as tools (devices or technologies), both fashioned and operated, not as perspectives or as awaiting operationalising into variables. However, as I have elsewhere argued (2005), this sort of consideration is often held to be second order within criminology. Kraska (2006) has illustrated that this second-order status poses significant problems that must be addressed in order to enable criminal justice studies to become more sophisticated and acquire 'academic legitimacy'. Thinking about and engaging in the process of producing, operating, and refining analytic concepts rather than only grappling with the outcome of theorising is necessary. The craft-enterprise model promotes active learning and theoretical literacy and can propel criminology and criminal justice studies beyond ensuring reception of information about perspectives.

Craft-enterprise and coercive facticity

The craft-enterprise model challenges (without necessarily discarding) the pervasive 'history of ideas' approach to theory and in so doing is necessarily 'realist' in its position on the nature of theories and concepts. It holds that theoretical concepts have an ontological status that renders them real in the sense that they can be crafted, worked on and indeed manipulated as tools to extend the human capacity to visualise the qualities of objects and their relational context. On this view, a theory is not ideational as it exists independently of the mind, furnishing a set of logically and coherently structured set of categories that researchers utilise to produce logically and coherently organised descriptions, explanations, and experiences of criminological objects. This would include the visualising or picturing of the stratification of simpler to more complex relations (including relations of potential that can be actualised or impugned in a contingent manner), some of which will not be amenable to direct experience. Theoretical systems obviously must be created by humans but once articulated they take on a *coercive facticity*. This quality of 'coercive facticity' can be clarified with a few examples.

First, Durkheim spoke of 'collective representations'. These are general to a society (widely dispersed) and act on a society's subjects to shape conduct. In this way collective representations, which are not material but are nevertheless 'objective', have what we can characterise as a coercive facticity. Today, a very powerful collective representation is terrorism: what it is, who participates, who is at risk, appropriate responses including what is considered the proper configuration of law enforcement and security institutions, notions about citizen conduct and rights, patriotism, foreign and domestic economic and social

policy, among other things are crystallised as a widespread collective sensibility about the nature of terror and insecurity. This has proven to be powerful for shaping legal, political and economic relations within advanced capitalist societies. The second example is what Foucault (1969/1972) called a 'discursive formation'. Discursive formations are contingent groupings of scientific statements and knowledge producing practices. Discursive formations and the scientific knowledge that appears in the form of authoritative statements was once characterised by Foucault (1970/1972:231) as having the quality of an 'incorporeal materialism'; not matter but neither ideational. Medicine and illness are examples. Medicine in Western cultures has a coercive facticity or 'incorporeal materialism' in that it can produce and delimit outcomes. The existence of ongoing changes to medical procedures, treatment regimes, categories of illness, and types of patients are testament to the coercive facticity of the discursive formation of medicine. A third example is Thomas Kuhn's (1962) notion of paradigm. According to Kuhn a paradigm is a generally accepted metatheoretical model that characterises the legitimacy of knowledge and practices of an entire scientific field. The accepted paradigm is a construct that governs how all 'normal science' in a given scientific field is carried out (organised by sets of concepts that comprise the paradigm) and evaluated. In times of crisis, the paradigm is challenged and eventually displaced.

The intention of this overly brief discussion of Durkheim, Foucault and Kuhn is not to equate or conflate their respective contributions to social science. Rather, it is hoped that one or more will be familiar to readers and that this familiarity can be drawn on to help illustrate that theoretical concepts and frameworks have a coercive facticity. Engagement with fictional realities is one useful way of promoting the craft-enterprise of theoretical analysis and illustrating the coercive facticity of analytic concepts in the production of descriptions, explanations, and interpretations of objects and our experiences of them. It is to engage in a reflective and circumscribed process of application and perhaps modification and construction. Methodically producing one's own descriptions and explanations by using a set of interconnected analytic concepts will foster, in an exemplary way, an understanding of the object-like nature of theoretical systems and concepts, systematic analysis, and how theories and concepts enable and constrain what can be reasonably and intelligently articulated about an object of enquiry (see Pearce 1989: ch 1).

Principles of practice and the criminological field

A distinction has been introduced, above, between different strategies and models for approaching and understanding the ontology of theory. The practices associated with these models have different normative underpinnings. The implications of this for pedagogical practice, and in turn for the reproduction of academic fields, will be clarified by drawing on the work of the social anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu and the philosopher Immanuel Kant. The point of such a discussion is to examine broadly, albeit briefly, what sort of criminology can be or is reproduced through different pedagogical models. The value of drawing on both Kant and Bourdieu is that Kant has emphasised two modes of thought that I think are useful for capturing the differences between a pedagogical model aimed at disseminating information and one aimed at stimulating higher order cognate abilities. Bourdieu offers a way to account for how the reproduction and transformation of the practical manifestation of these modes of thought (called *habitus*) are articulated with institutional fields. Thus both

provide for a novel way of describing how a particular form of criminological practice and normative underpining are pedagogically reproduced.

