In learning about anarchist criminology it is important to learn where and what (if anything) is presented about anarchism in academia. In order to learn what is presented, I conducted a content analysis of introductory criminology textbooks in order to measure the quantity and quality of content presented on anarchism in introductory (1st and 2nd year) criminology. Anarchism is a radical approach to criminology that has important ideals (absolute freedoms, mutual aid, and state abolition). The theory critically analyzes society in a manner significantly different than any other criminological theory. The content analysis measures to what extent (if at all) anarchism is presented in academic criminology.
Measuring the extent that anarchism is depicted in introductory criminology is beneficial to understanding the theory itself. In my experience in academia, I found that the introductory years do not present anarchism at all. Thus, the content analysis helps show the extent that it is missing, and leads to a theory development of anarchism. The content analysis can help create awareness among professors, students, publishers, and others in understanding how anarchism is presented in introductory criminology textbooks.

Introductory criminology classes are a student’s initial exposure to the field. These classes provide the foundation or framework for students. The large majority of classes assign textbooks for the class, which provides a framework for the curriculum of what will be studied. Ross (2008) states, introductory textbooks are a crucial function in “framing and interpreting the discussion of important academic disciplines by defining the boundaries for the inclusion and exclusion of appropriate discourse” (p. 447). Naturally not all textbook content is covered and an instructor may place higher importance on some areas over others; nonetheless the textbook provides a good idea of what is likely to be included or at least an understanding of what is available to be covered. From my academic experience, anarchism is not covered in introductory classroom textbooks.

To help understand the extent that anarchism is presented in introductory criminology textbooks, I conducted a content analysis of all the introductory criminology text-
books (8 textbooks) from Kwantlen Polytechnic University (KPU) for the Fall 2013 semester (13 classes) and the six most popular introductory criminology textbooks from Amazon.ca.

The goal of the research is to measure the extent that anarchism is presented in introductory criminology textbooks. The research is both quantitative and qualitative in design: anarchism is quantitatively compared with other relevant criminological theories and anarchism is qualitatively measured for accuracy and depth. The methodology will be further explained later.

**Context**

The theoretical perspective of anarchism is politically oriented. Similar to Marxism, it aims to reconstruct the socio-political structure. Anarchism promotes individual liberties and follows a do-it-yourself model. It is a radical theory that has historical and contemporary connections to criminology. Historically, there have been exchanges between Peter Kropotkin (an early anarchist) and Cesare Lombroso (an early positivist criminologist) roughly in the late-1800s. Throughout history there have been anarchist critiques of the criminal justice system, suggestions for positive and humanizing changes that have influenced contemporary theories such as peacemaking criminology, and restructuring society in a manner that involves all members of the community. The point here being that anarchism has been involved in criminological is-
sues and theoretical connections for an extensive period of time. The aim of this content analysis is to describe the extent and quality by which anarchism is presented in introductory criminology (1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} year classes) textbooks.

There was no previous literature found that measures anarchism, but there are other studies that measure introductory criminological theories. Wright’s (2000) study found how little critical criminology is presented in introductory criminology by measuring the amount of content in introductory criminology textbooks. Wright (2000) conducted a quantitative analysis of all known American introductory criminology textbooks from 1990-1999 (34 textbooks) and measured them ‘per inch’ of content, and then compared the textbooks based on the authors’ theoretical bias (‘consensus,’ ‘conflict,’ ‘interdisciplinary,’ ‘noncritical,’ ‘other discipline,’ or ‘no discernible’). Wright (2000) also qualitatively measured the accuracy of the content presented and, again, compared the textbooks based on the authors’ theoretical bias. I do not look to the authors’ theoretical bias but do think it is important to compare the theory differentiation Wright used; consensus versus conflict (critical).

Wagner (2006) replicated Wright’s study of critical criminology instead using the top 10 Amazon.com introductory criminology textbooks as his sample. Both studies (Wright, 2000; Wagner, 2006) found a disproportionate amount of content covered on consensus theories versus critical theories and the findings were compounded
when taking into account the authors’ theoretical bias. The researchers found that critical criminology is largely excluded in relation to consensus based theories. Thus, I chose to include at least one theory from each.

