دانشکده حقوق

دوره دکتری حقوق کیفری و جرم‌شناسی

جرم‌شناسی نظری

(منبع تکمیلی)

استاد: علی‌حسین نجفی ابرندآبادی

تهیه و تنظیم: حامد صفائی آتشگاه

نیم‌سال دوم سال تحصیلی ۹۵_۱۳۹۴

۱ـ منبع تکمیلی جرم‌شناسی نظری، به *زبان انگلیسی* تهیه و تنظیم شده است. این جزوه، در کنار منابع فارسی، به‌عنوان منبعی تکمیلی برای کلاس درس آقای دکتر نجفی ابرندآبادی آماده شده و شامل مدخل‌هایی از «*دایرة‌المعارف جرم‌شناسی و عدالت کیفری*» [1] می‌باشد. دانشجویان دوره دکتری، قاعدتاً در مقاطع کارشناسی و کارشناسی ارشد این نظریه‌ها را مطالعه کرده‌اند[2]. لذا هدف از تهیه این جزوه، از یک‌سو یادآوری مطالبی است که پیش‌تر فراگرفته شده‌اند و از سوی دیگر فراگیری جنبه‌های دیگری از نظریه‌های جرم‌شناسی است.

۲ـ ویراستار ارشد دایرة‌المعارف، (Jay S Albanese) استاد دانشگاه ایالت ویرجینیا بوده و بیش از ۲۵ سال سابقه فعالیت در حوزه جرم‌شناسی را دارد. تاکنون بیش از ۱۵ کتاب، ۷۰ مقاله و فصل کتاب از ایشان به چاپ رسیده است. از جمله آثار این جرم‌شناس برجسته به موارد زیر می‌توان اشاره داشت:

Jay S. Albanese, *Organized Crime in Our Times*, 5th ed. (LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 2007).

Jay S. Albanese, *Combating Piracy: Intellectual Property Theft and Fraud* (Transaction Publishers, 2011).[3]

Jay S. Albanese, *Organized Crime: From the Mob to Transnational Organized Crime*, 7th ed. (Elsevier, 2015).

با هدف انتشار اثری پربار و کم نقص، در کنار پروفسور *جی‌اس. آلبنیز*، ۱۴ نفر ویراستار متخصص و صاحب تألیف انتخاب شده‌اند تا بدین‌سان، این اثر توسط چندین متخصص، افزون بر نویسنده اصلی آن مدخل بازبینی شود. در نهایت، دایرة‌المعارف ۲۷۶۰ صفحه‌ای، طی ۵ جلد و با ۵۴۰ مدخل تنظیم شده و تقریباً همه حوزه‌های مختلف جرم‌شناسی و عدالت کیفری را از قبیل نظریه‌های جرم‌شناسی، علت‌شناسی، پیشگیری از وقوع جرم، عدالت ترمیمی، بزه‌دیده‌شناسی، بزهکاری کودکان و نوجوانان، دادگاه‌ها، کنش‌گران عدالت کیفری، جرایم و مجازات‌ها پوشش داده است. همچنین در انتهای هریک از مدخل‌ها، جهت مطالعه بیشتر، منابعی ذکر شده است. لذا این بخش نیز می‌تواند راهنمای مناسبی جهت یافتن منبع مطالعاتی در آن حوزه باشد.

---

[1]. Jay S Albanese, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (John Wiley & Sons, 2014).

[2]. این جزوه، در کنار دو جزوه دیگری که به تولد، تاریخچه، نظریه و موضوعات جامعه شناسی جنایی پرداخته‌اند، منبع اصلی درس جامعه شناسی جنایی دوره کار شناسی ار شد می‌با شد. لذا تو صیه می شود دان‌شجویان این دوره، در کنار منابع فار سی، مطالب این جزوه را نیز فراگیرند.

[3]. کتاب *سـرقت و کلاهبرداری مالکیت فکری* به‌وسـیله آقایان حمیدرضـا دانش‌ناری و امین روح‌الامینی مورد ترجمه و تحقیق قرار گرفته و در زمستان سال ۱۳۹۳ توسط انتشارات مجد به چاپ رسیده است.

۳ـ این دایره‌المعارف با هدف بهره‌برداری دانشجویان از منبعی جامع و مانع در کتابخانه دانشکده و دانشگاه‌ها منتشر شده؛ اما پس از پیگیری‌های لازم متوجه شدیم این اثر تابحال وارد ایران نشده است. لذا در جزوه حاضر، ابتدا مدخلی جهت تبیین جرم‌شناسی گنجانده شده، سپس مهم‌ترین نظریه‌های جرم‌شناسی استخراج و جمعاً طی ۳۴ عنوان تنظیم شده است. البته افزون بر این نظریه‌ها می‌توان به نظریه‌های آموزشگاه‌محور بزهکاری، نظریه‌های اولیه بزه‌دیدگی، نظریه‌های تجاوز جنسی، نظریه‌های تکرار بزه‌دیدگی، نظریه چرخه خشونت، نظریه کنش وضعی، نظریه هم‌زمانی فرصت مجرمانه و ... اشاره داشت. نظریه‌های اخیرالذکر در کتاب دانشنامه بزه‌دیده‌شناسی و پیش‌گیری از جرم[4] مورد بحث قرار گرفته‌اند[5]. همچنین براساس سنتی که استاد دارند، افزون بر این منابع، به‌تدریج و به اقتضای موضوع، منابع مرتبطی در کلاس ارائه خواهند شد.

۴ـ همان‌گونه که پیش‌تر گفته شد، مطالب این جزوه بدون دخل و تصرف ماهوی از دایره‌المعارف جرم‌شناسی و عدالت کیفری رونوشت شده است. لذا شماره صفحاتی که در پاورقی هرصفحه به صورت فارسی درج شده، قابل استناد نبوده و صرفاً جهت تسهیل در یافتن مطالب، از سوی تنظیم‌کننده جزوه اضافه شده است. بنابراین جهت ارجاع به مطالب، به شماره صفحات مندرج در سرصفحه توجه شود. به‌طور مثال، مطابق شیوه شیکاگو، نحوه استناد به مدخل Positive Criminology در پاورقی به شکل زیر خواهد بود:

Matthew William Logan and Brandon Dulisse, "Positive Criminology," in *The Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, ed. Jay S Albanese (John Wiley & Sons, 2014), 1–3, http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/9781118517383.wbeccj511.

---

[4]. بونی.اس فیشر و استیون پی. لب، ویراستاران، *دانشنامه بزه‌دیده‌شناسی و پیش‌گیری از جرم*، ترجمه اساتید حقوق کیفری و جرم‌شناسی سراسر کشور، زیر نظر: علی حسین نجفی‌ابرندآبادی، ۲ جلد (تهران: انتشارات میزان، ۱۳۹۳).

[5]. شایان ذکر است، نمونه‌های دیگری از نظریه‌های جرم‌شناسی نیز در آغاز هزاره سوم مطرح شده‌اند. از جمله این نظریه‌ها که عمدتاً در قالب نظریه‌های انتقادی مطرح‌اند به «آ سیب اجتماعی شنا سی»، «جرم شنا سی فرهنگی»، «جرم شنا سی محکومان زندانی»، «جرم‌شناسی سازمان ملل متحد/ جرم‌شناسی آبی» می‌توان اشاره کرد. جهت مطالعه این نظریه‌ها به درآمد ویراست دوم ـ سوم کتاب *دانشنامهٔ جرم‌شناسی* (انتشارات گنج دانش، ۱۳۹۳) رجوع کنید.

فهرست مطالب

ث

Criminology

STEPHANIE N. SPIEGEL

Criminology is the study of definitions, characteristics, and causes of crime in society. More specifically, crime theories attempt to explain how and why society defines certain behaviors as *criminal*, how patterns of criminal behavior and victimization are distributed across sociodemographic groups, and why crime occurs.

Attempts to explain crime and behavior date back through many centuries of recorded history. Criminology – the study of crime – emerged as a by-product of the Enlightenment, an era that celebrated reform and the advancement of knowledge through science (Lilly, Cullen, and Ball 2011). Two great traditions spearheaded the crusade for a more rational understanding of delinquent behavior. These were the *Classical School* and the *Positivist School* of criminology.

For much of Western history, explanations of crime were rooted in the belief that spiritual and religious forces were at play (Cullen and Agnew 2006: 8). Termed the "demonic perspective," this ideology suggested law-violating citizens were possessed by evil forces, or too weak to evade temptation (Einstadter and Henry 1995). Seeking explanations for crime in the spiritual world, according to scholars, laid the roots for the enactment of unjust legal processes. Consequently, judicial officials, who held great power, interpreted laws to suit their own purposes, resulting in prejudiced outcomes. More troubling, officials were inspired to coerce confessions, and inflict wildly cruel penalties like whipping, amputation, and maiming. As Stephen Pfohl pointed out, this ideology used punishments as a way to "purge the body of a sinner of traces of the devil and thereby restore the body of the community as a whole to its proper relation to God" (as cited in Cullen and Agnew 2006: 25).

Appalled by these conditions, Cesare Beccaria (1738–1794) and other Enlightenment thinkers challenged the "demonic perspective." Inspired by the notion that all humans are endowed with free will, Beccaria published *On Crimes and Punishments* (1764 = 1963), arguing for criminal offenses and their consequences to be documented, fair, and proportionate to the offense committed. Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), an English jurist and philosopher (see, e.g., Bentham 1948), further attempted to advance the penal system. Like Beccaria, he believed people adopt delinquent behavior based on their calculation of anticipated pleasures and pains. The influence of these groundbreaking ideas went far beyond the creation of new legal codes and judicial reform; their work inspired the Classical School of criminology.

Classical criminologists proposed that individuals choose to obey or violate the law based on their rational calculation of related risks and rewards. Before deciding to commit a crime, reasoning individuals ponder the risk of apprehension, the seriousness of the potential punishment, his or her own self-interests, and the potential value of the unlawful act. In this way, crime occurs when the offender believes the gains outweigh the costs of their actions. The decision to forgo crime, then, is reached when the potential delinquent considers the risks too costly. From this viewpoint, punishments should be just severe enough to outweigh any pleasures, either contemplated or actually experienced, yet remain fair and consistent. In doing so, sanctions will deter or reduce crime rather than inflict vengeance.

Although the Classical School of criminology led to important reforms in the criminal justice system, critics then and now suggest its view of human behavior is too simplistic. Classical scholars implicitly assumed that individuals make decisions simply based on their "hedonistic calculus" (Lilly et al. 2011), suggesting that forces both inside and outside individuals are irrelevant to the cause of crime.

The rise of social Darwinism, science, and medicine, led to an upsurge of attention being drawn away from rationalism and punishment, and toward the investigation of what produces crime. The Positivist School, trumpeting the use of reason and logic, contended that crime was caused, not chosen, and that the role

of criminology was to use empirical and objective methods to predict and explain social phenomena.

Influenced by evolutionary thought, Cesare Lombroso reasoned that criminals represent a physical type distinctly different from the body type of noncriminals. In other words, criminals represent a form of degeneracy that was manifested in characteristics of more primitive populations, in which sloping foreheads, ears of unusual size, excessively long arms, receding chins, and sloping noses were common characteristics of the criminally inclined (Lombroso 1876; Lilly et al. 2011). Holding this view, Lombroso classified criminals into four major categories: (1) *born criminals* or people with atavistic characteristics; (2) *insane criminals* including idiots, imbeciles, paranoiacs, epileptics, and alcoholics; (3) *occasional criminals*, whose crimes are primarily explained by opportunity, although they too hold innate traits that predispose them to criminality; (4) *criminals of passion*, who commit crimes because of anger, love, or honor, lacking emotional regulation (Wolfgang 1973: 252–253).

To Lombroso's credit, he modified his theory throughout five editions of *On Criminal Man,* with each new edition giving attention to more and more environmental explanations, such as sex, marriage, customs, structures of government, and even the organization of the church (Lilly et al. 2011). Still, he never disregarded the significance of biological markers, making early significant contributions that continue to have an impact on criminology today (Lilly et al. 2011).

In the years to follow, criminology would shift to more complex theoretical explanations of crime, eventually rejecting Lombroso's theory of the "born criminal." The Positivist paradigm and its noteworthy contributions, however, would continue to be embraced by scholars.

The twentieth century generated a profound effect on the cultural, social, and economic conditions of the United States. Terms like migration and immigration, urbanization, industrialization, poverty, and westward expansion entered common usage. In an era of increasingly rapid change, academics began to consider whether growing up in dense, urban areas had a maladaptive effect on an individual's life. Cities, particularly Chicago, sparked these interests because of their rapid expansion and detrimental conditions. The

study of crime, as a result, endured a major theoretical shift; one that suggested crime, like other behavior, was a social product. These ideas led to the *Chicago School of Criminology*.

Guided by Robert E. Park and Ernest Burgess's (1916 = 1967) theory on social organization – a model of concentric zones where urban development is patterned socially – Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay mapped thousands of juvenile delinquency incidents and analyzed relationships that existed between offending patterns and the various social conditions of the area. In their influential book, *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas* (1942 = 1972), they found support for ordered spatial patterns in that crime was concentrated in the inner city and as one moved further from the city center, crime decreased. Additionally, they observed that in most cities, crime rates were stable over time. That is, neighborhood crime patterns were related to the location of the industrial and commercial areas, and ecological factors such as rates of poverty.

Through their analysis they also concluded that contrary to biological determinism, an important criminogenic force was an individual's social environment and that "disorganized neighborhoods" helped to produce and sustain criminal trajectories. Disorganized areas, as discussed by Shaw and McKay, were likely to be foreign-born and racially diverse (heterogeneous); exhibit residential instability where few residents owned their homes and were highly transient (residential mobility); and be characterized by families on relief who held blue-collar jobs (low socioeconomic status).