Kant contrasted what he termed ‘public reason’ with ‘private reason’. ‘By public use of one’s reason I understand the use which a person makes of it as a scholar before the reading public. Private use I call that which one may make of it in a particular civil post or office which is entrusted to him’ (Kant 1784/1997:10). The former refers to general abilities to render reasoned assessments, to offer systematically produced and clearly articulated positions, a capacity for critical judgment and ability to think abstractly and broadly. The latter refers to an instrumental and narrower form of reason which operates toward finding a solution to problems as defined within the context of industry and government. In the criminological context these forms of reason are captured by Garland and Sparks’ (2000:192) discussion of different social and institutional locations from which criminology is undertaken: the academy, government, and popular culture.[8] The first two most closely approximate Kant’s scheme. Substantive discussion of the different roles and objectives of what amount to differing criminologies (see Menzies and Chunn 1999; Stenning 1999; Tombs and White 2002, 2003; Walters 2003; Walters and Presdee 1999; White 2001) highlights that the different forms of reason Kant identified aptly characterise what are different configurations of criminology and their respective ‘coercive facticities’. The categories of public reason and private reason characterise distinct but sometimes conflated sets of practices and forms of judgment which are beholden to different kinds of objects or problems (for example, those external to criminology such as social problems, problems of criminal justice administration, or problems of social order and those internal to the field such as epistemological problems). These forms of judgment and procedures are reflected in pedagogical practice and research and depend on the objects or problems being addressed. Although the distinction observed by Kant and by Garland and Sparks cannot hold in all practical situations it nevertheless characterises very different forms of criminological enquiry and ways of organising the criminological field, sometimes complementary sometimes not.

The distinction introduced by Kant and its relevance for criminology can be elaborated by drawing on Bourdieu. Bourdieu offers a valuable way of understanding the relation between pedagogical practice and the organisation of criminological enquiry, and in turn, how the structure of the criminological field enables and constrains not only practices within it but also the practical sensibilities (*habitus*) one needs in order to engage successfully in these practices. He has provided convincing empirical and theoretical accounts of how principles of practice and forms of reason are shaped and reproduced in a non-deterministic manner through fields of professional practice.

> Practical evaluation of the likelihood of the success of a given action in a given situation brings into play a whole body of wisdom, sayings, commonplaces, ethical precepts (‘that’s not for the likes of us’) and, at a deeper level, the unconscious principles of the *ethos* which, being the product of a learning process dominated by a determinate type of objective regularities, determines ‘reasonable’ and ‘unreasonable’ conduct for every agent subjected to those regularities (Bourdieu 1977:77).

---

[8] See Ericson (1998) for a more nuanced discussion of the sites of criminology.

The ethos mentioned in the above passage is not unlike a form of reason. These forms of reason — the unconscious principles determinant of what is considered reasonable and unreasonable conduct — are internalised by actors and take the form of what Bourdieu calls *habitus. Habitus* is the mechanism by which actions are calculated and executed and is the product of a type of learning process which is dominated by the 'objective regularities' that are characteristic of social fields.[9] These objective regularities can be thought of as having a 'coercive facticity'. The production of a practical sense — a particular type of *habitus* — is driven by the structural arrangements of social fields (such as criminology or more broadly education). The arrangements that come to characterise a social field are, in turn, subject to external forces.

One site of criminological enterprise is higher education which, as a political institution, is shaped in part by external national and international political and economic currents. These currents have a bearing on the internal configuration of fields such as criminology and knowledge producing (research) and reproducing (pedagogy) practices. In turn, a practical sense is forged within this context of immediately pressing 'objective regularities'. The latter often manifest as recurring social problems that a field sometimes takes up as its own or manifest as problems internal to a field that must be overcome for scholarship to advance. This conditioning of institutionalised fields and conditioning of *habitus* by field is significant for shaping pedagogical practice and impacts reasoning as to how best to achieve teaching objectives, what those ought to be, and more broadly what will be communicated about the field (for example, that it is a social science, behavioural science, that it is characterised by private reason, public reason, etc). The practical sense animates the practices that reproduce a particular type of criminological field and whether a criminology of private or public reason will be dominant. This has implications for how theory's place and role in criminology will be conceptualised, and in turn the pedagogical practices that will seem most suitable.

The aim of the above discussion has not been to displace a history of ideas approach but to offer a different model and strategy for pedagogical practice that more adequately captures what is done with theory by social scientists. It is received wisdom today that theory can be taught as a content oriented course while research courses must be 'hands on' to be of any practical benefit. This dominant ethos makes sense for a criminology of private reason but not a criminology of public reason. I suggest that a qualified 'hands on' approach is needed for criminological theory, and that the recent interest in fictional realities can help develop such an approach.

---

[9] My understanding of *habitus* derives from Bourdieu (1973, 1977, 1980/1990, 1981, 1987/1990, 1994/1998).

Fictional realities as social objects

At a time when having students conduct fieldwork is considered too costly, time consuming, and rife with possible ethical complications, fictional realities can be utilised as social objects to be analysed.

The social object, Bourdieu holds, is not a thing *per se* but rather 'a system of expressly constructed relations' (Bourdieu et al 1968/1991:34). These relations are constructed through social science craft work. Through the social enterprise of this craft work, as the researcher 'constructs' his or her object, qualities and characteristics of the object emerge:

> The program of observation and analysis through which it [the object] is effected is … a protracted and exacting task that is accomplished little by little, through a whole series of small rectifications and amendments inspired by what is called *le métier*, … by the set of practical principles that orients choices at once minute and decisive (Bourdieu 1992:227–8).

The practical principles and *habitus* of researchers, according to Bourdieu, has a significant impact on how an object emerges and how it is understood. It should be pointed out that what we are dealing with is the gradual formation of a social object through the craft enterprise of operating concepts and rendering a mass of tangled relations intelligible. Although Bourdieu speaks of the 'construction' of objects, it is crucial to note that there is an empirical referent apart from the knowledge of this referent which is being 'compiled', if you will, with our analytic tools. If we turn to the telescope metaphor we can more readily capture his meaning: objects 'emerge' or are 'constructed' in that different sets of concepts will enable us to see with more or less clarity (depending on their degree of refinement) different configurations of relations. They will bring into focus aspects of the relations that comprise the object of interest. This construction project — which is a craft-enterprise — is for Bourdieu (1992:224) 'the most crucial research operation and the most completely ignored.'