I look to take a similar approach to measuring the quantity and quality of content, but I do not comparatively analyze textbooks based on theoretical bias. Although quantitatively measuring the amount of content is beneficial for contextualizing and comparing the extent of theories. Measuring the quality of content is, also, important. Length typically equates to amount of time and effort put into an area, however one author may put in a more concise and accurate paragraph that another author takes two pages to write.

Wright (2000) and Wagner (2006) looked at critical criminology in general as well as specific theories within the field. For instance, they (Wright, 2000; Wagner, 2006) both examined the extent that Marxism, feminism, postmodernism, and other theories were presented in introductory criminology textbooks. Notably, Wright (2000) did include anarchism in his research however it was included within a miscellaneous group that contained other theories in the findings. Wagner (2006) did not include anarchism in his analysis. The results of the miscellaneous group were 1.62 pages of coverage, per text (Wright, 2000). Even without isolating anarchism in the study it is apparent that the miscellaneous group is marginalized.
From this research, it is hypothesized that anarchism will be marginalized in introductory criminology. Nonetheless, this research will help provide a clearer understanding of the extent that anarchism is presented in introductory criminology, in addition to it being a part of a larger project that aims to (re-)connect anarchism to criminology. This initial piece helps better understand the extent to which anarchism is excluded, while suggesting that this exclusion is unjustified.

Although my content analysis does not look to explain and/or discover the effects of marginalizing knowledge versus promoting knowledge or the influence that certain societal structures (e.g. capitalist) have on these effects. Reece Walters (2003) explains some reasons for these adverse affects; explaining why certain factions of knowledge are marginalized while others are promoted, and the connection this has to a capitalist society. This argument is important to note but I do not look to pursue finding data for the argument as it is not conducive to my overall thesis. My content analysis looks to measure the extent and quality of anarchist criminology content presented.

Anarchism

Anarchism is a truly radical theory that takes a left-wing approach of crime and criminology, which helps widen the spectrum of thought in criminology. Just as it is important to understand classical views or conservatism (right-wing theories) in criminology. Yet, from my experi-
ence in academia, I have extensively read the right-wing approaches, while anarchism has been excluded.

Anarchism has several different forms that derive from differing theorists. The theorist I focus on is Peter Kropotkin. Kropotkin is an early leading anarchist that was involved in historical debates with founding criminologists. Kropotkin wrote on anarchism in the late-1800s in many books and articles that include “Mutual Aid” and “The Conquest of Bread,” which theorize communal anarchism and conceptualize anarchist ideals. Kropotkin argues for a societal structure without an authoritative power that requires certain ideals: absolute freedoms, mutual aid, and positive progression for humanity. Kropotkin (1939; 2006) argues that persons are generally good (not egoists) and under an appropriate societal structure (anarchist structure), we could work well together to mutually and individually benefit.

The current research focuses on three key areas of potential intersection between introductory criminology textbooks and anarchism: 1) Content on Cesare Lombroso; 2) Within a Critical/Radical criminology section; and 3) Within content on peacemaking criminology. First Cesare Lombroso: there have been historical exchanges between Lombroso, an influential positivist thinker, and Peter Kropotkin, an influential communal anarchist. Lombroso published several works (1890; 1900; 2006) that analyzed anarchists in order to find and measure physical deformities that cause criminality. Lombroso analyzed anarchists because he believed they were “criminal in
Kropotkin (1887) objected to Lombroso’s findings, methodology, and conclusions. These critiques of Lombroso’s work resonate to this day when Lombroso’s work is presented. Thus, two potential areas to include anarchism are in Lombroso’s research on criminal anarchists or citing Kropotkin in objections to Lombroso’s work.

A second potential intersection of anarchism and criminology is in a textbook’s section on critical or radical criminology. Introductory criminology textbooks often present one or more sections on critical or radical theories. Critical criminology refers to the unmasking of political assumptions—moral and ideological—that reaffirm power and economic inequalities in society through “the ‘science’ of criminology” (Taylor, Walton, and Young, 1975, pp. 4/5). Radical criminology incorporates the definition of critical criminology and extends it to more than merely description, “it must engage in theory and research as praxis” (Taylor, Walton, and Young, 1975, p. 24, emphasis in original). There is overlap between the two sections, as all radical theories are critical in nature but not all critical theories are radical in nature. For instance Marxist criminology is an example of a radical theory that is also a critical theory, while postmodernism is a critical theory but not a radical theory. Similar to Marxism, anarchism is a radical approach to criminology, thus it could potentially be included in either or both sections of a textbook.