Edwin D. Sutherland extended the ecological perspective by advancing Shaw and McKay's ideas in two critical ways. First, Sutherland suggested both criminal and conventional cultures existed, where some social groups were organized based on their support for crime, and others were organized against such wayward behavior. Second, criminal behavior was learned. For Sutherland, individuals who encounter definitions favorable to crime more often, and with greater intensity, were more likely to offend (Lilly et al. 2011). Sutherland called this principle "differential association." Sutherland's theory of differential association went through various stages of development, but by 1947 he was able to articulate a finalized set of nine propositions

that explain the causes of crime (Sutherland and Cressey 1970: 75–76; Lilly et al. 2011).

Later, Ronald Akers elaborated on Sutherland's eighth principle of criminal activity, by addressing the mechanisms and processes through which criminal learning takes place. The key advance in his social learning theory was that delinquent behavior continues because individuals are differentially reinforced through social stimuli (see, e.g., Burgess and Akers 1966; Akers 1977, 1998).

Beyond the Chicago School and its theoretical descendants, anomie and strain theory prevailed. In 1938, Robert K. Merton published *Social Structure and Anomie*, an essay that was short but impactful. The United States, according to Merton, was unusual not simply because it placed emphasis on success, but also because the ambition to achieve success was universal. For most, however, legitimate means to achieve such successes are limited, causing an undesirable mixture of stress, anger, and anxiety. To alleviate their strain, individuals, particularly members in lower socioeconomic classes, would act out in deviant ways. To conceptualize these responses, Merton later developed his own typology, including: *conformists, innovators, ritualists, retreatists*, and *rebels* (Merton 1968: 140).

According to Merton, *innovators* committed most criminal behavior. Innovators still regard success as meaningful, but turn to illegitimate means to achieve such a status. An innovator, for instance, is someone who justifies the illegal distribution of any drug so that he or she may decorate a lavish home, or own a luxury vehicle. By contrast, *ritualists* mitigate their strain by scaling down their aspirations so that their end goals can be reached comfortably. These individuals are content to avoid risks and live within the limits of their earnings. *Retreatists* make more of a dramatic response. Strained by society's expectations coupled with the desire to be unconventional, these individuals seek out various deviant means, such as alcoholism, substance abuse, vagrancy, and so on. *Rebels* also reject cultural norms, but unlike other typologies, seek to revolutionize the system with new goals and means (Merton 1968).

Until the 1960s, three major theories were the center of American criminology: control theory, differential association theory, and anomie/strain theory. These theories pointed to conditions in society that could reduce crime, but did not argue

that the United States was marked by intolerable injustices (Lilly et al. 2011). As the United States turned into the 1960s and 1970s, however, the time was ripe for a new understanding of why crime occurs. Three important schools of criminology flourished: labeling theory, critical or radical theories, and feminist theories.

Labeling theorists suggest that the role played by society and social control agencies – police, courts, and corrections – in the labeling and shaping of criminal involvement is underestimated. This approach cautions that socially constructed labels, like deviant or criminal, affect one's self-image. Once internalized, negative self-conceptions cause people to increasingly engage in the very behavior society seeks to halt, delinquency (see Becker 1963; Braithwaite 1989). Beyond theory, this perspective, as Empey (1982: 409) stated, "had a profound impact on social policy" by promoting courses of action toward decriminalization, diversion, due process, and deinstitutionalization.

In a similar vein, critical theory blamed capitalism, especially the extreme version found in the United States, for crime. This approach argued that America's free-market system perpetuated social inequality and oppression. Under these conditions, street crime flourished. In capitalist America, as Jeffrey Reiman commented, "the rich get richer and the poor get prison" (Lilly et al. 2011).

With the advent of the Women's Movement, feminist theory gained force. Influential theorists such as Frieda Adler, Rita Simon, Meda Chesney-Lind, and Barbara Bloom proposed that gender differences in behavior, life circumstances, and parental responsibilities have broad implications for women's pathways into crime (Bloom, Owen, and Covington 2003). Feminist theorists also call attention to how the marginalization of women in society, through the social context of patriarchy, has led to women's criminal involvement.

Four developments, worthy of mention, have shaped criminal theory by revitalizing traditional ideas. In doing so, they furthered core ideas into more sophisticated and empirically defensible perspectives. First, returning to the Chicago school, scholars elaborated on Shaw and McKay's social disorganization theory by presenting a host of community-level theories. The most influential was collective efficacy theory

advanced by Robert Sampson and colleagues. Second, Merton's anomie/strain theory inspired two important extensions: institutional-anomie theory by Steven Messner and Richard Rosenfeld (1994), and Robert Agnew's general strain theory (1992). Finally, there was a renewed interest in the control theory perspective with Hirschi's two related but ultimately competing theories. The first perspective, social bond theory, was presented in his book *Causes of Delinquency* (1969). The second perspective, self-control theory, was presented in *A General Theory of Crime*, co-authored with Michael Gottfredson (1990).

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, interest in adolescence and the stability of antisocial behavior across individuals grew. As it applied to maladaptive behavior, scholars began to question how the developmental process and the idiosyncrasies of people affected such behavior. Accordingly, a new paradigm called life-course criminology emerged. As this new paradigm emerged, two noteworthy theories merited attention: Robert Sampson and John Laub's life-course theory and Terrie E. Moffitt's life-course-persistent adolescence-limited theory. The power of Sampson and Laub's contribution is that their analysis of the Gluecks' data supplied persuasive empirical evidence that family social control mediates the effects of delinquency and that quality social bonds during adulthood – stable work, a rewarding marriage – can divert persistent offenders away from crime (Sampson and Laub 1993; Lilly et al. 2011). For Moffitt (1993), offending is marked by continuity *or* change. Most youth "get into trouble" during adolescence; so commonplace that it is considered a normal part of development. This normative pathway, then, involves youth experimenting with problem behavior. That is, their delinquent behavior is "adolescent-limited." Life-course persistent youth, however, continue to manifest antisocial tendencies, including crime, into adulthood.

In recent years, however, biology as a field has experienced a dramatic revolution, with more sophisticated tools to yield explanations of human behavior and progressive policy recommendations. In this regard, new approaches and theoretical ideas are ever developing.

SEE ALSO: Beccaria, Cesare; Classical Criminology; Conflict Theories of Crime; Differential Association Theory; Feminist Theories of Criminal Behavior; Labeling and Symbolic Interaction Theories of Crime; Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime; Lombroso, Cesare; Positive Criminology; Social Disorganization Theory; Social Learning Theory.

References

Agnew, R. (1992) Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency: *Criminology* 30, 47–87.

Akers, R. L. (1977) *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*, 2nd edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Akers, R. L. (1998) *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Beccaria, C. (1963) *On Crimes and Punishments*, trans. H. Paolucci. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Becker, H. S. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press.

Bentham, J. (1948) *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, ed. L. J. Lafleur. New York: Hafner.

Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003) *Gender-Responsive Strategies: Research, Practice, and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders*. NIC 018017. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Braithwaite, J. (1989) *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, R. L., & Akers, R. L. (1966) A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems* 14, 128–146.

Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2006) *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Einstadter, W. J., & Henry, J. (1995) *Criminological Theory: An Analysis of Its Underlying Assumptions*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Empey, L. T. (1982) *American Delinquency: Its Meaning and Construction*, rev. edn. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lilly, R. J., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2011) *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Lombroso, C. (1876) *On Criminal Man*. Milan: Hoepli.

Merton, R. K. (1938) Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3, 672–682.

Merton, R. K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure.* New York: Free Press.

Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (1994) *Crime and the American Dream.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993) Adolescent-limited and life-course persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* 100, 674–701.

Park, R. E., & Burgess, E. W. (1967) *The City.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1972) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1970) *Criminology*, 8th edn. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Wolfgang, M. E. (1973) Cesare Lombroso. In H. Mannheim (ed.), *Pioneers in Criminology*, 2nd edn. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, pp. 232–291.

Theory and Public Policy

ANNMARIE CORDNER

On the surface, the relationship between criminological theory and public policy is simple and direct. Explanations of criminal behavior are developed, not just to understand the phenomenon, but to enable policy makers to control it. Put simply, if we understand the processes that lead to criminal behavior, we should be able to develop policies and programs designed to interrupt the process (Pfohl 1985). As such, theories should form the basis of criminal justice policy. Even a casual review of current policy, however, indicates that the potential of criminological theory to shape policy has not been fully realized, suggesting that the relationship between theory and policy may be more complex than it initially appears. This article discusses the nature of the relationship between theory and policy and explores potential reasons why policies may not always be based on theory.

A direct relationship between theory and policy was demonstrated as early as 1764 in Cesare Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments*. This essay laid out the central tenets of what is known today as deterrence theory; however, the author's primary purpose was to argue for systematic reform of the criminal justice system. The theoretical reasoning simply served as the basis for the suggested reforms, which were adopted by many countries. Since that time, criminologists have continued to develop theories intended to inform the attempts of legislators and criminal justice practitioners to reduce, if not eliminate, criminal behavior (Gilsinan 1997).

It is important to examine the ways in which theory may have an impact on policy. Essentially, theory has the potential to shape policy on two levels: (1) the basic *assumptions* that form the foundation of the theory; and (2) the specific *theoretical propositions* of the theory. Each level has important and distinct effects on the development of policy. Consequently, the roles of both must be considered when examining the relationship between theory and policy.

All theories are founded on a type of belief known as a domain assumption. These beliefs are assumptions about the nature of human beings and/or society (Gouldner 1970). To be specific, domain assumptions are untestable beliefs about *all* human beings or *all* societies. The belief that all human beings are born evil is an example of a domain assumption. These assumptions are critical to the development of policy, because they point the policy maker toward solutions to the problem under study. For instance, theories which assume that human beings are essentially evil (such as control and deterrence theories) would lean toward policies that attempt to decrease offending either by restricting behavior or through punishment as the consequence of crime. On the other hand, it would make little sense for such policies to be developed from a theory built on the assumption that people are essentially good (e.g., differential association, strain, or one of the biological theories). A theory assuming the essential goodness of human beings would indicate that the solution to crime must be found in the elimination of the causes of criminal behavior, that is, factors that are beyond the individual's control. Thus, identifying the theorist's domain assumptions is essential to ensuring that the policy developed from a theory is consistent with the beliefs implicit in the theory.

It is important to note that policy implications will differ even amongst theories that have the same domain assumptions. For instance, while both control and deterrence theories share the domain assumption that all human beings will commit crimes if left to their own devices, each approaches the problem from a different direction. Control theory locates the source of crime in the lack of personal or societal controls designed to limit the behavior of individuals. Thus, policies based on control theory focus primarily on the need to strengthen societal controls (such as parental supervision or police patrols) designed to prevent crime from occurring. Deterrence theory, on the other hand, suggests that individuals who are contemplating criminal behavior

consider its risks and benefits when making the decision. Policies derived from this theory focus on strengthening the effectiveness of punishment in order to reinforce the costs of crime so that they outweigh the advantages gained when crime is committed. It is clear, then, that relying on an examination of a theory's domain assumptions alone is insufficient as a basis for policy.

Domain assumptions are not typically spelled out clearly in the presentation of a theory. Consequently, it is easy to forget their importance in the development of policy. It is much easier to see the influence of theoretical propositions. Whereas domain assumptions point in the general direction of the problem's solution, theoretical propositions lead policy makers to the particulars of policy. This is done by identifying the factors that are related to crime and detailing the ways in which each factor influences criminal behavior. Thus, theoretical propositions form the basis for specific programmatic actions. For example, Merton's strain theory suggests that the existence of structural blocks to success is one of the factors leading to criminal behavior. Policies derived from this theory might prescribe governmental actions designed to remove at least some of these structural blocks – perhaps by requiring affirmative action in education and employment or by providing educational loans or grants to underprivileged students.

Before leaving our discussion of the ways in which theory may influence policy, it is important to emphasize again that policy making requires consideration of *both* domain assumptions and theoretical propositions in order to be successful. Policies often rest on a combination of ideas from different theories. While specific propositions from different theories may appear to be compatible on the surface, the possibility that the theories rest on incompatible domain assumptions could lead to problems upon the implementation of the policy and, ultimately, its failure. Even when policy makers base their efforts on a single theory, consideration of the domain assumptions is essential in order to ensure that the policy is consistent with the assumptions and propositions of the theory.

Based on what we know about how theory and policy can be related, one would expect that most, if not all, policies relating to crime are directly influenced by criminological theories. However,

this expectation is not borne out in reality. In her presidential address to the American Society of Criminology, Joan Petersilia spoke of the common perception that criminology has had a weakened impact on policy and practice in spite of the fact that work in the field is more rigorous and credible than at any point in its history (Petersilia 1991). Reasons for that perception will be explored here.

It is important to note that theory has never been the only factor which influences the development of policy. Policy making is, in many respects, driven as much by political factors as by theory (Mears 2010). Financial concerns, political turf battles, and popular opinion are just a few of the factors that can come into play. Thus, although it makes sense that developments in theoretical thinking would lead to changes in policy, this is often not the case (Lilly, Cullen, and Ball 1989). In some instances, theories are used to justify the implementation of policies after the fact. At other times, theories and policies develop simultaneously, each legitimizing the other. Whichever way the process works, one thing is certain: Crime control is shaped by current understandings of crime causation, understandings that can change over time (Flanagan 1987).