> An object of research … can only be defined and constructed in terms of a *theoretical problematic* which makes it possible to conduct a systematic questioning of the aspects of reality that are brought into relationship by the question that is put to them (Bourdieu et al 1968/1991:35).

That 'aspects of reality' are highlighted and revealed through systematic questioning indicates not only a construction process but also that which makes systematic questioning possible: an articulated set of analytic concepts and the 'set of practical principles' for their operation. Whether these practical principles are aligned with private or public reason will have implications for the kind of research and teaching practices that become characteristic of and deemed legitimate for criminology.

What is particularly valuable about the fictional reality is that it is an empirical referent that can provide a 'hands on' approach to theorising and analysis. Because this process emphasises the manipulation and operation of concepts (as object-like tools or technologies) and thinking broadly and abstractly, it is well suited to promoting a criminology of public reason. A comparative approach to applying and evaluating concepts

is also made possible. As an object that is distinctly social in nature, the fictional reality offers not examples of concepts but a complex of relations to be analytically delineated through social science craft work. Layered and complex they lend themselves to being deconstructed and creatively theorised. This provides a vehicle to facilitate an active learning approach to criminological and sociological theorising; to clarifying, discussing, and transmitting concepts. Following Bourdieu, applying and operating the analytic tools provided by sociology and criminology can raise objects out of the complex set of relations of which the fictional reality is comprised. Although the fictional reality is just that, fictional, this does not mean that the objects that are defined and constructed will also be fictional. Issues of gender, race, class, power or processes such as criminalisation, juridification, and racialisation may be explored criminologically. Although bounded by a fictional context they certainly are far from fictional. As Potter (2001:184) has persuasively argued, 'even the most non-naturalistic fictional forms and "unrealistic" fictional universes are reality-dependent in terms of meaning.'

The complex fictional reality and what we might think of as its 'simpler' objects must indicate to some degree the social, political, and economic conditions under which it was produced (Ollman 1976:26–7; Potter 2001) and under which it can be understood (or not) and interpreted (Potter, 2001:190–1). Thus Ollman (1976:26–7) is able to claim:

> Thus, the book before me expresses and therefore, on this model, relationally contains everything from the fact that there is a light on in my room to the social practises and institutions of my society which made this particular work possible. The conditions of its existence are taken to be part of what it is …

Foucault suggests something similar:

> The frontiers of a book are never clear-cut: beyond the title, the first lines, and the last full stop, beyond its internal configuration and its autonomous form, it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network. … The book is not simply the object that one holds in one's hands; and it cannot remain within the little parallelpiped that contains it: its unity is variable and relative. As soon as one questions that unity, it loses its self-evidence; it indicates itself, constructs itself, only on the basis of a complex field of discourse (Foucault 1969/1972:23).

Foucault, Ollman, Potter, and Bourdieu each emphasise what are known as 'internal relations' — the connexions between 'simpler' (but not simple) objects that are necessary to the 'complex' object's existence. The value of this holistic view is that it highlights the necessary connexions between, for instance, objects of social science and their embeddedness within both a material and knowledge-specific context (social science knowledge in general and the specific conceptual lenses through which we can observe and experience our object). Following this it is more than plausible to hold that there is a necessary relation between teaching and research, research and theorising, as well as the structure and organisation of the criminological field and the criminologist's *habitus*.

Different sets of analytic tools and practical principles enable and constrain the production/ highlighting/revealing of different sets of relations, whether economic, political, discursive, or what have you. A fictional reality is much more than a work of fiction; it offers 'knowledge of the knowledge (potential knowledge that is, as literary texts may

deceive as well as enlighten) of reality that is contained within the text' (Potter 2001:192). 'In short', continues Potter, 'the text itself is not the object of knowledge. Rather the literary text is the medium in which the knowledge is initially expressed; the text's "literariness" is merely the form, the special sort of language in which the knowledge is presented' (Potter 2001:192). Thus, far from watching films or reading novels for entertainment, or using these as examples of criminological concepts, the embedded reality and relational aspect of social objects can be illuminated through sociological and criminological theorising. In turn, the analytic process is highlighted, serving to clarify concepts and their operation.

Craft-enterprise and the fictional reality as pedagogical tool: An illustration

Thus far I have made a theoretical intervention to argue that a history of ideas as a pedagogical strategy is hampered by its implicit assumptions about the ontological status of theories and concepts. This operates as an epistemological obstacle to both the craft-practice of theoretical analysis and for reproducing a criminology of public reason. To illustrate what I have been arguing thus far, I employ the work of Jack Katz (1988) to offer a brief analysis of the motion picture, *Falling Down* (Schumacher 1993). It is hoped that this brief application will clarify any ambiguities and exemplify the pedagogical approach to theorising advocated. *Falling Down* offers a richly textured fictionalised social reality to engage with, enabling illustration of how operating different sets of analytic concepts will necessarily yield different descriptions, interpretations, and explanations of the same empirical referent. Importantly, the film is not used here as an example of Katz but rather as an empirical referent to demonstrate what an exemplary pedagogy for criminological theory might look like and the value of this for empowering students to craft their own descriptions and explanations through the operating of criminological and sociological concepts. The film provides multiple cases of crime/deviance for analysis, but due to space restrictions I will limit engagement to one scene of the film and the introduction and chapter one of Katz. The point of the discussion can be found in the contrast between the existing interpretations highlighted and the Katzian interpretation offered. Thus readers require no prior knowledge of the film as the reader is not expected to formulate his or her own interpretation of the film.