Lastly, a key topic that could potentially intersect or include anarchism is in the presentation of peacemaking
criminology. Peacemaking criminology is a nonviolent, collective effort (offender, victim, family, community members, and so on) to criminology that includes restorative justice and empowers individual freedoms to peacefully respond to and work with social harms (Quinney, 2000; Tifft and Sullivan, 1980; 2006). Some presentations of peacemaking criminology doctrines derive from anarchism, particularly from peacemaking criminology presented by Tifft and Sullivan. Tifft and Sullivan have written on both anarchism (1980) and peacemaking criminology (2001; 2004; 2006). In referencing peacemaking criminology and restorative justice (a form of peacemaking criminology), Larry Tifft and Dennis Sullivan (2006) (re-)connect the persons connected to the harm to the community, and work on the healing process. Notably, Tifft and Sullivan directly cite Peter Kropotkin in their work (1980; 2001; 2004; 2006). In addition to citing Kropotkin, Tifft and Sullivan’s conceptualization of peacemaking criminology has clear humanizing connections to the community through solidarity, mutual aid, and mutual support.

Tifft and Sullivan are not the only theorists that present peacemaking criminology. Richard Quinney is coined as the founder of peacemaking criminology and his presentation of the theory continues to be influential today. However, Quinney takes a significantly different approach than Tifft and Sullivan in arguing for peacemaking criminology. Quinney focuses on the individual, arguing that in order to work compassionately together, it requires a
mind shift, from a western, rational-egoist mind to an eastern compassionate one (2000). Quinney’s (2000) conceptualization of compassion and a compassionate mind draws from Buddhism and Zen, which connects heavily to spirituality and metaphysical arguments.

An issue that arises from Quinney’s presentation is that it presents a false dilemma or leads to an unmeasurable variable. The false dilemma is that our minds can be either wholly compassionate or wholly rational. This seems to oversimplify the mind’s components into being incompatible with one another. You can either be compassionate or you can be rational. However, this statement seems counter-intuitive. For one, I feel that my mind can be compassionate when a friend talks to me about a dying loved one in one situation, and my mind can be rational in planning for a future career. Secondly, I feel that even in one particular situation, my mind can be both compassionate and rational. For instance, if a person was sentenced to the death penalty, I could empathize in a compassionate way with the convicted and their family and the finality of their life. I could also rationally look at the cost/benefit of the death penalty and the state’s ability to control one’s life. The same subject brings about differing angles to the topic that help in different ways. The point is that it is mistaken to dichotomize the mind to either compassion or rationality, and to assume that our mind is capable of entirely committing to one or the other.

Tifft and Sullivan (1980) argue for peacemaking criminology by demystifying and broadening the concept ‘so-
cial harm’. Away from the individual blaming focus that the criminal justice system takes to also include institutions (state, business, etc.) that, also, cause social harms, yet are legitimized. For instance, the rise of poverty levels due to a larger income inequality gap, the disproportionate amount of Aboriginals in jails, detaining protestors at the G20 summit in Toronto for expressing free speech, and the list goes on. Tifft and Sullivan (1980) argue that harm breeds further harm, relying on a state that focuses on harm producing responses to crime, as seen in crime control and punitive measures, breeds further harm within society. Hence, humanistic, community based responses such as restorative justice, which do not rely on the state, (re-)connect the victim, offender, and community, which leads to a more humanizing, peaceful result.

I do not believe that Quinney’s presentation is inconsistent with Tifft and Sullivan as both presentations argue for compassion and community connection. However, Quinney focuses on the individual and spirituality in his argument, while Tifft and Sullivan focus on the individual and structuring of society. So, it makes more sense why Tifft and Sullivan cite Kropotkin and Quinney does not. Tifft and Sullivan’s presentation derives from communal anarchist tenets. In measuring the extent that anarchism is presented within peacemaking criminology, it is important to also note who the authors of the textbooks use for the presentation, as Kropotkin should be connected or cited in Tifft and Sullivan’s presentation but not necessarily in Quinney’s.
Methodology

Previous literature (Wright, 2000; Walters, 2003; Wagner, 2006) has shown there is a link between knowledge promoted and knowledge marginalized. Walters (2003) argues that the “production of criminological knowledge” is increasingly representative of State and power interests, which are, typically, connected to research funding. Wright’s (2000) study supports Walters’ argument in finding that critical criminology approaches are often marginalized. I look specifically to measure anarchist criminology, as Wright (2000) merely grouped anarchism within a “miscellaneous” section included in his overall look at critical criminology. I include Walters’ argument to show that I have some assumptions on certain results that need to be explicit.