Given the importance of theoretical assumptions and propositions to the development of good policy, it is critical that theory be well constructed and clearly delineated. Unfortunately, early criminological theory has been described as "discursive," a term that implies that the assumptions on which the theory is based are not clearly identified, that the concepts are vaguely defined, and that the theoretical propositions are murky (Gibbs 1972, 1985). While a great deal of effort has been expended toward the development of new theoretical approaches, most theories can still be criticized for being scientifically inadequate (Gilsinan 1997). In fact, critics have characterized criminological theory as an "art form" rather than science (Leavitt 1999). Not only has criminological theory been criticized, but research based on these theories has been described as irrelevant (Austin 2003) and, consequently, of little use to policy makers.

The perception that criminological theory lacks rigor is compounded by the fact that many policy makers believe that a simple solution to the problem of crime exists (Mears 2007). Such a "silver

bullet" solution can only be effective when "the targeted cause is truly a cause of the outcome of interest (e.g., criminal behavior), the cause is widespread, and the cause is easily amenable to modification" (Mears 2010: 28). Unfortunately, these conditions are unlikely to be met in criminal justice. The desire for a silver bullet solution to crime leads to the development of policies that attempt to address complex social problems with simplistic solutions. It is not surprising, then, if evaluations of such policies indicate that "nothing works" as Martinson did in his review of rehabilitative programs in the 1970s (Martinson 1974).

The desire for a simple solution to the problem of crime may also lead policy makers to overlook the aspects of a theory that would be more challenging or less politically acceptable to implement. For instance, deterrence theory suggests that offenders will refrain from crime if punishment is certain, swift, and severe. All three conditions are necessary to the goal of achieving a deterrent effect. However, rather than attempting to meet these conditions, legislators have focused almost exclusively on increasing the severity of punishment, in spite of the fact that apprehension and punishment are generally neither certain nor swift. If research then finds that these penalties do not lead to a reduction in crime, the temptation may be to conclude that deterrence is not the appropriate basis for crime control policies. However, these circumstances do not provide a fair test of the theory's potential impact on crime, since the theory has not been fully embraced in the policies.

It has been suggested that the relationship between policy and criminology is *hermeneutic* in nature, rather than *vertical* (Gilsinan 1997). This means that scientific understanding of crime and its control are shaped by the social, historical, and political contexts in which they are developed. That is, scientific understanding influences policy debates and cultural understandings, which, in turn, shape the scientific understandings, which then shape policy debates and cultural understandings, and so on. If the relationship is circular, as described here, then it is essential that criminological theorizing and research be conducted in partnership with policy makers. At the very least, common definitions of crime and its parameters would be required. At this point, however, most

criminological theory and empirical tests are conducted by academics, many of whom have limited, if any, contact with practitioners involved in the development of policy. Thus, one possible explanation for the weak impact of theory on criminal justice policy may be that criminologists and policy makers are applying different meanings to the issues involved.

Pratt (2008) suggests that the primary reason criminologists have a limited impact on policy has more to do with the way knowledge is communicated than with the quality of the work produced. He suggests that academics need to expand the outlets in which theory and research are disseminated in order to ensure that the work is more widely understood. Ideas and findings also need to be expressed in language that simultaneously captures the complexity of the work and is understandable to non-academics. That is, academic jargon should not be used. In addition, criminologists need to be able to speak with unambiguous confidence about the policy implications of their work. Finally, criminologists need to be able to discuss their work in ways that would not be politically threatening to policy makers if they follow their advice. For instance, discussions of work that suggest the implementation of rehabilitative policies might focus on the decrease in crime that the policies might be expected to achieve, so that policy makers would not appear to be soft on crime.

A weak relationship between policy and criminology (including both theory and research) is a cause for concern. It opens the door to policies that are irrational, that is, lacking sound reasoning and not supported by solid empirical evidence. Under those conditions, it is likely that money, time and energy will be wasted in attempts to control crime that will ultimately be unsuccessful. Fortunately, the combination of criminological research and theorizing has a long history of influencing governmental policy (Gilsinan 1997), even if that impact is often more limited than expected. In recent years, a movement toward "evidence-based" policy has developed that would rely extensively on the use of evaluation research to ensure that policy is based on the programs that work best. Mears (2010: 49) defines it as "occurring when government adopts *needed* policies that rest on a credible *theoretical* or research foundation, that are *implemented* well, that are shown

to be *effective* and that achieve intended outcomes in a *cost-efficient* manner." This type of approach may overcome some of the issues, discussed here, which currently inhibit an effective relationship between policy and theory.

SEE ALSO: Beccaria, Cesare; Classical Criminology; Careers in Law Enforcement; Gun Control Policy; Politics and Crime Policy; Theoretical Integration.

References

Austin, J. (2003) Why criminology is irrelevant. *Criminology & Public Policy* 2, 557–564.

Beccaria, C. (1983) *An Essay on Crimes and Punishments*. Brookline Village, MA: Branden Press.

Flanagan, T. J. (1987) Change and influence in popular criminology: Public attributions of crime causation. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 15(3), 231–243.

Gibbs, J. P. (1972) *Sociological Theory Construction*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.

Gibbs, J. P. (1985) The methodology of theory construction in criminology. In R. F. Meier (ed.), *Theoretical Methods in Criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 23–50.

Gilsinan, J. F. (1997) Public policy and criminology: A historical and philosophical reassessment. In B. W. Hancock & P. M. Sharp (eds.), *Public Policy: Crime and Criminal Justice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 22–34.

Gouldner, A. W. (1970) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.

Leavitt, G. (1999) Criminological theory as an art form: Implications for criminal justice policy. *Crime & Delinquency* 45(3), 389–399.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (1989) *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Martinson, R. (1974) What works? – Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest* 35, 22–54.

Mears, D. P. (2007) Towards rational and evidence-based crime policy. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35, 667–682.

Mears, D. P. (2010) *American Criminal Justice Policy: An Evaluation Approach to Increasing Accountability and Effectiveness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petersilia, J. (1991) Policy relevance and the future of criminology. *Criminology* 29(1), 1–15.

Pfohl, S. J. (1985) The "discovery of child abuse." *Social Problems* 24, 310–323.

Pratt, T. C. (2008) Rational choice theory, crime control policy, and criminological relevance. *Criminology & Public Policy* 7(1), 43–52.

Further Readings

Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2000) Assessing correctional rehabilitation: Policy, practice and prospects. In J. Horney (ed.), *Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, pp. 109–175.

Eskridge, C. W. (2005) The state of the field of criminology. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 21, 296–308.

Farabee, D. (2005) *Rethinking Rehabilitation: Why Can't We Reform Our Criminals?* Washington, DC: AEI Press.

Farrington, D. P., & Welsh, B. C. (2007) *Saving Children from a Life of Crime: Early Risk Factors and Effective Interventions.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Forst, B. (2004) *Errors of Justice: Nature, Sources, and Remedies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lipsey, M. W., Adams, J. L., Gottfredson, D. C., et al. (2005) *Improving Evaluation of Anticrime Programs*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Marion, N. E., & Oliver, W. M. (2009) Congress, crime and budgetary responsiveness: A study in symbolic politics. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 20, 115–135.

Mears, D. P. (2007) Towards rational and evidence-based crime policy. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35, 667–682.

Sherman, L. W., Farrington, D. P., Welsh, B. C., & Mackenzie, D. L. (2002) *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*. London: Routledge.

Welsh, W. N., & Harris, P. W. (2008) *Criminal Justice Policy and Planning*, 3rd edn. Dayton, OH: LexisNexis, Anderson.

Classical Criminology

MATTHEW VALASIK

Classical criminology developed in western Europe during the eighteenth century, incorporating the emerging ideas of liberty and democracy into the criminal justice system. The classical school brought the revolutionary ideas of liberalism and utilitarianism from the Age of Reason into the criminal justice system. Classical criminology advocated the principles of fairness, individual rights, and due process instead of retribution, brutality, and arbitrariness, which were commonplace in eighteenth-century Europe. Torture to extract confessions, along with cruel punishments such as mutilation, whipping, and public executions, were routinely employed. Foucault (1975) illustrates this frequent barbarism through the graphic description of the ruthless public execution of Robert-Francois Damiens in 1757 for the attempted regicide of Louis XV in France. The growth of the middle classes provided an audience demanding legal rationality and equality to support national and international trade and commerce. Classical criminology emerged as a way to provide a logical, rational, and theoretical alternative to this abusive, inhumane, and inconsistent criminal justice system. The principal component of the classical school of criminology is the emphasis on human agency, or free will. That is, individuals are able to make decisions determining the direction of their life's course.

Prior to the introduction of the classical school, individuals relied on spiritualism to ascertain who was criminal and who was not. Spiritualism focused on conflict between good and evil. People who engaged in crime were thought to be possessed by evil spirits, typically referred to as demons. While the origins of spiritualism are unknown, it was common for ancient civilizations to blame the paranormal for unexplainable phenomena. Spiritualism continued to develop through the Middle Ages, becoming entwined with the social and political structure of feudal Europe. During the feudalist period, several new processes were developed to deal with suspected criminals that addressed the private nature of crime. Crime was originally thought of as a private problem, a transgression between two individuals, an offender and a victim (or the victim's family). This resulted in the creation of blood feuds that would ruin entire families (e.g., the Hatfields and McCoys), along with justice being dispensed inconsistently. A strong family might never have a guilty member punished while a weak family might have an innocent member being unfairly wronged or the victim never finding justice.

Eventually, the procedure of dealing with offenders evolved, being replaced by three separate methods: trial by combat, trial by ordeal, and trial by oath (Vold and Bernard 1986). While the private nature of crime became open with the disciplining process being performed in public, it still was very much tied to spiritualism's belief of good versus evil being decided by the supernatural. Trial by combat allowed the victim and offender, or a family member from each of the parties, to fight each other to determine who was the upstanding citizen. The innocent party would be the victor of the battle, having put faith in God (Vold and Bernard 1986). Yet, this allowed criminal behavior to continue among individuals who were good at fighting, since they would always be exonerated. In trial by ordeal a suspected offender would undergo intense life-threatening pain. Innocence would be declared if the individual survived, occurring through the grace of God absolving the individual. Guilt resulted in a painful death. Examples of this trial include being tied up and thrown into a body of water: an innocent person would float while the guilty sank (Vold and Bernard 1986). However, this method was reversed during the witch trials of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in which an individual who sank was not a witch but could drown, while floating meant the individual was in league with the devil (Currie 1968). Clearly the context for this type of trial mattered. Another example of trial by ordeal would be the placing of large stones on individuals' chests; if their chests were not crushed then they were not guilty.

The final procedure employed was trial by oath, in which esteemed people in the community would essentially vouch for a suspected offender's innocence. It was believed that no one would swear a false oath to God in fear of retribution (Vold and Bernard 1986).

While spiritualism was the dominant perspective through the sixteenth century, scholars began to look at more naturalistic explanations to account for crime. These scientists began to explain human behavior in terms that were understandable and not otherworldly (Vold 1958). Two of the most influential scholars who applied this naturalistic theory to explain criminal behavior were Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham. The development of classical criminology occurred prior to and during the American Revolution. While these scholars applied the democratic ideals emerging throughout western Europe and America to the criminal justice system, their theories were in direct response to the autocratic governments of France and England.

Born into an aristocratic family, Beccaria had a solid liberal arts education and became an economist and mathematician. Beccaria's book, *On Crimes and Punishments*, released in 1764, is considered to be one of the most important treatises on penal reform, criticizing the barbarism used in criminal justice procedures in Europe. Beccaria's critique came at a time when the French police were permitted to not only deal with many criminal matters, but also regulate the public opinions of morality and politics. Individuals who were arrested for a crime lost legal assistance, could be tortured, and were removed from their family: similar to the modern concept of rendition.

Beccaria's argument can be summarized into 11 major points (Radzinowicz 1966). First, in order to avoid disorder and war, individuals relinquished some liberty to establish a contractual relationship with society. This set up a sovereignty able to create laws and punish those that broke them. Second, the establishment of criminal laws restricts the freedoms of individuals and should remain narrow in scope, ignoring morality. The greater sanctioning of human behavior will only increase the amount of crime, not inhibit it (e.g., Prohibition in 1920s America). Third, the guiding principle should be the presumption of innocence not guilt during all stages of the administering of

justice, thereby protecting the rights of all parties involved. Fourth, laws should be written down in a criminal code defining what are offenses and punishments. Fifth, punishment should be retributive, since one individual has violated another's rights. Sixth, the severity of the punishment should be restricted to what is required to deter future criminality and not go beyond. Seventh, the punishment should correlate or fit with the severity of the crime, not the individual criminal. Eighth, the punishment for an offense should be certain and quickly administered. Ninth, the punishment should not be used to reform the individual or set an example. Tenth, the criminal should be considered a logical, rational person who has weighed the consequences of partaking in a criminal act. The final tenet asserts that the aim of any legislative administration should be to inhibit crime. Thus, it is better to prevent crime than to punish offenders.

Another scholar critical of the justice system was Jeremy Bentham, an English philosopher and jurist. Being a utilitarian, Bentham argued that crime is the result of human behavior and can be attributed to an individual's free will through the employment of "hedonistic calculus." Bentham describes hedonistic calculus as an individual's ability to logically ascertain if the pleasure acquired from the participation of a criminal act outweighs the potential pain. Thus, individuals are considered to be selfish actors pursuing gratification while avoiding discomfort. Thus, "nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure" (Bentham 2010/1789). Therefore, crimes are just acts that quench the basic aspirations of human behavior.