Existing interpretations

The description of the film offered by the studio holds that *Falling Down* is 'a tale of urban reality.' The main character, Bill Foster (Michael Douglas), is an 'ordinary man at war with the everyday world' (DVD). Nicole Rafter (2006:157) holds *Falling Down* to be a 'vigilante film' in which the protagonist, a 'middle-aged failure', becomes 'unglued and lashes out against all the forces that seem to be conspiring to make men like himself miserable'. Jude Davies (1995:147) notes that *Falling Down* is a 'transformation film' mainly concerned with gender, specifically 'a crisis of lost masculinity.' The transformation of the Bill character, it is suggested, is 'from everyman to madman' (Davies 1995:147). Bill's transformation is said to be the outcome of his response to 'a series of encounters with different city-dwellers … with ever-increasing violence' (Davies 1995:147). Through this process, 'D-FENS [aka Bill] is thus established as an archetypal, universal figure challenging power in the name of reason and natural justice, a white male standing up for the rights of whites and blacks, men and women' (Davies 1995:149). Rafter (2006:194)

suggests it is revenge which motivates his actions. Davies suggests Bill uses violence as a solution to his problems.

Davies' conclusion, that we are dealing with a madman borne of frustration and suffering a crisis of lost masculinity, is not one that can be arrived at if we theorise the film through the work of Jack Katz. Nor will we arrive at the description offered by the studio, that Bill is an 'ordinary man at war with the everyday world'. Nor, again, will we arrive at the position advanced by Rafter that Bill is a vigilante, a failure, fighting against what he perceives is an unjust world. The suggestion here is not that these interpretations are incompatible with one another or with Katz or that they are wrong. Rather, these interpretations serve for us to illustrate that choosing and operating one set of concepts over another will necessarily produce a different description and understanding of the events depicted in the film (or in social life), will constrain what can be articulated, and will highlight/reveal/construct a different set of objects contained within the complex.

A criminological variation

Katz suggests that we should bracket off or separate 'taken-for-granted' understandings and assumptions to grasp the subjective, foreground experience of actors to get at how they understand their situation. The acts dealt with by Katz, including killing, theft, and vandalism, are viewed as acts based on, or as responses to an interpretation or definition of the situation by a social self.[10] Katz (1988:7) stipulates that social selves, for instance what he terms the 'righteous killer', undergo a complex process, a 'dialectic process through which a person empowers the world to seduce him to criminality'. Action is produced and understood by social selves through one or other frame of reference. Indebted to symbolic interactionism, Katz is interested in the different 'qualities of experience that distinguish different forms of criminality' (Katz 1988:4) and the process of the 'emergence of' criminality (Katz 1988:9). The experience of the emergence of criminality is complex and ultimately ends with what is either a successful or failed attempt by an offender to avoid — or void — an experience of humiliation. In short, Katz suggests that intersecting social and mental processes constitute the conditions for realising or impugning an experience of criminality.

Utilising Katz, we must view the character of Bill as a social self who, through the intersecting of social and mental processes, can experience different forms of criminality and humiliation and who attempts to nullify his experiences of humiliation. To clarify, Katz sets out a structure — a theoretical framework arrived at through analytic induction (Katz 1988:11) — that explains the emergence and experience of criminality. The three conditions outlined below are necessary for 'raising the spirit of criminality' (that is, for one to experience criminality)(Katz 1988:9). With this, the process is shown to be a differentiated one in which the emergence of criminality may be enabled or impugned. '[F]or each type of crime,' Katz (1988:9) argues, '[there is] a different set of individually necessary and jointly sufficient conditions', each set containing:

1. Path of Action — 'the distinctive practical requirements for successfully committing the crime; (*practical attention to a mode of executing action*)

---

10 The Social Self is the outcome of a dialectical relation between what GH Mead called the 'I' and the 'Me', the basis for Symbolic Interactionism.

2. Line of Interpretation — unique ways of understanding how one is and will be seen by others (*symbolic creativity in defining the situation*), and
3. Emotional Process — seductions and compulsions that have special dynamics (*aesthetic finesse in recognising and elaborating on the sensual possibilities*)

Katz's text is not only a protracted effort to illustrate that the intersection of these three conditions is necessary for the emergence of various types and experiences of deviance, but the text itself is the outcome of a process (of analytic induction). Thus the text is exemplary of process, the latter being central to interactionist methodology. The film, *Falling Down*, can be theorised as a protracted effort to illustrate the process of symbolic transformation of the main character, Bill. Attention to process in *Falling Down* and treating the film as an empirical referent to which can be applied Katz's concepts, helps us to examine and clarify Katz's theoretical position and a particular mode of theorising, just as Katz's theoretical concepts can help us examine *Falling Down*.

In his analysis of violence and killing (Chapter One), the process of symbolic transformation comprises a number of articulated existential moments that rest upon the three conditions outlined above. These are humiliation-righteousness-rage-sacrificial violence (sometimes appearing as 'righteous slaughter') and finally, moral transcendence (the transcendence of humiliation). This should not be interpreted as a stage theory of violence but rather as the description of the articulation of moments necessary to the emergence of physical violence and transcendence of symbolic violence. Physical violence may emerge and with this symbolic violence may be overcome. It should be noted, however, that there is a necessary sequence of experiences but this does not mean actualisation of the full sequence. The moments of experience commingle and may or may not culminate in physical violence and moral transcendence (overcoming of the symbolic violence of humiliation).