KPU is a Canadian post-secondary institution. My research measures all introductory criminology textbooks (8 textbooks) from introductory criminology classes that present sociological based theories (2 classes) during the Fall 2013 semester at KPU. This research, also, measures the top 6 textbooks from Amazon.ca. The two classes at KPU that introduce sociological based theories are titled “Introduction to Criminology” and “Sociological Explanations of Criminal Behavior.” The former is a first year class, the latter is a second year class. Both classes provide students with initial exposure to the broad field of criminology and include sociological based theories in the curriculum. The first year class also includes topics other
than criminological theories and areas than merely sociological based theories, and thus must include a broader amount of material than the second year class. The second year class is the earliest level criminology class dedicated to sociological based theories. The second year class is more thorough than the first year class, but is introductory in nature.

If anarchism is to be included in an introductory criminology textbook, it would be included as a sociological based theory in criminology. Sociological based theories of crime and deviant behavior refer to theories that study social order and structure, and their connection to collective and individual deviant behavior, which may include organizations and institutions (Rock, 2006; Sampson, 2000). This definition is not exhaustive of the topic, however it shows that the theories look at society’s connection to crime and deviance, whether at a macro- or micro-level.

In addition to the KPU Fall 2013 textbooks, I chose to also measure the top six introductory criminology textbooks from Amazon.ca. Wagner (2006) and Ross and Rothe (2008) used Amazon.com (the American version) for their sample of introductory criminology textbooks. Wagner had similar findings to Wright whom used all known American textbooks from 1990-1999. Ross and Rothe (2008) focused on state crime, thus their findings are not relatable but the methodology is relevant. Since Amazon.ca is a top-selling textbook site in Canada, the sample collected will act as my control group as well as
helping gauge generalizability issues that arise from focusing on only one sample institution.

As per measuring methods, I chose to conduct a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the content. As the research focuses on anarchism, the qualitative analysis is solely of anarchism. The qualitative analysis looks at the accuracy and depth of the content. Accuracy will look at whether the anarchist content presented is true or false. For instance, if an author accredits a concept to the wrong theorist or misconstrues the presentation of the theory. The depth measures how thoroughly the textbook looks at the theory. This is not merely connected to length, which the quantitative analysis will help exemplify, as writing can be shorter, more concise but have more depth on the topic. The goal is to understand the quality of anarchism presented in the textbooks.

The content is, also, quantitatively measured by counting the number of lines of content on the relevant theory. I chose to focus on number of lines as opposed to a word count, inch measurement, or other measurement because the content analysis is exploratory in nature and has a low projection for anarchist content presented. It is likely that there is such a high content gap that complete accuracy of the amount of content is unnecessary. In addition, due to time restraints a line count enables a more expeditious project. If there is to be a larger amount of anarchist content than predicted, then a more accurate measurement will be needed. If there is minimal to no content, then a more general contextualization of the theory is sufficient.
to help better understand the extent that anarchism is excluded from introductory criminology textbooks.

As textbooks come in different shapes and sizes, the research ensured to produce results from each textbook first in order to more accurately compare the overall findings based on a relative percentage. Each book will produce differing lengths that do not necessarily mean the textbook covers a theory more relative to other theories. For instance if one book included 100 lines of anarchism and 1,000 total lines of content, while another book included 50 lines of anarchism and 100 total lines of content, the second book includes fewer lines, but more content relative to the other theories which is a focus of the research.

In order to contextualize the presentation of anarchism, I chose to comparatively measure it against strain theory, Marxism, and peacemaking criminology. Strain theory is a prominent consensus based theory. Marxism is a prominent critical and radical theory. Peacemaking criminology is a critical and radical theory that, depending on which theorist is cited, derives from anarchism. The goal is to quantitatively compare anarchism with particular theories; a consensus based theory, a critical and radical theory, and a theory that derives from anarchism.