In 1789 he developed a general theory of crime, which is composed of four sanction systems, that are the sources of pleasure and pain: physical, religious, moral, and political. Physical sanctions are natural restrictions (e.g., bodily harm) to behavior making them risky or difficult to achieve. Religious sanctions (e.g., hellfire) are deterrents that are delivered in both this life and the afterlife. Presumably this type of sanction should be a powerful influence on individuals, yet previous research has shown this to not be the case. According to Bentham, moral sanctions (e.g., attachment) should be considered the most important of the four, requiring the assent of neighbors, the community, and family: essentially, establishing a

type of informal deterrence that is quite potent (Grasmick and Bursik 1990). The theories of both social disorganization and social bond build off of this concept. Finally, political sanctions (i.e., penalties) are state limitations of an individual's behavior. Thus, behaviors that are either considered to be criminal or non-criminal are based upon what the government (i.e., the criminal justice system) deems to be the most optimal and utilitarian to society. By emphasizing the principles of utility to justify the use of government penalties to produce some optimum effect for society, Bentham began to focus primarily on political sanctions. Bentham also argued that punishment should have a suppressive effect.

Thus, the principal criminological theory that accounts for the principles developed by Beccaria and Bentham is deterrence. Essentially, deterrence theory argues that individuals who are planning on engaging in a crime are able to account for the legal sanctions of the act and the probability of being apprehended. However, this calculation is influenced by the individual's knowledge of the criminal justice system (Paternoster 1985).

Deterrence theory stresses that the foundational purpose of the criminal justice system is to inhibit crime, and that it should not be used for vengeance. Therefore, in order to encourage compliance with criminal laws these political sanctions should have reasonable penalties that are administered in a equitable manner. The application of these principles establishes a more uniform and equitable justice system. Thus, in order to inhibit human behavior a sanction must be composed of three dimensions: severity, certainty, and celerity.

The concept of severity can be understood as providing an appropriate sanction for a criminal act. Thus the punishment must "fit the crime." This concept is comparable to the idea of retribution (e.g., an eye for an eye) described in the Code of Hammurabi, the Torah, and the Bible's Old Testament. Thus, the penalty for a criminal act must be proportional to the harm caused to society by the crime. If the punishment is not serious enough it will not deter crime; if it is too grievous than the penalty is unjust.

Certainty refers to the probability that an individual will be apprehended and punished for a crime. In order to dissuade individuals from the commission of a criminal act the sanction for a crime must be definite. Beccaria and Bentham both stressed that the certainty is a more effective dimension in deterring crime than severity.

The swiftness with which a criminal sanction is applied is the celerity of punishment. A punishment that is immediately administered after the perpetration of a crime is more effective because the individual will directly associate the punishment with the crime. As the time interval increases from the commission of the crime to the sanctioning the deterring effect reduces (Beccaria 1963/1764).

If one of these aspects is lacking from the punishment, then the deterrence effect is substantially reduced and requires the other dimensions to compensate. Thus, if the certainty of punishment decreased then the severity and celerity would have to increase to maintain the deterrent effect. If the celerity of punishment is unable to be modified, leaving only the severity of punishment to be adjusted, then the acuteness of the sanction must be great. Yet, this limits the impact of deterrence, since a harsher penalty will less likely be utilized. Thus, if the sanction does not have certainty, celerity, and severity then individuals are unable to rationally calculate the pain to be experienced from the commission of a crime and they will be less likely to restrain themselves from carrying out the act.

Deterrence theory is generally operationalized as either specific or general. Specific deterrence refers to the idea that apprehended and punished offenders will refrain from future recidivism if they are definitely arrested and severely sanctioned. General deterrence refers to the government's ability to punish offenders, serving as an example to the public who have not yet engaged in criminality, thus discouraging them from doing so in the future.

The extant literature has shown that the three dimensions of deterrence generally are ineffective at inhibiting crime. One of the first studies that investigated deterrence theory was conducted in 1959 by Thorsten Sellin. The results of this study showed that the presence or absence of the death penalty had no effect on the homicide rate. Studies such as this have been one of the principal arguments against the use of the death penalty by the criminal justice system. Scholars generally have shown that the severity of punishment weakly impacts crime (Smith and Akers unpublished paper; Pratt et al. 2006). While the certainty

of punishment is statistically significant, it is also weak, with perceived certainty being slightly more robust (Pratt et al. 2006). That is, there will be a deterrent effect on individuals who are afraid of the legal sanctions for a crime regardless of the reality of these sanctions (Scheider 2001). There also appears to be an experiential effect, in which individuals who lack experience with committing criminal offenses have higher estimates of the certainty of being apprehended for participating in a criminal act than those who have experience (Paternoster 1987). Thus, if an individual is not punished after being caught this could explain the difference observed by this experiential effect, since there would be a lower perception of certainty (Staford and Warr 1993). Thus, repeat players in the criminal justice system would be affected less by deterrence theory than individuals who have never or rarely experienced it. Finally, research has shown that the celerity of punishment has very little effect if any (Nagin and Pogarsky 2001).

It is important to remember that deterrence theory according to Beccaria and Bentham developed prior to American democracy and was principally a reaction to the autocratic rulers in Europe. The modern-day criminal justice system in America protects the rights of individuals and the due process of law. As a result, the aspects of celerity and certainty become more ambiguous, lacking ability to be greatly modified, thus diminishing their impact on inhibiting crime. Therefore it should not be a surprise that when the principal tenets of deterrence theory are tested in a country with a democratic political system the results are significantly weak at best.

The policy implications of deterrence theory have been well documented in recent American history. The primary effect has been the rapid increase in the number of prisoners, with 2.3 million in federal and state prisons and local jails, or one in 100 adults being incarcerated (Warren 2008). Along with an increase in incarceration of criminals, there has also been an enormous increase of individuals, currently a population of 5 million or one in 31, who are under the supervision of the criminal justice system through either probation or parole (Warren 2009). Since this rampant expansion of the prison industrial complex has taken place there have been no well-controlled evaluations researching how

this observed increase in deterrence has contributed to the changes in the crime rate. Other policy approaches using deterrence theory have been employed by law enforcement, with some promising significant effects on the policing of "hot spots" and driving under the influence (DUI) stops (Ross 1982; Sherman et al. 1998). Another popular approach used by the criminal justice system to deter youth has been the use of boot camps (Zhang 2000) and shock incarceration (Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, and Bueller 2006), both of which have produced little to no effect.

By the early nineteenth century, after many legal reforms following the American Revolution, French Revolution, and establishment of the US Constitution, there was still proliferation of crime. Several counter-arguments began to emerge that questioned the ability of hedonism to explain criminal behavior. Aggravating and mitigating circumstances became more important in accounting for individuals' criminal conduct. People felt less inclined to be convinced that bad laws created bad people. However, the causes of crime were still a question unanswered, requiring a more complex solution than was offered by the classical school. The school of criminology that followed was the positivists, focusing on the actions of criminals being determined by free will as opposed to being the resultant. The positivist school of criminology differed from the classical school by focusing on empirical research to ascertain that crime was the product of multiple factors. The original positivists emphasized the features of the criminal, such as the mind and body, that were readily available to measurement, while disregarding social factors that were outside of the individual.

While classical criminology became unpopular for some time, there was a resurgence of scholarly interest in the late twentieth century, in which several criminological theories built off of the classical school's interest in explaining human behavior. The emergence of these theories occurred during a period of conservatism in America, in which scholars were unsatisfied with the explanations that the discipline of criminology provided for the causes of crime and criminality. These criminological theories include rational choice, self-control theory, and routine activities.

SEE ALSO: Beccaria, Cesare; Bentham, Jeremy; Rational Choice Theory; Routine Activities and Crime; Self-Control Theory.

References

Beccaria, C. (1963) *On Crimes and Punishments* (trans. H. Palace). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill. (Originally published in Italian 1764.)

Bentham, J. (2010/1789) *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. New York: Clarendon.

Currie, E. P. (1968) Crimes without criminals: Witchcraft and its control in Renaissance Europe. *Law and Society Review* 3, 7–32.

Foucault, M. (1975) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random.

Grasmick, H. G., & Bursik, R. J., Jr. (1990) Conscience, significant others, and rational choice: Extending the deterrence model. *Law and Society Review* 24, 837–861.

Nagin, D. S., & Pogarsky, G. (2001) Integrating celerity, impulsivity, and extralegal sanction threats into a model of general deterrence: Theory and evidence. *Criminology* 39, 865–892.

Paternoster, R. (1985) Assessments of risk and behavioral experience: An explanatory study of change. *Criminology* 36, 417–436.

Paternoster, R. (1987) The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly* 4, 197–217.

Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., & Bueller, J. (2006) Scared straight and other juvenile awareness programs. In B. C. Welsh & D. P. Farrington (eds.), *Preventing Crime: What Works for Children, Offenders, Victims, and Places*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 87–102.

Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Dangle, L. E., & Madensen, D. (2006) The empirical status of deterrence theory: A meta-analysis. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory. Advances in Criminological Theory. Volume 15*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, pp. 367–396.

Radzinowicz, L. (1966) *Ideology and Crime: A Study of Crime in its Social and Historical Context*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ross, L. H. (1982) *Deterring the Drinking Driver: Legal Policy and Social Control*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Scheider, M. (2001) Deterrence and the base rate fallacy: An application of expectancy theory. *Justice Quarterly* 18, 63–86.

Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D. C., MacKenzie, D. L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. D. (1998) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Staford, M., & Warr, M. (1993) A reconceptualization of general and specific deterrence. *Journal in Crime and Delinquency* 30, 123–135.

Sellin, J. T. (1959) The death penalty. A report for the Model penal code project of the American Law Institute.

Vold, G. B. (1958) *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vold, G. B., & Bernard, T. J. (1986) *Theoretical Criminology*, 3rd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Warren, J. (2008) *One in 100: Behind Bars in America*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Warren, J. (2009) *One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Zhang, S. X. (2000) *An Evaluation of the Los Angeles County Probation Juvenile Drug Treatment Boot Camp*. San Marcos, CA: California State University.

Positive Criminology

MATTHEW WILLIAM LOGAN and
BRANDON DULISSE

In general, positive criminology refers to the scientific study of criminals and the causes of crime, and is based on research from a variety of disciplines including – but not limited to – sociology, psychology, and biology. More importantly, virtually all positivist theories in criminology incorporate some form of measurement – such as quantitative or statistical analyses – to identify and compare a host of factors thought to influence criminal behavior.

Following the Age of Enlightenment – a period during which criminal behavior was thought to be the product of free will and rational choice – there emerged a line of inquiry that sought to examine crime in the context of social and economic conditions. Two of the most prominent scholars in this area were André M. Guerry (1802–1866) and Adolphe Quetelet (1796–1894), who today have become synonymous with the birth of crime statistics (Hagan 2011). Employing cartographic and comparative statistical methodologies, the research of Guerry (1833) and Quetelet (1835) challenged the notion that individuals exercise free will in their decisions to engage in crime, and instead focused on the influence of social and economic factors – such as age, sex, geographic location, and poverty – to explain criminality. Specifically, they used city maps and analyzed neighborhoods to calculate English and French crime rates and identify patterns of relationships. Results from their analyses suggested that a disproportionate amount of crime was being committed in neighborhoods with greater proportions of young men, that seasonal and regional variation existed in the nature of crimes committed (e.g., crimes against persons increased during summer months; property crimes increased during winter months), and that relative deprivation – as opposed to absolute poverty – was a causal mechanism in explaining crime rates.

Nearly half a century later, challenges to ecological theories of crime emerged, which viewed criminality as the result of innate differences existing between criminals and noncriminals. Perhaps the most famous – albeit controversial – scholar in this area was Cesare Lombroso (1835–1909), who carried out research on the "criminal man" (Gibson 2002). Drawing heavily on Darwinian and evolutionary perspectives, Lombroso viewed criminals as biologically inferior to their noncriminal counterparts; a notion illustrated by his theory of atavism, which referenced criminals as "genetic throwbacks" (Cullen and Agnew 2011).

Through the examination of criminal body types, skull shape and size, and facial features, among others, Lombroso's theory of atavism posited that criminals were born savages who possessed low intelligence and a ferocious animal instinct that ultimately rendered them unfit for civilized society. However, because many criminals did not display the biological inferiorities as described by atavistic theory, Lombroso broadened the scope of his research by incorporating environmental factors to explain criminal behavior. In doing so, he concluded that there existed several types of criminal. As atavistic theory would dictate, there were the born criminals, who constituted the most important part of the criminal population because of the severity of their crimes and frequent involvement with the criminal justice system. The remaining criminal population was comprised of the "criminaloids" or minor offenders: individuals whose criminal behavior was occasional and showed little variation from noncriminals.

While Lombroso's research was considered revolutionary during the early part of the twentieth century – namely, because it facilitated the development of positivist thinking in criminology – it has since been discredited. Detractors of atavistic theory have contended that Lombroso's arguments regarding the biology of offenders were flawed because of his inability to differentiate criminals from noncriminals on the basis of carefully matched samples. Additionally, his typology was based on highly skewed samples – mental hospital patients and

the military (Bernard, Snipes, and Gerould 2009). Modern positivist theories of crime adhere to the scientific method and focus more on specific factors, testable hypotheses, and probabilistic causal effects.

The emergence of modern positivism in criminology was heavily influenced by a number of scholars in sociology, including Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay, whose analyses were rooted in empiricism, based on data, as well as a firm belief in an objective external reality that can be measured (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1987). Shaw and McKay were most famous for their theory of social disorganization (1942), which was based on empirical data assembled from structural factors of the inner city. By creating measurements for socioecological influences – such as poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, and neighborhood mobility – they were able to apply statistical evidence to criminological theory. Their ability to ground statistical analyses within sound criminological theory ultimately strengthened the discipline by emphasizing rigorous methodology and scientific evidence, which were seen as improvements over untestable or "free will" theories (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1987).