Utilising the conditions theorised by Katz to produce the emergence of criminality and moral transcendence, we can arrive at the following interpretation of the first important scene of *Falling Down*. In this scene, a middle-aged Caucasian, Bill, enters a variety store in a poor, working class neighbourhood of Los Angeles, having left his vehicle on a freeway on-ramp only a short distance away. In the previous scene, the opening scene of the film, director Joel Schumacher attempts to provide us with some existential context, drawing the viewer into the sights and sounds that overwhelm Bill and effect his experience of, and reaction to a traffic jam during a record-breaking heat wave. Bill enters Mr Lee's store to acquire coins to use a pay phone, only to be told by the Korean owner that he must purchase something. Bill's choice of a cold can of Coke is not only motivated by his attempt to spend as little money as possible but also to obtain some relief from the heat. He is informed that the can of soda (his relief from the heat and means to utilise the pay phone) will cost 85 cents, not leaving him enough for the pay phone. An unfriendly exchange of words ensues leading to a physical altercation in which, among other things, a glass jar of American flags is dislodged from the counter, forcefully crashing to pieces on the floor, scattering and humiliating the flag and everything it represents. This functions as an analogy for the conflict between Lee and Bill, the call to defend 'American' values, with the humiliation of the American flag symbolising the humiliation that Bill experiences at the hands of Lee. It is surely no coincidence that the Bill character displays 'D-FENS' on his vehicle licence plate

and is throughout the film constantly challenged to defend a value-commitment against social selves representative of 'other' supposedly un-American values.

According to Katz a 'line of interpretation' is required to enable the would-be perpetrator to interpret the victim's actions and the context in a particular way. This facilitates the belief that the victim is somehow attacking or offending the offender's sense of self, social identity, and what are believed to be commonly shared values. This is often framed in moral terms. Bill understands himself to be an upstanding citizen, a 'good guy' and is deeply offended by what he perceives as Mr Lee's price-gouging, offensive because of his belief that hard working Americans ought not be 'ripped off'. This offends Bill's sense of decency and morality and this is compounded by Lee's ethnicity. Bill views this price gouging and Lee's 'un-American' values as a barrier to making a phone call to his (former) wife and child on his daughter's birthday. These are also barriers to Bill reproducing his social identity and sense of self as a hard working family man and good, loving, caring father. When Mr Lee attempts to club Bill with a baseball bat, thinking he is defending himself against a 'crazy', Bill's sense of how decent, civilised people ought to properly resolve their differences is offended, casting Lee as uncivilised and reinforcing his status as 'un-American'. This value conflict is expressed by Katz (1988:18–19) when he stipulates that the would-be attacker 'must understand not only that the victim is attacking what he, the killer, regards as an eternal human value, but that the situation requires a last stand in defence of his basic worth.' In other words, Bill understands Mr Lee to be issuing a 'challenge' (Katz 1988:20) to Bill to defend his sense of self, social identity, and what he perceives as distinctly American values.

The second component of the emergence and experience of criminality is the 'emotional process'. Katz (1988:19) argues that the would-be-killer undergoes 'a particular emotional process' where the humiliation or indignation perceived must be transformed or changed into rage. Rage usually builds after an altercation begins, not before (Katz 1988:39, 40). This is where the would-be attacker, in that moment, feels compelled to respond to a 'fundamental challenge to his worth' (1988:20), to act in the name of 'right' or even 'justice' to defend what is Bill's sense of morality, shaped by a collective sensibility about civility and 'Americaness'. Bill views Mr Lee's actions (eg, trying to club him with a bat) as 'disrespectful' (1988:22). Mr Lee thinks Bill wants to rob him and tells him to, 'Take the money.' This deeply offends Bill, who states, 'I'm not the thief; you're the thief.' This is the transforming of Bill's indignation into rage. The outcome of his interpretation and experience is Bill destroying stock by using the same bat that moments earlier was an instrument of offence. The bat has been transformed into an instrument of D-FENS, not only as an instrument of righteousness with which to defend the moral challenge but also as a tool wielded by Bill, whom we find out in the film credits is also named D-FENS, no doubt an indication of his transformation. The bat is an instrument to defend 'the good' and also to restore the 'goodness' to Bill's social identity. He has perceived Lee as gouging or 'ripping off' customers and takes what is thought to be a necessary stand (see pp 19–22) against this in the form of 'trashing' Lee's store. Important to note is Katz's (1988:23) stipulation about the transformation of humiliation into rage: 'Righteousness is not the product of rage; it is the essential stepping stone from humiliation to rage.' '[T]he attack,' writes Katz (1988:24), 'is not a "statement" of moral superiority. It is the outcome' of Bill's belief that he has taken a righteous position; that he must make a stand in the name of common decency for himself and others who have suffered humiliation by being 'ripped off'. Vandalism this is not.

Rather, it is a defence of what Katz defines as 'the good'. Taking this righteous position (that it is wrong to rip people off; that Bill is a 'good' person, not a thief; that Bill is a good provider, father, and husband; that Lee is bad) serves to resolve the deep and penetrating identity altering humiliation Bill has experienced seemingly through no fault of his own (Katz 1988:30). Here we have a process of symbolic transformation whereby 'victim' (Lee) and 'offender' (Bill) are transposed. Lee becomes the offender, Bill the victim. This involves a change in the perception of social identity, the perception and experience of an assault on the offender's (Bill) sense of self and social role, the issuing of a challenge, and need to defend or restore this sense of self. Alongside this is a perception and experience of an offence against 'the good' or 'common decency', which, if it is to be preserved or restored, requires D-FENS.