**Findings**

The research found that strain theory, the prominent consensus theory, tended to have the largest amount of con-
tent, then Marxism, then peacemaking criminology, and finally anarchism. The research does not show whether consensus theories dominate content (or not) in introductory criminology textbooks from the sample researched. Notably, there are typically one or two chapters on critical criminology while there are consistently more chapters on consensus based theories so their findings likely remain true, but further research would need to be done to replicate Wright’s study.

As mentioned earlier, there are three key topic areas that anarchism or Kropotkin’s work could be linked to: Cesare Lombroso, critical or radical criminology, or peacemaking criminology. All textbooks with the exception of one (Cullen & Agnew, 2011) had content on Lombroso. None of those textbooks had any discussions about Lombroso’s research on anarchists nor Kropotkin’s objections to Lombroso’s research.

► TABLE 1: Content Comparison of KPU Criminology Textbooks: Anarchism Compared with:
Strain Theory; Marxism; Peace-making Criminology
### Analysis of Anarchism within Mainstream Criminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPU Textbooks</th>
<th>Strain Theory</th>
<th>Marxism</th>
<th>Peace-making Criminology</th>
<th>Anarchism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td>247 lines/60.6%</td>
<td>80 lines/19.7%</td>
<td>80 lines/19.7%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 2</td>
<td>580 lines/45.7%</td>
<td>617 lines/48.7%</td>
<td>64 lines/5.0%</td>
<td>19 lines/1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 3*</td>
<td>2,835 lines/63.3%</td>
<td>965 lines/21.6%</td>
<td>678 lines/15.1%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 4</td>
<td>76 lines/28.2%</td>
<td>128 lines/47.4%</td>
<td>66 lines/24.4%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 5*</td>
<td>212 lines/86.9%</td>
<td>32 lines/13.1%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 6</td>
<td>566 lines/53.5%</td>
<td>427 lines/40.3%</td>
<td>66 lines/6.2%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 7</td>
<td>122 lines/27.0%</td>
<td>244 lines/54.0%</td>
<td>86 lines/19.0%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 8</td>
<td>506 lines/38.1%</td>
<td>486 lines/36.6%</td>
<td>337 lines/25.3%</td>
<td>0 lines/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>.19%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Book is in both KPU and Amazon.ca sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amazon.ca Top 6</th>
<th>Strain Theory</th>
<th>Marxism</th>
<th>Peace-making Criminology</th>
<th>Anarchism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td>932 lines / 54.2%</td>
<td>649 lines / 37.7%</td>
<td>125 lines / 7.3%</td>
<td>14 lines / 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 2</td>
<td>205 lines / 56.0%</td>
<td>123 lines / 33.6%</td>
<td>38 lines / 10.4%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 3</td>
<td>731 lines / 62.6%</td>
<td>365 lines / 31.3%</td>
<td>71 lines / 6.1%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 4</td>
<td>677 lines / 66.5%</td>
<td>341 lines / 33.5%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 5*</td>
<td>2,835 lines / 63.3%</td>
<td>965 lines / 21.6%</td>
<td>678 lines / 15.1%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 6*</td>
<td>212 lines / 86.9%</td>
<td>32 lines / 13.1%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
<td>0 lines / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average %</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Book is in both KPU and Amazon.ca sample.
As per anarchist content under the subject heading of critical or radical criminology, there was one Amazon.ca textbook that contained 14 lines of anarchist content for its description of constitutive criminology, which was in a “radical and critical criminology” section (Akers & Sellers, 2013, p. 239). Otherwise, there were no books that included anarchism in the critical or radical section of the textbook and none of the textbooks presented the theory.

In terms of connecting anarchism to peacemaking criminology, most of the textbooks presented peacemaking criminology according to Quinney. One of the few textbooks that presented according to Tifft and Sullivan presented seven lines on “mutual aid” (Siegel & McCormick, 2010, p. 340). Mutual aid is a term conceptualized by Kropotkin yet he was not cited in connection to the term.