While Shaw and McKay used empirical measures to assess the relationship between macro-level characteristics and crime, more recent perspectives have relied on quantifiable measures to assess individual theories of criminal behavior; some of which are rooted within the field of psychology. For example, Andrews and Bonta (2010) created empirical measures of criminal conduct and psychological traits – such as antisocial personalities – which identified individuals who were at the highest risk of offending. Their contention was that, through empirical prediction, specific treatments can be applied based on specific rehabilitative needs for each offender, a method that has proven effective in identifying risk and reducing rates of recidivism (McGuire 2002; Lowenkamp, Latessa, and Holsinger 2006). Positivist research in criminology also borrows from the field of biology, which relies heavily on the use of scientific methodology and empirical backing when constructing theories.

In the last 20 years, biological markers have been measured to identify potential correlations between criminality and personality traits such as aggressiveness, psychopathy, self-control, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (Pratt and Cullen 2000; Pratt et al. 2002; Glenn, Raine, and Schug 2009). It has also been suggested recently that connections between the environment and biological processes may serve to either promote or reduce criminal activity in individuals. For example, Caspi et al. (2002) found that the monoamine oxidase A (MAOA) gene can regulate behavior – such as antisocial behavior – in adults who were maltreated as children. Positive theories in criminology – including those described above – have been championed for "unlocking new doors" to understanding the relationship between the social context, biological predispositions, and criminality. However, this sentiment is not uniform across the discipline, and some scholars have warned that taking an entirely positivist approach may lead to more harm than good.

A major criticism of modern positivist research is that it can sometimes be atheoretical – that is, the empirical analyses conducted may be devoid of any substantive or theoretical relevance to criminology (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1987). In this regard, scholars may "put the carriage before the horse" in that they let their results dictate their theory and not vice versa. Ideally, researchers create a model based on the theory they wish to test; however, what sometimes occurs is that they end up choosing a theory based on their results. This can be especially problematic for evaluation and implementation of various social policies, an area in which criminology is particularly influential.

According to Greenberg (1981), for example, research based on criminological positivism brings with it certain assumptions, the most common being that crime and its causes are ultimately deterministic, pathological, and can be studied using the same methods as the natural sciences. That the study of criminality is viewed as akin to understanding scientific phenomena carries with it the possibility that governing bodies can – and often do – draw on positive criminology to implement policies designed to eliminate the causes of crime. Governmental reliance on positive criminology for social policy is not problematic in and of itself; however, one implication of doing so is that it is congruent with totalitarian patterns of government (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1987).

For example, the argument of biological inferiority implied by Lombroso's aforementioned research supports the notion of eugenics – criminals would be prohibited from procreating and thus phased out of society. Such logic was adopted by – and congruent with – the ideological platform of the Nazis during World War II in their quest to "purify" the human race. While the above example is anomalous, it draws attention to the fact that research and subsequent policies based on positivist inferences can have severe ramifications. Thus, instead of examining criminality purely on the basis of cause and effect, there has been a recognition that positive criminology should operate on the assumption of *probabilistic* cause and effect. That is, given the variability of human behavior across multiple social contexts, researchers can only infer – based on their methodologies – which particular crimes and behaviors are more or less *likely* to occur.

SEE ALSO: Biosocial Explanations of Crime; Prediction of Crime (Issues in Measurement); Psychological Theories of Crime; Social Disorganization Theory.

References

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. New Providence, NJ: Anderson.

Bernard, T. J., Snipes, J. B., & Gerould, A. L. (2009) *Vold's Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J., et al. (2002) Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science* 297(5582), 851–854.

Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2011) *Criminological Theory: Past to Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gibson, M. (2002) *Born to Crime: Cesare Lombroso and the Origins of Biological Criminology*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Glenn, A. L., Raine, A., & Schug, R. A. (2009) The neural correlates of moral decision-making in psychopathy. *Molecular Psychiatry* 14, 5–6.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1987) *Positive Criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Greenberg, D. (1981) *Crime and Capitalism*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Hagan, F. E. (2011) *Introduction to Criminology: Theories, Methods, and Criminal Behavior*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. M. (2006) The risk principle in action: What have we learned from 13,676 offenders and 97 correctional programs? *Crime and Delinquency* 52, 77–93.

McGuire, J. (2002) Integrating findings from research reviews. In J. McGuire (ed.), *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Re-offending*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 3–38.

Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2000) The empirical status of Gottfredson's and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime. A meta-analysis. *Criminology* 38(3), 931–964.

Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L., et al. (2002) The relationship of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder to crime and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 4(4), 344–360.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Genetic Theories of Criminal Behavior

DANIELLE BOISVERT and JAMIE VASKE

The tradition in criminology is to focus on the environmental factors that influence criminal behavior while neglecting to consider the role that genetic factors play in behavior. This tradition may be the result of several factors but is primarily due to the fact that our discipline stems from sociology and very few criminologists are trained outside of the social sciences. In order to understand the complexities of behavior, including antisocial behavior, researchers must delve deep into the literature on neuropsychology, evolutionary psychology, behavioral genetics, and molecular genetics. For instance, molecular genetics is the study of the function of genes, and how individual differences in the functioning of genes may influence one's health, cognition, and behavior. With regards to the study of criminal behavior, it is important to highlight here that there is no "crime gene." Rather, it is likely that several genes are operating simultaneously and interacting with one another and the environment to influence behavior. In order to fully appreciate all of the exciting and groundbreaking research being done in this area, readers should have a basic understanding of molecular genetics. This entry will provide a very short description of genes and alleles, but readers can find more information on genetic variation and genetic expression from other resources.

Humans have 23 pairs of chromosomes or 46 chromosomes in total. They receive one set of chromosomes from their mother (i.e. 23 chromosomes), and a complementary set of chromosomes from their father (i.e. 23 chromosomes). A single chromosome from either parent only contains half of the genetic information or DNA that is required for a single gene. That is, mothers provide half of the genetic information for a specific gene, and fathers provide the other half. Each DNA sequence for a gene is referred to as an allele. Thus, each gene has two alleles: one inherited from the mother and one inherited from the father. These two alleles represent a person's genotype and the expression of a person's genotype is referred to as a phenotype.

Genes are segments of DNA that code for proteins. Studying the function and translation of proteins may help to better understand behavior. Researchers that have examined the link between genes and criminal behavior have predominantly focused on genetic polymorphisms related to neuropsychological systems. For instance, genetic polymorphisms related to the serotonin system, dopamine system, and enzymatic system have been identified as candidate genes for delinquent and criminal behavior. More specifically, researchers have linked antisocial behavior to several polymorphisms, including: (1) a serotonin transporter polymorphism (5HTTLPR), (2) serotonin receptor polymorphisms ($5HT_{2A}$ His452Tyr & $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A), (3) a dopamine transporter polymorphism (DAT1 3'UTR VNTR), (4) polymorphisms in dopamine receptor genes (DRD2 TaqIA RFLP & DRD4 48bp VNTR), and (5) a monoamine oxidase A polymorphism (MAOA 30bp VNTR). Researchers have focused primarily on these genes because it is assumed that these genetic polymorphisms influence neuropsychology and cognition (i.e., how or what a person thinks), which in turn influences a person's behavior. Thus, maladaptive cognitive processes may mediate the association between genetic polymorphisms and antisocial behaviors.

Studying the genetic effect on antisocial/criminal behavior at the molecular level is often accomplished in one of three ways. First, known as gene-behavior studies, researchers can examine the direct effect of genetic markers on a specific behavior. Next, referred to as gene × gene studies, the conditioning or moderating effects of one gene on another gene can be examined. Finally, gene × environment studies are used to examine the interactive effect of a specific genetic marker when coupled with a particular environment. Several empirical studies have examined the association between

offending and specific polymorphisms using gene-behavior studies, gene × gene studies, and gene × environment studies. These different types of study capture some of the complex relationships between genetic risk factors and criminal behavior.

Serotonin is synthesized in the raphe nucleus of the brain and is then distributed to various regions, including the prefrontal cortex, hippocampus, brain stem, and limbic system. Serotonin is an inhibitory neurotransmitter and it has been suggested that lower levels of serotonin is associated with higher levels of aggressive, impulsive, and antisocial behaviors. Three genes related to the serotonin system are often examined in the study of antisocial and criminal behaviors: (1) 5HTTLPR; (2) $5HT_{2A}$ His452Tyr; and (3) $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A. First, the serotonin transporter gene, 5HTTLPR, is located on chromosome 17q11.1-17q12. This 44 base pair insertion/deletion polymorphism translates into either a long (insertion) or short (deletion) allele. The short allele is associated with reduced transcription of the 5HTTLPR gene, which results in less serotonin transporter proteins, fewer serotonin transporters, and subsequently less reuptake of serotonin (Boisvert and Vaske 2011). Several gene-behavior studies have found that the 5HTTLPR polymorphism is significantly related to criminal behavior, especially violent criminal behavior (Gerra et al. 2005; Beaver et al. 2008a; Vaughn et al. 2009). For example, Gerra et al.'s (2005) analysis of data from 101 heroin addicts revealed that heroin addicts who engaged in violent criminal behavior were more likely to carry one or more copies of the short allele than heroin addicts who had not engaged in violent criminal behavior.

Gene × gene and gene × environment studies have also examined how 5HTTLPR interacts with other genes and specific environments to influence antisocial behavior. For example, Rae (2006) found that 5HTTLPR interacted with the dopamine transporter polymorphism DAT1 to predict the total number of arrests in adulthood. Specifically, individuals who carried a short allele and who were homozygous for the 10R allele in DAT1 were significantly more likely to get arrested compared to those who carried the short allele but who were not homozygous for the 10R allele. Gene × environment studies have also found that

5HTTLPR interacts with specific environmental risk factors to influence criminal and antisocial behaviors (Rae 2006; Reif et al. 2007; Vaske et al. 2009). For example, Reif and colleagues (2007) found that 5HTTLPR interacted with childhood adversity to influence violent criminal behavior among a sample of adult males (N = 184) referred for forensic evaluation.

In addition to a serotonin transporter gene, researchers have recently begun to examine the role that serotonin receptor genes, $5HT_{2A}$ His452Tyr and $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A, play in influencing criminal behavior. First, $5HT_{2A}$ His452Tyr, is located on chromosome 13q14-q21 and this genetic polymorphism involves a C (cytosine) to T (thymine) substitution. The Tyr allele has been associated with reduced signal transduction in $5HT_{2A}$ receptors (i.e., movement of a message from outside a cell to inside a cell). Second, the serotonin receptor gene, $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A, is located on chromosome 13q14-q21 and involves a G (guanine) to A (adenine) substitution. The functional significance of $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A is currently not known but it is hypothesized that the polymorphism reduces the number of receptors by influencing transcription. A few gene-behavior studies have examined the effect of these receptor genes on criminal behavior. For example, Burt and Mikolajewski (2008) found that males who carried two copies of the His allele of the $5HT_{2A}$ His452Tyr polymorphism reported higher levels of nonaggressive, delinquent behavior than males who were not homozygous for the His allele. However, their results did not show an association between $5HT_{2A}$ His452Tyr and aggressive types of delinquent behavior. In 2009, Burt (2009) later reported that delinquent and antisocial behaviors mediated the relationship between the $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A polymorphism and popularity among a group of undergraduate males. Males who carried one or more copies of the G allele were significantly more involved in delinquent activities and subsequently were rated as more popular among their peers. On the other hand, Berggard et al. (2003) reported that the prevalence of the A allele of the $5HT_{2A}$ 1438G/A polymorphism was significantly higher among offenders than non-offenders.

Dopamine is an excitatory neurotransmitter and is implicated in the pleasure-reward system of the body. Put simply, when there is

an excess of dopamine, individuals are increasingly sensitive to stimuli, are more likely to be hyperactive, and can even display signs of psychosis. Conversely, too little dopamine can lead to depression, the inability to concentrate, and lower levels of satisfaction with life. In the study of criminal and antisocial behaviors, researchers have focused primarily on a dopamine transporter gene, DAT1 3'UTR VNTR, and two dopamine receptor genes, DRD2 TaqIA RFLP and DRD4 48bp. First, dopamine transporters are responsible for returning dopamine to presynaptic neurons. Too many dopamine transporters can lead to dopamine deficiency and subsequently behaviors associated with low dopamine. On the other hand, too few dopamine transporters can lead to an excess of dopamine and subsequently behaviors associated with high dopamine (although this is not always the case). Again, several researchers have examined the role that the dopamine transporter gene, DAT1 3'UTR VNTR, plays in the etiology of criminal and antisocial behaviors. Located on chromosome 5p15.3, DAT1 is a 40 base pair (bp) variable number tandem repeat (VNTR) polymorphism which can be repeated 3 to 11 times. The 9-repeat (9R) and the 10-repeat (10R) alleles are the most commonly occurring alleles found in the population. The 9R allele specifically is associated with reduced transcription of the DAT1 gene, which results in less dopamine transporter proteins, fewer dopamine transporters, and subsequently less reuptake of dopamine (Boisvert and Vaske 2011).