A third intersecting element is what Katz terms the 'path of action.' The would-be attacker (sometimes ending up becoming a killer) must act to 'wipe out' (Katz, 1988:33) or erase the source of what is experienced as a deeply internalised humiliation. 'Death may or may not result, but when it does, it comes as a sacrificial slaughter' (Katz 1988:19; cf 33–9). This is an important point — Bill does not need to sacrifice Mr Lee, only Lee's capacity to offend. Bill destroys Mr Lee symbolically by sacrificing Lee's social identity of shopkeeper and his ability to offend the good. He does this by destroying Lee's stock and therefore his capacity for 'price gouging'. Bill is also destroying any interpretation of himself as a thief by paying for the can of soda he was compelled to purchase in the first place. The struggle over the soda represents an emotional conflict, with Bill defending and Mr Lee offending. Offence and defence are central themes in the film.

Although Bill has engaged in violence and what might typically be regarded as vandalism, this is not perceived by Bill to be a destructive act: 'the impassioned attacker is destroying his victim only to create something for himself' (Katz 1988:32). This, then, is a creative and productive act. This is what Katz (1988:33, 41) calls 'sacrificial violence' — a ritual performed for 'wiping out' or obliterating a source of moral indignation while moving the offended and defending social self toward successfully meeting the challenge and morally transcending the humiliation experienced. Concomitantly, the negative representation of Bill is destroyed and moral order restored. Through an ongoing process over the course of the film Bill becomes what we could call a 'folk hero' for taking a stand against other 'sources of moral offence', eventually ending up what many would consider a vigilante. However, through the Katz framework, Bill is not a vigilante but rather a righteous killer engaged in sacrificial violence.

There are other aspects to this process of transformation, such as 'marking the offense' (Katz 1988:34) in order to symbolically transform the victim into a 'morally lower, polluted, corrupted, profanized form of life …' (Katz 1988:36). Katz argues that cursing or swearing is a method of 'casting a spell', an incantation to accomplish this magical transformation. 'Cursing sets up violence to be a sacrifice to honour the attacker as a priest representing the collective moral being' (Katz 1988:37). Bill engages in this by berating Lee, through his indignant behaviour, his remarks pertaining to how Lee ought to 'learn how to speak English', his suggestion that Korea is financially subservient to the United States, and his charge that Lee is a 'thief'. This transformation of the victim into 'moral garbage' and the attacker into a defender of all that is good and moral, aids in rationalising the attack: 'If the other is shit,' Katz (1988:37) stipulates, 'attacking him becomes a community service

— a form of moral garbage collection performed on behalf of all decent people.' Thus Bill, rather than being a violent attacker or killer, is a social self firmly rooted in the belief that he is performing a public service and defending 'the good'.

The three intersecting conditions Katz theorises to underpin the emergence and experience of deviance/criminality have been illustrated and utilised to analyse the social reality offered by *Falling Down*. We have here not simply a descriptive overview of the film and then an attempt to relate to Katz, but rather the crafting of description and interpretation through the analytic lenses furnished by Katz. This is only an illustration of the utility of fictional realities for theoretical criminology but provides a sense of how a craft enterprise model offers an exemplary pedagogical practice and strategy. Whether or not we agree with Katz or hold that he is offering an apology for violent behaviour is not at issue. Quite possibly Katz has it wrong and we would do well to steer clear of his position. The value, however, of Katz and other theoretical frameworks does not rest upon whether or not they are right or have been empirically tested. What is at issue here is how fictional realities can be fruitfully exploited for illustrating and honing a craft enterprise of theorising that can communicate a deeper understanding and approach to how theoretical concepts within criminology and sociology are crafted, refined, and operated and that concepts possess a 'coercive facticity'.

The craft-enterprise model is valuable because it insists on putting a theory's concepts 'into action'. Our analysis can be categorised as 'micro' or 'interactionist'. Far from being the result of a personal preference, Katz has lead us to this. Employing his concepts necessarily leads us away from issues of social structure (although such issues might be brought into the discussion through combining Katz with a structurally oriented set of concepts). This is a good example of how analytic concepts not only enable the production of a particular description, but also how they limit what can be articulated. It is through operating concepts that we can map out their limitations and possible avenues of reformulation and extension. For example, as Katz has nothing to say about the experience of the victim, our analysis cannot speak to Mr Lee's experience. Thinking about this limitation helps us reveal the limits of the Katz framework which enables identification of a potential area for further devlopment or refinement. Limitations in this sense are invitations. Additionally, the craft-enterprise model makes explicit the concept-dependent nature of any description and explanation, even those that are seemingly value neutral or 'commonsense'. Different from a history of ideas approach, what is offered through a craft-enterprise model and use of the fictional reality as a pedagogical tool is an active engagement in creative theorising;[11] clarification of the concepts used and the process of thinking relationally, analytically and abstractly; as well as the highlighting of the complexity of the social reality examined.

---

[11] The term 'creative theorising' should not be read to mean 'the construction of theory'. I also do not mean by this the operationalising of concepts into variables or the formulation of a hypothesis. Nor am I suggesting the 'translation' of data into key terms or jargon. The systematic and considered use of theoretical concepts to produce a description and/or explanation and/or to illuminate features of our object of investigation, a process that moves beyond technical practice of categorising, is meant. I include in this the process of discovery, through use, of limitations and an attempt to remedy these through reformulation or creation of new analytic concepts.

Conclusion

Some readers may think that higher order reasoning abilities for criminology are unimportant. Some may think that these abilities are important but are learned as part of the 'hidden curriculum'. Still others might believe that such abilities are fostered by reading texts about theory, texts that may themselves be untheoretical, as long as they are read in a critical manner. Some may add that criminology has never been known for its theoretical sophistication and that any such expectation of criminologists or students of criminology is unrealistic. It may even be that this article's focus on pedagogy and theorising from a criminological standpoint will be considered trivial. Pedagogical practice, though, is something that confronts every criminologist located within a university setting. Moreover, any reflexive criminology worth its salt must contemplate how the criminological field and dominant practices within it are reproduced and the implications of this.