The results from the content analysis are slightly worse than projected from the previous literature. Anarchism was presented for a total of 33 lines (19 lines from one KPU textbook and 14 lines from one Amazon.ca textbook). The 19 lines from the one KPU textbook resulted in 1.5% of the total relevant content in the particular textbook and an average of 0.19% for all the KPU textbooks. The 14 lines from the one Amazon.ca textbook resulted in 0.81% of the total relevant content in the particular textbook and an average of 0.13% from all the Amazon.ca textbooks.
As per the qualitative analysis, there was minimal amount of content presenting anarchism, thus minimal content to analyze; 33 lines. First, the 19 lines from the KPU textbook that had content presented on “mutual aid” from a section in peacemaking criminology: Peacemaking criminology was presented according to Tifft and Sullivan’s presentation of the theory. The content did not cite Peter Kropotkin nor did it connect the theory explicitly with anarchism. Peter Kropotkin (1939) should be connected to mutual aid, since he dedicated an anarchist book to the topic titled, “Mutual Aid”. The presentation of the term is consistent with Kropotkin’s presentation of the concept. As the content was only 19 pages, the content did not go in depth about the concept, however it did connect it to a humanizing and community response to crime (Siegel & McCormick, 2010, pp. 340)—peacemaking criminology response—which is consistent with Kropotkin’s argument for communal anarchism (Kropotkin, 1927). Thus the 19 lines on anarchism from the KPU textbook are accurate and shallow.

The 14 lines from the Amazon.ca textbook did explicitly state “anarchism” in the textbook, however it was used as an example to help describe a larger field; “constitutive criminology” as presented by Dragan Milovanovic and Stuart Henry (Akers & Sellers, 2013, p. 239). The content was not specifically about anarchism but did provide characteristics that anarchism shares with other constitutive criminological theories. Since the intention of including anarchism is for a larger field, the content in-
cluded is deemed “not applicable” as it is neither an accurate nor inaccurate description of anarchism. Anarchism is used to describe another field, therefore, the 14 lines of anarchism from the Amazon.ca textbook is neither applicable for accuracy nor depth. Even though anarchism is used to help exemplify features of a broader field, the lines are included in the research because it presents the student with a name of a theory, thus could potentially plant a seed for future interest.

Conclusion

First and foremost, anarchism is not presented as a theory in the introductory criminology textbooks measured. One anarchist concept is mentioned in connection to peace-making criminology without connecting where the concept derives from. In the other instance, it is used to help exemplify a larger field. Neither textbook that included anarchism described the theory or contextualized it seriously in the field of criminology, while the rest of the textbooks excluded anarchism completely.

Limitations of this research: there are issues with generalizability and validity of the research. The content analysis is a great way to progress anarchist criminology starting with an early anarchist (Peter Kropotkin). The content analysis could benefit from randomizing the sample group and comparing with a sample group from other nations, since, as Walters (2003) argues, different state structures will produce different marginalized and
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promoted knowledge.

Anarchism is excluded from introductory criminology textbooks. The exclusion may be purposeful or accidental, future research that aims to explain the rationale for this exclusion is necessary. There is likely no single answer, rather several that produce the result. It is also likely that it is due to a combination of publisher influence (Keenan, 2012), author knowledge or bias (Abrutyn, 2013; Ross and Rothe, 2008; Wright, 2000), and the political nature of anarchism (Arrigo, 1999; Walters, 2003).

Notably, Marxism is a theory that criticizes the societal structure with a heavy focus on economy, class structure, and a socialist egalitarian societal structure. Marxism is consistently presented in introductory criminology textbooks. Anarchism is a theory that has similar critiques to Marxism but is further left on the spectrum of thought, yet anarchism is excluded and Marxism is included.

What can be deduced from the exclusion of anarchism is that the theory is *de facto* marginalized. It cannot be the case that a theory is both excluded from presentation and considered important. This marginalization is unjustified. Anarchism has connections to criminology throughout history and the theory brings a unique and important line of thought to criminology that should be included in introductory criminology textbooks.
Appendix A—All Introductory Criminology Textbooks Measured:

KPU Textbooks:


Amazon.ca Top 6 Textbooks:\(^1\):


References


---

\(^1\) List was obtained on December 3, 2013 from Amazon.ca under headings “bestsellers”, “textbooks”, and “criminology”. One textbook that would have been #2 of the top six was omitted from the list. The textbook is theories applied to the criminal justice system, not criminology as a whole. I chose to omit the book, because it limits the field of study. Although from looking through the abstract and outline, the textbook does seem to include conflict theories. Nonetheless, since the class focus is CRIM 1100 and CRIM 2331 not CRIM 1101, I decided not to include the textbook in the analyses.
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