Several gene-behavior studies have examined the relationship between the DAT1 3'UTR VNTR polymorphism and various forms of criminal behavior. The results, however, are mixed with several studies showing that the 10R allele is significantly associated with greater involvement in criminal behavior (Beaver et al. 2008b), including serious and violent delinquency (Guo, Roettger, and Shih 2007; Guo, Roettger, and Cai 2008) as well as nonaggressive forms of delinquent behavior (Burt and Mikolajewski 2008). Furthermore, the 10R allele of DAT1 has been linked to greater contacts with the police (Vaughn et al. 2009) and a decreased likelihood of desisting from criminal behavior (Beaver et al. 2008a). However, not all studies have reported a significant relationship between the DAT1 polymorphism and criminal behavior (Reif et al. 2007; Caspi et al. 2008). In

fact, some have found the opposite to be true in that the 9R allele is associated with criminal behavior (Gerra et al. 2005). Thus, it is not yet clear whether the 10R allele or the 9R allele of DAT1 leads to greater risk for delinquent and criminal behavior.

Gene × gene and gene × environment studies have also found that DAT1 interacts with other genetic polymorphisms and specific environments to influence criminal behavior. For example, as previously mentioned, Rae (2006) reported that DAT1 and 5HTTLPR interacted to influence the total number of arrests in African American youth. Vaughn et al. (2009) also found that the 10R allele was associated with serious violent criminal behavior, but only for white respondents who had a low number of delinquent peers.

In addition to a dopamine transporter gene, two dopamine receptor genes, DRD2 TaqIA RFLP and DRD4 48bp, have also been examined in the study of criminal and antisocial behaviors. Dopamine receptors are essential to the proper functioning of dopamine. Too few receptors can lead to either the under- or over-production of dopamine. The dopamine receptor gene, DRD2 TaqIA RFLP, is located on chromosome 11q23 and the polymorphism is a C (cytosine) to T (thymine) substitution. The A1 allele of DRD2 has been associated with reduced density of dopamine receptors. Several gene-behavior studies, using the Add Health data, have reported an association between DRD2 and criminal behavior in males (Guo et al. 2007; Boutwell and Beaver 2008; Vaske 2009). Furthermore, a number of gene × gene and gene × environment studies, also using the Add Health data, have revealed that DRD2 interacts with other genetic polymorphisms, such as DRD4, and criminogenic environments to influence delinquent and criminal behavior (DeLisi et al. 2008; Guo et al. 2008). For example, Guo and colleagues (2008a) found that serious and violent delinquency was highest among respondents who had the A1/A2 genotype and who grew up without both biological parents, did not have regular meals with a parent, had social services come to the house for an investigation, and who hung out with delinquent peers. Contrary to Guo et al.'s (2008) findings that delinquency was highest among individuals who carried a DRD2 risk allele and who

had weak parental bonds, DeLisi and colleagues (2008) found that DRD2 was associated with age of first contact with police and age of first arrest for offenders who reported strong maternal attachment, strong maternal involvement, and greater maternal involvement. Subsequent analyses by DeLisi et al. (2009) also found that DRD2 moderated the effects of having a criminal father on adolescent serious delinquency, adolescent violent delinquency, and number of police contacts for African American females.

Second, the dopamine receptor gene, DRD4 48bp, is located at chromosome 11p15.5 and is a 48 base pair number tandem repeat polymorphism resulting in 2 to 11 repeat alleles. The functional significance of DRD4 is currently not known but it is hypothesized that the 7+ repeat alleles are associated with reduced transcription of the DRD4 gene and weaker intracellular signaling in D4 receptors. The current research linking DRD4 to delinquent and criminal behavior is mixed and inconclusive. While some researchers report that individuals, particularly males, who carry the 7R allele are more likely to be involved in criminal activity (Boutwell and Beaver 2008; Dmitrieva et al. 2011), others have found no association between DRD4 and delinquent and criminal behavior (Caspi et al. 2008; Vaske 2009). Even still, others have reported that individuals who carried a 7+ repeat allele were less likely to engage in criminal behavior (Rae 2006). As such, it is currently not clear whether the 7+ repeat allele in DRD4 is implicated in promoting antisocial behavior.

Monoamine oxidase A (MAOA) is an enzyme that breaks down serotonin, norepinephrine, and dopamine. The MAOA gene is located on the X chromosome, specifically Xp11.3-11.4. It is a 30 base pair variable number tandem repeat polymorphism, resulting in 2-, 3-, 3.5-, 4-, and 5-repeat alleles. The 2R, 3R, and 5R alleles are associated with reduced transcription of the MAOA gene, which may result in less degradation of neurotransmitters in the synaptic cleft. Low MAOA activity has been linked to hypersensitivity to negative environments, aggression, and anxiety. Several gene-behavior studies, using various populations, have found a relationship between the low activity MAOA gene and delinquent and criminal behavior (Reif et al. 2007; Sjoberg et al.

2007; Guo et al. 2008; but see also Lu et al. 2003; Vaske 2009).

Gene × environment studies have also examined how MAOA interacts with specific criminogenic environments to influence antisocial behavior (Caspi et al. 2002; Sjoberg et al. 2007). For example, Guo and colleagues (2008) found that MAOA interacted with grade retention and school attachment to influence both serious and violent delinquency. Furthermore, several studies have examined how MAOA interacts with childhood maltreatment to influence antisocial and criminal behaviors. While many have found a significant interaction effect between MAO and childhood maltreatment on antisocial behaviors (Caspi et al. 2002; Widom and Brzustowicz 2006), others have failed to replicate these findings (Kim-Cohen et al. 2006; Vaske 2009).

There are several limitations that gene-behavior, gene × gene, and gene × environment studies face when investigating these research questions. First, a review of the literature demonstrates that not all gene-behavior studies find a significant relationship between genetic polymorphisms and criminal behavior. It has been suggested that sample size can affect the results in that many of the individual genetic polymorphisms only explain a small percentage of variation in criminal behavior. It is much more likely that criminal behavior is a polygenic phenotype whereby hundreds of genetic polymorphisms combine in additive and multiplicative ways to influence offending. Thus, researchers who are studying the effect of an individual genetic polymorphism on criminal behavior may need large samples to detect the small effect sizes of an individual genetic polymorphism. Related, many of the gene × environment interaction studies have a small number of cases falling into the interaction categories, which may cause studies to lack sufficient power to detect small to medium effect sizes, or the results may be unstable. As such, future studies should ensure that they have acceptable power (i.e., 80%) prior to conducting their analyses.

Several advancements have been made in the study of molecular genetics, particularly as it relates to behavior. While much of the focus pertaining to antisocial behavior had been on genetic polymorphisms related to dopamine, serotonin, and MAOA, recent

research has begun to investigate the role that additional polymorphisms, such as tryptophan hydroxylase gene A218 C, and the catechol-O-methyltransferase gene (COMT Val^{158}Met), play in antisocial behaviors. There are many additional areas for future research in the study of genetic influences on criminal behavior. One particularly interesting avenue that is garnering a lot of attention is in the area of epigenetics. An epigenetic effect occurs when the expression of a gene is either sped up or slowed down as the result of the environment. This change in genetic expression will subsequently affect behavior. There is a growing body of literature in the animal sciences that shows that exposure to abusive or stressful environments early in life influences the expression of genes, and that these changes may have implications for antisocial behavior (Andersen and Teicher 2008). While this is an exciting and promising avenue of study within the field of criminology, this type of research requires active collaboration between criminologists and scholars from other disciplines. The interdisciplinary nature of biosocial criminology makes it a promising perspective with which to continue to examine the complexities of behavior.

SEE ALSO: Biological Theories of Crime; Biosocial Explanations of Crime; Genetics and Crime.

References

Andersen, S., & Teicher, M. H. (2008) Desperately driven and no brakes: Developmental stress exposure and subsequent risk for substance abuse. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 33, 516–524.

Beaver, K., Wright, J. P., DeLisi, M., & Vaughn, M. (2008a) Desistance from delinquency: The marriage effect revisited and extended. *Social Science Research* 37, 736–752.

Beaver, K., Wright, J. P., & Walsh, A. (2008b) A gene-based evolutionary explanation for the association between criminal involvement and number of sex partners. *Biodemography and Social Biology* 54, 47–55.

Berggard, C., Damberg, M., Longato-Stadler, E. et al. (2003) The serotonin 2A – 1438 G/A receptor polymorphism in a group of Swedish male criminals. *Neuroscience Letters* 347, 196–198.

Boisvert, D., & Vaske, J. (2011) Genes, twin studies, and antisocial behaviors. In A. Somit & S. Peterson (eds.), *Biology and Politics: The Cutting Edge*. United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing.

Boutwell, B., & Beaver, K. (2008) A biosocial explanation of delinquency abstention. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health* 18, 59–74.

Burt, A. (2009) A mechanistic explanation of popularity: Genes, rule breaking, and evocative gene-environment correlations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, 783–794.

Burt, A., & Mikolajewski, A. (2008) Preliminary evidence that specific candidate genes are associated with adolescent-onset antisocial behavior. *Aggressive Behavior* 34, 437–445.

Caspi, A., Langley, K., Milne, B. et al. (2008) A replicated molecular genetic basis for subtyping antisocial behavior in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 65, 203–210.

Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. et al. (2002) Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science* 297, 851–854.

DeLisi, M., Beaver, K., Vaughn, M., & Wright, J. P. (2009) All in the family: Gene X environment interaction between DRD2 and criminal father is associated with five antisocial phenotypes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 36, 1187–1197.

DeLisi, M., Beaver, K., Wright, J. P., & Vaughn, M. (2008) The etiology of criminal onset: The enduring salience of nature *and* nurture. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 36, 217–223.

Dmitrieva, J., Chen, C., Greenberger, E. et al. (2011) Gender specific expression of the DRD4 gene on adolescent delinquency, anger, and thrill seeking. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* 6, 82–89.

Gerra, G., Garofano, L., Pellegrini, C. et al. (2005) Allelic association of a dopamine transporter gene polymorphism with antisocial behavior in heroin-dependent patients. *Addiction Biology* 10, 275–281.

Guo, G., Roettger, M., & Cai, T. (2008) The integration of genetic propensities into social control models of delinquency and violence among male youths. *American Sociological Review* 73, 543–568.

Guo, G., Roettger, M., & Shih, J. (2007) Contributions of the DAT1 and DRD2 genes to serious and violent delinquency among adolescents and young adults. *Human Genetics* 121, 125–136.

Kim-Cohen, J., Caspi, A., Taylor, A. et al. (2006) MAOA, maltreatment, and gene-environment interaction predicting children's mental health: New evidence a meta-analysis. *Molecular Psychiatry* 11, 903–913.

Lu, R., Lin, W., Lee, J. et al. (2003) Neither antisocial personality disorder nor antisocial alcoholism is associated with the MAO-A gene in Han Chinese males. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 27, 889–893.

Rae, M. (2006) Genetic and environmental influences on criminal behavior. Doctoral dissertation. University of Cincinnati.

Reif, A., Rösler, M., Freitag, C. et al. (2007) Nature and nurture predispose to violent behavior: Serotonergic genes and adverse childhood environment. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 32, 2375–2383.

Sjöberg, R., Nilsson, K., Wargelius, H. et al. (2007) Adolescent girls and criminal activity: Role of the MAOA-LPR genotype and psychosocial factors. *American Journal of Medical Genetics*, Part B, 144B, 159–164.

Vaske, J. (2009) The role of genes and abuse in the etiology of offending. Doctoral dissertation. University of Cincinnati.

Vaske, J., Newsome, J., Makarios, M. et al. (2009) Interaction of 5HTTLPR and marijuana use on property offending. *Biodemography and Social Biology* 55, 93–102.

Vaughn, M. G., DeLisi, M., Beaver, K. M., & Wright, J. P. (2009) DAT1 and 5HTT are associated with pathological criminal behavior in a nationally representative sample of youth. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 36, 1113–1124.

Widom, C., & Brzustowicz, L. (2006) MAOA and the "Cycle of Violence": Childhood abuse and neglect, MAOA genotype, and risk for violent and antisocial behavior. *Biological Psychiatry* 60, 684–689.

Biological Theories of Crime

JAMIE NEWSOME

The human brain is responsible for all thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. The brain is divided into a number of regions, each of which is responsible for unique tasks. Dysfunction in specific regions of the brain has been implicated in the explanation of deviant, criminal, and violent behaviors (Raine 1993; Blair et al. 2005). The limbic system is housed deep within the brain and encompasses multiple brain structures, which are responsible for tasks such as memory formation, the generation of emotional responses, and motivation. This system is also responsible for "fight-or-flight" responses. For instance, the amygdala is one structure housed within this system that is believed to be associated with violent behavior because of its role in generating feelings of fear and anger.

The cerebral cortex makes up the outer part of the brain, and is divided into the left and right hemispheres. Each hemisphere is further divided into four lobes: frontal, temporal, parietal, and occipital. Of particular importance is the frontal lobe, because it is largely involved in abstract thought, planning, goal formation, sustaining attention and concentration, self-monitoring, and behavioral inhibition (Moffitt 1990; Ishikawa and Raine 2003). This region is located behind the forehead, and does not fully develop until early adulthood. Lower levels of executive functioning may contribute to individual criminality by reducing inhibition and hindering one's ability to develop a prosocial response to frustrating or difficult circumstances. Research indicates that those who are antisocial have reduced executive functioning (Morgan and Lilienfeld 2000). Moreover, the cerebral cortex and limbic system are interconnected. An individual may be more likely to engage in violent behaviors if strong emotional responses generated by the limbic system are not adequately regulated through executive functions.