Bourdieu (1992:222–3) has argued convincingly that many modes of thinking and acting, especially in the case of a craft, 'are transmitted from practice to practice, through total and practical modes of transmission founded upon direct and lasting contact between the one who teaches and the one who learns'. A significant part of the craft, Bourdieu continues, as scientists, historians and philosophers of science have observed, 'is acquired via modes of transmission that are thoroughly practical' (Bourdieu 1992:223).[12] This article has sought to exploit the space carved out by recent treatments of film and literature, exploring the value of the fictional reality as a pedagogical tool for an *exemplary* pedagogical practice. I have argued that theory is best approached via a craft-enterprise model and that this requires an exemplary pedagogical practice, the type of practice that the dominant history of ideas model alone cannot provide for. The history of ideas model, it has been argued, is hampered by implicit assumptions about the ontological status of theories and concepts, which in turn operates as an epistemological obstacle to both stimulating the craft-practice of theoretical analysis and to reproducing a reflexive criminology of public reason.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges and thanks Peter Kraska and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. The author has also benefited greatly and continues to benefit from ongoing dialogue with Frank Pearce and R Paul Datta on all manner of theoretical, practical, metaphysical and transcendental matters.

---

[12] Frank Williams (1999) has argued that we ought to look to 'evidence epistemologies' (p 65) for why changes occur in the criminological field regarding the state of theory (its production and reception). He argues that when new methodologies are utilised it creates the possibility of new theories being generated. In this sense how one undertakes empirical investigation will have implications for theory production because the procedure utilised constructs the objects (in Bourdieu's sense) to then be theorised and explained. In other words, social scientists 'construct their objects' as Bourdieu argues and in this rendering of their empirical object require interpretive schemes and devices to then explain these objects.

References

Blaikie, N (2000) *Designing Social Research* Polity Press, Cambridge

Bourdieu, P (1973) 'The Three Forms of Theoretical Knowledge' *Social Science Information* vol 12, no 1, pp 53–80

Bourdieu, P (1977) 'Structures and Habitus' (R Nice trans) in *Outline of a Theory of Practice* pp 72–95, Cambridge University Press, New York

Bourdieu, P (1980/1990) *The Logic of Practice* (R Nice trans) Stanford University Press, Stanford

Bourdieu, P (1981) 'Men and Machines' in Knorr-Cetina K and Cicourel AV (eds) *The Micro-Sociological Challenge of Macro-Sociology* pp 304–17, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston

Bourdieu, P (1987/1990b) 'Fieldwork in Philosophy' in *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* pp 3–33, Polity Press, Cambridge

Bourdieu, P (1992) 'The Practice of Reflexive Sociology' in Bourdieu P and Wacquant L (eds) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* pp 218–60, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Bourdieu, P (1994/1998) *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* Polity Press, Cambridge MA

Bourdieu, P, Chamboredon J-C and Passeron J-C (1968/1991) *The Craft of Sociology: Epistemological Preliminaries* Walter de Gruyter, New York

Bryman, A (1988) *Quality and Quantity in Social Research* Routledge, London

Craib, I (1984) *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas* Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York

Currie, D, MacLean, B and Milovanovic D (1992) 'Three Traditions of Critical Justice Inquiry: Class, Gender, and Discourse' in Currie D and MacLean B (eds) *Re-thinking the Administration of Justice* pp 3–42, Fernwood, Halifax

Davies, J (1995) '"I'm the Bad Guy?" Falling Down and White Masculinity in 1990s Hollywood' *Journal of Gender Studies* vol 4, no 2, pp 145–52

Downes, D and Rock, P (2003) *Understanding Deviance* (4th ed) Oxford University Press, New York

Einstadter, W and Henry, S (2006) *Criminological Theory: An Analysis of its Underlying Assumptions* Rowan and Littlefield, New York

Engel, ST (2003) 'Teaching literature in the criminal justice curriculum' *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* vol 14, no 2, pp 345–54

Ericson, R (1996) 'Making Criminology' *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* vol 8, no 1, pp 14–38

Fiddler, M (2007) 'Projecting the Prison: The Depiction of the Uncanny in *The Shawshank Redemption*' *Crime Media Culture* vol 3, no 2, pp 192–206

Foucault, M (1969/1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Pantheon, New York

Foucault, M (1970/1972) ‘The Discourse on Language’ (Sheridan A trans) in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* pp 215–37, Pantheon, New York

Foucault, M (1975/1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Sheridan A trans) Random House, Toronto

Frauley, J (2005) ‘Representing Theory and Theorising in Criminal Justice Studies: Practising Theory Considered’ *Critical Criminology: An International Journal* vol 13, no 3, pp 245–65

Frauley, J (2008) ‘Heterodox Criminology: Rethinking Methodology and Criminological Knowledge Production’ in Ventura, W (ed) *Criminology: Challenges for the 21st Century* pp 1–23, Nova Science, New York

Frauley, J and Pearce, F (2007) ‘Critical Realism and the Social Sciences: Methodological and Epistemological Preliminaries’ in Frauley, J and Pearce, F (eds) *Critical Realism and the Social Sciences: Heterodox Elaborations* pp 3–29, University of Toronto Press, Toronto

Garland, D and Sparks, R (2000) ‘Criminology, Social Theory and the Challenge of Our Times’ *British Journal of Criminology* vol 40, pp 189–204