Scientists assess the structure and function of the human brain with the use of five different brain imaging techniques. Computerized tomography (CT) uses multiple X-ray images taken from various angles to produce a composite image of the brain, and is commonly used to examine the structures of the brain and assess injuries. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) uses radio waves and magnetic fields to produce images of the brain. This technique has been improved upon since its initial development to now include functioning of the brain. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) examines blood flow within the brain, as those regions that are more active experience an increase in blood flow. Positron emission tomography (PET) is also used to assess brain functioning. These scans detect and record energy used within the brain, which is then used to create detailed images. Finally, single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) is a technique used to evaluate functioning within the brain. This technique uses a radioactive gas and a specialized camera to create images that display brain activity. These techniques compliment psychological assessments because they allow for direct observation of regions within the brain that may be responsible for behavioral problems. For example, using PET scans Raine et al. (1997) examined a sample of convicted murderers and a control group. The results indicated that the murderers had greater deficits in functioning in the prefrontal region of the brain.

Neuroscience has also uncovered how chemicals in the brain known as neurotransmitters can work to influence thought, emotion, and behavior. Electrochemical messages are sent throughout the brain in a process known as neurotransmission. Neurons send and receive these chemical messages. The sending, or presynaptic, neuron sends an electrical impulse down its axon, a tail-like extension of the cell. Once this impulse reaches the synaptic cleft, the space between the neurons, neurotransmitters are released into synaptic space where they bind to the receiving, or postsynaptic, neuron. Any excess of a neurotransmitter is removed from the synapse through

reuptake into the presynaptic cleft, or it may be enzymatically degraded. The process of neurotransmission often involves groups of neurons, also known as neural networks, working together to carry out complex functions within the brain. As this process repeats, the neural networks become more efficient, and messages are sent more quickly.

Neurotransmitters are central to this process. These chemicals can be classified as excitatory or inhibitory, depending on whether they increase or decrease cell firing. Dopamine is an excitatory neurotransmitter and is necessary for optimal cognitive functioning. It is also involved in the reward system in the brain. When an individual engages in a pleasurable activity, dopamine is released and the individual experiences feelings of euphoria, increasing the likelihood that the behavior will be repeated. Some studies have shown that excessive levels of dopamine may be related to aggressive and criminal behaviors (Molling et al. 1962; Yudofsky et al. 1987; Brizer 1988). Antipsychotic drugs that reduce dopamine production have been used to reduce aggression.

Norepinephrine is also an excitatory neurotransmitter, and is distributed throughout the limbic system. This neurochemical is released during fight-or-flight response periods, and influences emotion and memory. Prior research has demonstrated that increased levels of norepinephrine may result in increases in aggressive behavior (Yudofsky et al. 1987; Brizer 1988). There is also some evidence that suggests that reduced levels may be linked to antisocial behavior (Raine 1993), which suggests that both high and low levels of norepinephrine may result in behavioral problems.

Serotonin is an inhibitory neurotransmitter that is used throughout the brain, including within the limbic system and the frontal cortex. This neurochemical is used to regulate mood and behavior. Reduced levels of serotonin have been linked to criminal behavior in both juveniles and adults (Brizer 1988; Raine 1993). More recently, research has found that serotonin is important in managing impulsivity, and that impulses corresponding to intense emotions are more likely to result in violence (Krakowski 2003). A class of drugs known as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) is often used to regulate levels

of serotonin in the brain in order to treat a number of disorders.

While the study of brain structure and function has a number of potential implications in the study of criminal behavior, this research cannot indicate whether observed differences across individuals are due to nature or nurture. Behavioral genetic research has allowed criminologists to investigate the contribution of both genetic and environmental factors in traits and behaviors frequently observed in criminal offenders. This research is based on the assumption that, if genetic differences have a substantial influence on a trait, those with greater genetic similarity will be more similar in regards to the trait of interest; however, if the environment that individuals share is influential, those that live together would be expected to show greater similarity in the trait (Plomin 2004).

Family, adoption, and twin studies are commonly conducted to estimate influences on various traits because these can specify the degree of similarity in both genes and environment (Plomin 2004). Similarity among family members can serve as an indication of genetic or shared environmental difference, while dissimilarity can suggest that neither heredity nor the common environment influence a given trait. Adoption studies provide some evidence as to whether genes or environment are important for explaining differences in a particular trait. This is because those that are related genetically are placed in different environments. If individuals are more similar to their biological relatives than their adoptive relatives, this suggests that there may be a stronger genetic basis for a given characteristic. Twin studies are unique, and particularly informative, because they can compare similarity among identical twins to similarity among fraternal twins. Identical twins share the same genetic material, while fraternal twins typically only share about half of their genes, the same as non-twin siblings from the same parents. Since twins that grow up together will share the same prenatal and home environments, genetic influences are assumed if identical twins are more similar than fraternal twins.

Family, twin, and adoption studies converge to show that personality and behavioral characteristics are heritable. In a well-known study by Mednick, Gabrielli, and Hutchings

(1984), 14,427 adoptees and their biological and adoptive families were examined to determine the genetic and environmental influences on criminal behavior. The results of this study indicated that for adoptees in which neither adoptive nor biological parents had been convicted of a crime 13.5% were convicted. Among the group of adoptees in which only the adoptive parents had been convicted, 14.7% had been convicted. Interestingly, among the adoptees that had only biological parents with convictions 20% were also convicted. Approximately 25% of those adoptees with both adoptive and biological parents with convictions were convicted. These results suggest that there are traits linked to criminality that are somewhat heritable, but when individuals with these traits are also reared in an environment in which they are exposed to criminal behavior they are even more likely to engage in criminal behavior.

Twin studies allow for the observed variation in a trait to be separated into additive genetic influences (i.e., those that add together across genes), non-additive genetic effects (i.e., those that involve interactions among gene variants), environmental influences that are shared by family members, and unique environmental influences that are not shared among family members. In a recent review of 51 twin and adoption studies, Rhee and Waldman (2002) concluded that there are substantial genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behavior. Specifically, they found that approximately 32% of the variation in antisocial behavior was due to additive genetic effects, 9% was due to nonadditive genetic effects, 16% was due to shared environmental influences, and 43% was due to unique, or non-shared, environmental influences. These findings also highlight the importance of both heredity and environment in explaining behavior, including criminal behavior. More recently, Moffitt (2005) reviewed more than 100 behavioral genetic studies and concluded that approximately 50% of the population variation in antisocial behavior was due to genetic influences. Taken together, these studies provide strong evidence that genes contribute considerably to differences in behavior.

Behavioral genetic studies are limited because they cannot be used to determine which specific genetic factors are responsible for behavioral differences. A number of genes can disrupt normal development, which may result in abnormal behavior. Molecular genetic studies are useful in identifying genes that may be related to antisocial and criminal behavior. As many of these traits and behaviors are diverse and comprised of numerous complex functions, it is unlikely that a single gene could be responsible for criminality. However, multiple genes may provide only slight contributions to a trait, including behavioral traits and disorders such as aggression, impulsivity, ADHD, and conduct disorder, commonly observed in criminals (Comings et al. 2000).

Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) is the chemical code that determines how humans form, develop, and function. It is passed from both parents to their offspring, and combines to form a unique genetic code for each person. Genes are sections of DNA that work together to code for the development and production of various proteins. Variants exist at the genetic level, and affect the production of proteins that are ultimately responsible for physical, psychological, and behavioral differences among human beings.

Two broad systems of genes have been of particular interest to criminologists: those from the dopaminergic system and those from the serotonergic system. Several genes code for the production and breakdown of dopamine, including DAT1, DRD2, and DRD4. As previously noted, varying levels of dopamine in the brain can result in a wide array of behavioral outcomes. Research has demonstrated that specific variants of these genes are related to serious and violent antisocial behavior (Comings et al. 2000). There are also a number of genes that code for the production, detection, and removal of serotonin in the brain, including 5-HTTLPR, 5-HIAA, 5HTR2A, 5HTR1B, and 5HTR2C. Previous research has indicated that low levels of serotonin are associated with increases in antisocial behavior (Raine 1993). While there is some indication that variants of these genes may contribute to criminality, the evidence available at this time is mixed.

It is also possible that the expression of genes may vary depending on the environment to which one is exposed. Recall that each individual has his or her own unique DNA, or genetic code. As a result, individuals are likely to respond to similar environments in very different ways. Those with a genetic predisposition

towards criminality are more likely to engage in such behaviors if they are exposed to criminogenic environments. In contrast, those that do not have similar genetic predispositions are unlikely to engage in criminal behaviors, even in the most criminogenic environments. It is this gene–environment interaction, or the intersection of these two factors, that is likely to produce differences in behavior. The most notable evidence of gene–environment interactions was produced by Caspi and colleagues (2002). Results from their study revealed that genetic variants of MAOA, an enzyme responsible for the breakdown of neurotransmitters, did not have a direct effect on behavior. However, boys that had experienced maltreatment as children and had the gene which coded for low MAOA production were more likely to have antisocial behavioral problems. These findings have been supported by subsequent research (Kim-Cohen et al. 2006).

Genotype–environment correlations (rGEs) may also represent the potential relationships between biological and environmental features in one's development, as they reflect the frequency with which certain genotypes and environments simultaneously occur (Plomin, DeFries, and Loehlin 1977). Passive rGEs occur when the biological parents provide their child with both the genetic material and the environmental conditions that are likely to produce a given trait. For example, aggressive parents may produce children that have a genetic predisposition towards aggression, and further, may expose these children to aggressive environments. Reactive or evocative rGEs are another type of correlation that describes the tendency for people to respond differently to different genotypes. Parents, peers, and other significant individuals in one's life may respond to various behaviors that are genetically influenced in a child. In this way, the child's genes indirectly influence their environment. Finally, active rGEs occur as a result of one seeking out environments that foster one's own genetically influenced traits. For example, adolescents with preferences for antisocial behaviors are likely to choose friends that are also antisocial. Recent research has provided evidence that a specific gene is, in fact, related to the formation of delinquent peer groups (Beaver et al. 2008). Moreover, this relationship was only observed in families that were classified as high-risk, which also provides evidence for a gene–environment interaction.

SEE ALSO: Biosocial Explanations of Crime; Genetic Theories of Criminal Behavior; Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime.

References

Beaver, K. M., Wright, J. P., & DeLisi, M. (2008) Delinquent peer group formation: evidence of a gene × environment correlation. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 169, 227–244.

Blair, J., Mitchell, D., & Blair, K. (2005) *The Psychopath: Emotion and the Brain*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Brizer, D. A. (1988) Psychopharmacology and the management of violent patients. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America* 11, 551–568.

Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J., Martin, J., Craig, I. W., Taylor, A., & Poulton, R. (2002) Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science* 297, 851–854.

Comings, D. E., Gade-Andavolu, R., Gonzalez, N., Wu, S., et al. (2000) Multivariate associations of 42 genes in ADHD, ODD and conduct disorder. *Clinical Genetics* 58, 31–40.

Ishikawa, S. S., & Raine, A. (2003) Prefrontal deficits and antisocial behavior: a causal model. In B. B. Lahey, T. E. Moffitt, & A. Caspi (eds.), *Causes of Conduct Disorder and Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Guilford, pp. 277–304.

Kim-Cohen, J., Caspi, A., Taylor, A., Williams, B., Newcombe, R., Craig, I. W., & Moffitt, T. E. (2006) MAOA, maltreatment, and gene–environment interaction predicting children's mental health: new evidence and a meta-analysis. *Molecular Psychiatry* 11, 903–913.

Krakowski, M. (2003) Violence and serotonin: influence of impulse control, affect regulation, and social functioning. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience* 15, 294–305.

Mednick, S., Gabrielli, W., & Hutchings, B. (1984) Genetic influences on criminal convictions: evidence from an adoption cohort. *Science* 224, 891–894.

Moffitt, T. E. (1990) The neuropsychology of juvenile delinquency: a critical review. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 99–169.

Moffitt, T. E. (2005) Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behaviors: evidence from behavioral–genetic research. *Advances in Genetics* 55, 41–104.

Molling, P. A., Lockner, A. W., Sauls, R. J., & Eisenberg, L. (1962) Committed delinquent boys. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 7, 70–76.

Morgan, A. B., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2000) A meta-analytic review of the relation between antisocial behavior and neuropsychological measures of executive function. *Clinical Psychological Review* 20, 113–136.

Plomin, R. (2004) *Nature and Nurture: An Introduction to Human Behavioral Genetics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., & Loehlin, J. C. (1977) Genotype–environment interaction and correlation in the analysis of human behavior. *Psychological Bulletin* 84, 309–322.

Raine, A. (1993) *The Psychopathology of Crime: Criminal Behavior as a Clinical Disorder*. San Diego, CA: Academic.

Raine, A., Buchsbaum, M., & LaCasse, L. (1997) Brain abnormalities in murderers indicated by positron emission tomography. *Biological Psychiatry* 36, 365–373.

Rhee, S. H., & Waldman, I. D. (2002) Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behavior: a meta-analysis of twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Bulletin* 128(3), 490–529.

Yudofsky, S. C., Silver, J. M., & Schneider, S. E. (1987) Pharmacological treatment of aggression. *Psychiatric Annals* 17, 397–407.

Further Readings

Beaver, K. M. (2009) *Biosocial Criminology: A Primer*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Fishbein, D. (2001) *Biobehavioral Perspectives in Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rafter, N. (2008) *The Criminal Brain: Understanding Biological Theories of Crime*. New York: New York University Press.

Rowe, D. C. (2002) *Biology and Crime*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Walsh, A., & Beaver, K. M. (eds.) (2008) *Biosocial Criminology: New Directions in Theory and Research*. New York: Routledge.