Gehrke, P (2001) ‘Deviant Subjects in Foucault and *A Clockwork Orange*: congruent Critiques of Criminological Constructions of Subjectivity’ *Critical Studies in Media Communication* vol 18, no 3, pp 270–84

Hagan, FE and Benekos, P (2002) ‘The Nacirema Revisited: A Pedagogical Tool for Teaching Criminological Theory’ *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* vol 13, no 1, pp 25–34

Hunt, A (1989) ‘The Role and Place of Theory in Legal Education: Reflections on Foundationalism’ *Legal Studies* vol 9, no 2, pp 146–64

Hunt, A (1993) Explorations *in Law and Society: Toward a Constitutive Theory of Law* Routledge, New York

Kant, I (1784/1997) ‘Was ist Aufklarung?’ in Lotringer, S and Hochroth, L (eds) *The Politics of Truth* pp 7–22, Semiotext(e), New York

Katz, J (1988) *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil* Basic Books, New York

Kraska, PB (2006) ‘Criminal Justice Theory: Toward Legitimacy and an Infrastructure’ *Justice Quarterly* vol 23, no 2, pp 167–85

Kuhn, T (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Layder, D (1993) *New Strategies in Social Research* Polity Press, Cambridge

Laz, C (1996) ‘Science Fiction and Introductory Sociology: The “Handmaid” in the Classroom’ *Teaching Sociology* vol 24, no 1, pp 54–63

López, J (2003) *Society and its Metaphors: Language, Social Theory and Social Structure* Continuum, New York

Manicas, PT (1987) *A History and Philosophy of the Social Sciences* Blackwell, New York

Menzies, R and Chunn, DE (1999) 'Discipline in Dissent: Canadian Academic Criminology at the Millenium' *Canadian Journal of Criminology* vol 41, no 2, pp 285–97

Morrison, W (1995) *Theoretical Criminology: From Modernity to Post-Modernism* Cavendish, London

O'Brien, M, Tzanelli, R, Yar, M and Penna, S (2005) 'The Spectacle of Fearsome Acts: Crime in the Melting P(l)ot of *Gangs of New York*' *Critical Criminology* vol 13, pp 17–35

Ollman, B (1976) *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* (2nd ed) Cambridge University Press, New York

Pearce, F (1978) 'Art and Reality: Gangsters in Film and Society' *The Sociological Review Monograph* vol 26, April, pp 245–70

Pearce, F (1989) *The Radical Durkheim* (1st ed) Unwin Hymen Winchester, MA

Potter, G (2001) 'Truth in Fiction, Science and Criticism' in J Lopez and G Potter (eds) *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism* pp 183–96, Athlone Press, New York

Rafter, N (2006) *Shots in the Mirror: Crime Films and Society* (2nd ed) Oxford, New York

Rafter, N (2007) 'Crime, Film and Criminology: Recent Sex-Crime Movies' *Theoretical Criminology* vol 11, no 3, pp 403–20

Rigakos, G and Frauley, J 'The Promise of Critical Realism: Toward a Post-Empiricist Criminology' in A Doyle and D Moore (eds) *The Criminological Promise* UBC Press, Vancouver

Ritzer, G and Goodman, D (2004) *Classical Sociological Theory* (4th ed) McGraw-Hill, New York

Ruggiero, V (2002) 'Moby Dick and the Crimes of the Economy' *British Journal of Criminology* vol 42, pp 96–108

Ruggiero, V (2003) *Crime in Literature: Sociology of Deviance and Fiction* Verso, New York

Sayer, A (1992) *Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach* (2nd ed) Routledge, New York

Schumacher, J (1993) *Falling Down* (Warner Bros USA) directed by Joel Schumacher, screenplay by Ebbe Roe Smith

Seidman, S (2007) *Contested Knowledge* (3rd ed) Wiley Blackwell, New York

Stenning, P (1999) 'Implications of Public Service Reform for Criminal Justice Research and Policy in Canada' *Canadian Journal of Criminology* vol 41, no 2, pp 179–90

Tombs, S and Whyte, D (2002) 'Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful' *Critical Criminology* vol 11, pp 217–36

Tombs, S and Whyte, D (2003) 'Scrutinizing the Powerful: Crime, Contemporary Political Economy, and Critical Social Research' in Tombs, S and Whyte, D (eds) *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful: Scrutinizing States and Corporations* pp 3–45, Peter Lang, New York

Walters, R (2003) 'New Modes of Governance and the Commodification of Criminological Knowledge' *Social & Legal Studies* vol 12, no 1, pp 5–26

Walters, R and Presdee, M (1999) 'Governing Criminological Knowledge — State, Power and the Politics of Criminological Research' in Corsianos, M and Train, K (eds) *Interrogating Social Justice: Politics, Culture and Identity* pp 51–70, Canadian Scholar's Press, Toronto

West, AD (2005) 'Horton the Elephant is a Criminal: Using Dr. Seuss to Teach Social Process, Conflict, and Labelling Theory' *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* vol 16, no 2, pp 341–58

White, R (2001) 'Criminology for Sale: Institutional Change and the Intellectual Field' *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* vol 13, no 1, pp 123–42

Williams, F (1999) *Imagining Criminology: An Alternative Paradigm* Ashgate, Aldershot

Woodiwiss, A (1990) *Social Theory After Post-modernism: Rethinking Production, Law, and Class* Pluto Press, London

Woodiwiss, A (1998) *Globalisation, Human Rights and Labour Law in Pacific Asia* Cambridge University Press

Woodiwiss, A (2001) *The Visual in Social Theory* Athlone Press/Continuum, New York

Wright Mills, C (1959) *The Sociological Imagination* Oxford University Press, New York