Wright, J. P., Tibbetts, S. G., & Daigle, L. E. (2008) *Criminals in the Making: Criminality Across the Life Course*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Human Ecology

STACY C. MOAK

The field of human ecology encompasses the study of humans as they interact with their environments. Human ecology is a broad term covering more than sociology. It is a combination of sciences from different fields that examine human existence as one among interrelated elements of the environment. In 1939, Quinn argued that human ecology covered seven perspectives: that human ecology is an inclusive synthesis of many fields of study; that it is identical to human geography; that it involves application of biological principles; that it is a product of the competitive process of humans; that it includes study of urban sociocultural areas; that it is a study of spatial distributions; and that it is related to studies of communities and regions. These seven principles precipitated much of the research in the field, even studies that occurred prior to Quinn's work.

For criminology, particular concern is focused on the study of crime within the environment. The primary development in this area was the foundation of the Chicago School of sociology in 1892. Researchers from this school conducted the first ecological research related to the urban city and the interaction of people within the urban environment. Students from the Chicago School became proponents of human ecology. They studied neighborhoods as small environmental clusters where organisms worked together and competed against one another for resources. Early on, Robert Park examined urban areas and the interaction of people within those environments (Park 1916). Ernest Burgess worked closely with Park to better understand the formation and growth of cities (Burgess 1923). One of Burgess's most important findings was that of a concentric ring pattern around Chicago within which most social ills occurred. That finding would later lead to the theory of social disorganization by Shaw and McKay (1942).

By the 1930s human ecology had become popular in many fields and in the study of human ecology itself what should be studied and by whom became a popular topic of discussion. Continuing the work of Park, one of his students, Roderick McKenzie (1924), became a strong proponent for the examination of human ecology. McKenzie's student, Amos Hawley (1944), continued to advocate for the importance of human ecology. He added the study of crime as a key element to his studies and his work had a significant influence on the development of social disorganization theory, a particular line of research in human ecology that would be studied most completely by Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay.

While human ecology was a broad term and field of study, one of the most prevalent criminological implications from the human ecology school of thought was the relationship of the human environment to crime. The Chicago School examined neighborhoods as small environmental clusters where organisms worked together and also competed with one another. In neighborhoods that were flourishing, strong relationships were created and neighborhoods were socially organized. When neighborhoods became socially disorganized, relationships broke down, resulting in a variety of social problems. The development of social disorganization theory in criminology was a product of the human ecology concept of social disorganization combined with the Chicago School's methodology of mapping social characteristics of cities and neighborhoods.

Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay used techniques of human ecology to study the association between socioeconomic characteristics of a neighborhood and crime and delinquency in urban cities. Shaw and McKay (1942) studied the physical characteristics of an area, arguing that population change, the proximity of the neighborhoods to industrial areas, and the number of vacant or condemned housing lots were associated with neighborhood disorganization. Further, they examined economic relationships, such as the number of homes owned and the median rental price. Areas that were heavily concentrated with low levels of home ownership and low rental prices were argued to be more disorganized. The final area of study was that

of population characteristics of neighborhoods. Shaw and McKay were particularly concerned about the number of foreign born and black heads of households, because research supported the argument that areas with high concentrations of minority groups were higher in delinquency.

From their studies, Shaw and McKay proposed that the population, as well as physical and economic characteristics of neighborhoods in Chicago, followed specific patterns of concentric rings around the city center. They identified that concentrations of delinquency followed similar patterns, with the greatest amount of delinquent activity occurring in the inner rings closest to the city center and decreasing as the rings moved outward. Early discoveries indicated that delinquency patterns remained stable regardless of which people occupied the place, and that crime remained relatively stable in a place over time (Shaw and McKay 1942). Their research was replicated in multiple cities with similar results.

Although much was learned from the study of social disorganization, the theory and its study continued to be plagued by methodological and other concerns. As a result, social disorganization theory lost popularity during the 1970s, but parts of it continued to live on in research that followed. Subsequent researchers took components from human ecology and components from social disorganization theory and applied them to neighborhoods in different ways.

During the 1970s, American cities declined and much of the research focused on declining cities, with little attention on human ecology. In the 1980 and 1990s, however, renewed interest in cities and urban environments brought this line of research into focus again. New research methods and stronger statistical analysis procedures refined the research and the theoretical base. The new focus on social ecology focused on how to control crime at the neighborhood level. Researchers began to explore the relationships of neighborhood characteristics and change (e.g., Bursik and Webb 1982; Wilson and Kelling 1982; Sampson 1985).

Two important research studies during this period of human ecology were Bursik and Webb (1982) and Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz (1986). These two studies used strong methodological and theoretical techniques to examine neighborhood characteristics and change. Bursik and

Webb reexamined the work of Shaw and McKay and updated the data to current years. They examined more closely the association between changes in the racial and ethnic composition of an area and its delinquency rates. They concluded from their findings that the nature of change in an area, not the people involved in the change, influenced delinquency.

Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz endeavored to update neighborhood research and theory by combining several theoretical perspectives and adding more advanced analysis to address community structure and crime. They examined internal community characteristics, both cultural and structural, as well as external reactive factors to explain delinquency. They found that community effects on delinquency were mediated by socialization experiences. They attributed a community's vulnerability to disorganization more to official reaction to delinquency than to internal community factors over which communities had more control. From their research, they argued that future studies examining social order and deviance should include social disorganization, subcultural, and labeling perspectives as theoretical components.

Another substantial element of this line of research was the work of Robert Sampson (1985). Instead of social disorganization, Sampson examined collective efficacy, or the extent to which a community was cohesive and working together for the common good.

As human ecology theory continues to evolve in the study of criminology, the study of environmental criminology has emerged as a prominent and growing area of focus. The basic premise of this line of inquiry is that crime is influenced by the physical environment of neighborhoods and cities. Researchers such as Jeffery (1971) and Newman (1972) argued that crime was often influenced by the physical design of the environment. Accordingly, they argued that crime could be reduced by making changes to the design and environment of cities. This line of inquiry is called crime prevention through environmental design.

Based on the work of Jeffery, the Brantinghams extended the concepts of environmental design to include more elements of the human environment (Brantingham and Brantingham 1991). They pointed out three distinct differences between the study of environmental criminology

and studies that had come before. They argued that environmental criminology should be separated from other sister or parent disciplines. They argued for a move away from studying the criminal offender, to studying the criminal event. Finally, they argued for changing the focus from a sociological basis to a geographic basis. Instead of examining individuals and their interactions with others, the geographic focus examines places and the patterns of events that occur in those places.

A central element of environmental criminology is routine activities first identified by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson (1979). The essential tenet of routine activities theory is that crime occurs when the everyday patterns of motivated offenders and suitable targets overlap in normal activities. The focus is on the reality that the daily lives of people sometimes put them in a position where they could commit a crime or be a victim of a crime. Routine activities theory is central to the premises of environmental criminology because it focuses on place, environment, and activities of people.

Stemming from both routine activities theory and crime pattern theory, other analyses of crime in relation to place have informed the study of environmental criminology. Researchers have examined journeys to crime and discovered that criminals travel fairly short distances to their crime sites, and there is a decreased likelihood of crime as distance from the criminal's residence increases. Research into the journey to crime and the patterns of criminal events led to a specific area of environmental criminology called geographic profiling. Some of the most prominent work in this area is the geographic profiling of serial offenders. Additionally, predator–prey models, foraging models, computational criminology models, and agent-based models have all developed from environmental criminology, and the discipline continues to grow.

The development of environmental criminology was actually a return to the basics of human ecology/social ecology. Such an emphasis represents a more complete model of studying criminal behavior, encompassing the law, the offender, the target, and the location. The focus of this area of research is that something about a place attracts crime, that crime persists in specific places no matter who lives there, and that offenders will travel to that place to commit crimes. These theories continue to develop and evolve in the study of human ecology.

SEE ALSO: Collective Efficacy; Environmental Criminology; Routine Activities and Crime; Social Disorganization Theory.

References

Brantingham, P. J., & Brantingham, P. L. (1991) *Environmental Criminology*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Burgess, E. W. (1923) The study of the delinquent as a person. *American Sociological Review* 28, 657–680.

Bursik, R. J., Jr., & Webb, J. (1982) Community change and patterns of delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology* 88, 24–42.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44, 588–608.

Hawley, A. H. (1944) Ecology and human ecology. *Social Forces* 22, 398–405.

Jeffery, C. R. (1971) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McKenzie, R. D. (1924) The ecological approach to the study of the human community. *American Journal of Sociology* 30, 287–301.

Newman, O. (1972) *Defensible Space*. New York: Macmillan.

Park, R. E. (1916) The city: Suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the urban environment. *American Journal of Sociology* 20, 577–612.

Quinn, J. A. (1939) The nature of human ecology: Reexamination and redefinition. *Social Forces* 18(2), 161–168.

Sampson, R. J. (1985) Neighborhoods and crime: The structural determinants of personal victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 22, 7–40.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas: A Study of Rates of Delinquency in Relation to Differential Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simcha-Fagan, O., & Schwartz, J. E. (1986) Neighborhood and delinquency: An assessment of contextual effects. *Criminology* 24, 667–703.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982) Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly* 249(3), 29–38.

Biosocial Explanations of Crime

DANIELLE BOISVERT

Twin studies have become quite popular over the years in the study of genetic and environmental effects on behaviors/traits, with new twin registries continuing to emerge and existing registries continuing to expand. Studying twin pairs residing in the same home is an ideal way to assess whether genes are influencing a behavior/trait given the genetic differences between monozygotic (MZ) and dizygotic (DZ) twins. First, monozygotic twins, also referred to as identical twins, come from a single fertilized egg. These twin pairs will have approximately 100% of their DNA in common and are virtually clones of one another. Next, dizygotic twins, or fraternal twins, come from two fertilized eggs. These twin pairs are similar to regular siblings in that they share approximately 50% of their DNA in common (Plomin 1990). Knowing this information and following behavioral genetic theory, the behavioral similarities between MZ twins raised together can be compared with those of DZ twins raised together to assess whether genetic factors are influencing the behavior of interest. Broadly speaking, if MZ twins are more similar to one another on a measure of antisocial/criminal behavior compared with DZ twins, then it is suggested that genetic factors are operating on that behavior. Conversely, if MZ twins and DZ twins are equally similar to one another on a measure of antisocial/criminal behavior, then it concluded that genes are not affecting that particular behavior (Plomin 1990).

One way to assess the degree of similarity between MZ and DZ twins for a continuously measured behavior is to compare the intraclass correlations of both MZ and DZ twin pairs. In turn, intraclass correlations can then be used to calculate heritability estimates (Neale and Cardon 1992). First, intraclass correlations represent the degree to which one can predict one twin's score on a particular behavior/trait by using the other twin's score. Intraclass correlations range between -1 and 1, with the value representing the strength of the relationship (i.e., values closer to absolute 1 signify a greater degree of predictability) while the sign (i.e., + or $-$) indicates the direction of the relationship. As mentioned, the intraclass correlations obtained for MZ and DZ twin pairs are compared with one another in order to provide initial information on the extent to which genetic factors are influencing antisocial/criminal behavior. If the intraclass correlation for MZ twins is up to approximately twice that of DZ twins, this indicates that there are additive genetic effects influencing antisocial/criminal behavior (Neale and Cardon 1992). Additive genetic effects refer to the sum of the average effects of all individual alleles that are influencing the behavior. Next, if the intraclass correlation among MZ twins is *more* than twice the size of the DZ intraclass correlation for a measure of antisocial/criminal behavior, this demonstrates that dominant genetic effects are influencing the behavior (Neale and Cardon 1992). Dominant genetic effects refer to interactions between alleles at the same loci in an individual. If, however, the intraclass correlation of MZ twins does not exceed that of DZ twins, this indicates that genetic effects are not influencing the measure of antisocial/criminal behavior (Neale and Cardon 1992).

Using the intraclass correlations obtained from MZ and DZ twin pairs, a heritability (h^2) estimate is then calculated. Heritability refers to the proportion of variation in a particular behavior/trait that can be accounted for by genetic differences between individuals in a population (Plomin 1990). Heritability estimates can range between 0 and 1, with a value of 0 representing no genetic influence on the behavior/trait while a value of 1 implies that genetics is entirely responsible for the variation in that behavior/trait. As an example, antisocial behavior typically has a heritability estimate of approximately 0.50; this means that 50% of the variance in antisocial behavior is explained by genetic differences among individuals. The remaining 50% can be attributed to environmental influences that differ across individuals as well

as measurement error (Plomin et al. 1997). The following equation can be used to calculate a heritability estimate: $h^2 = 2(MZr - DZr)$. In other words, taking twice the difference between the intraclass correlations (r) of MZ and DZ twins of a particular behavior/trait provides a crude estimate of heritability.

The field of behavioral genetics has since developed a more sophisticated biometrical approach to estimating heritability. Specifically, these analyses function to partition the variance in a behavior/trait into its additive (A), and sometimes dominant (D), genetic effects, as well as the environmental effects. The environmental effects are further subdivided into two components: shared (C) and non-shared (E) environmental factors (Neale and Cardon 1992). First, shared environmental factors (or common environmental factors) are those that have the same effect on children residing in a home. These can include socioeconomic status, neighborhood conditions, school conditions, number of individuals residing in the home. These shared environmental influences operate to make individuals residing in the same home more similar to one another. Next are the environmental factors that do not have the same effect on individuals living together. Referred to as non-shared environmental influences, or unique environmental influences, these consist of life experiences and events that are unique to each child within the home (e.g. individual peer networks, parental treatment, hobbies/activities) (Neale and Cardon 1992). Non-shared environmental influences tend to make siblings residing in the same home different from one another.

In order to assess the genetic and environmental influences on antisocial/criminal behavior, researchers can create either a univariate ACE or ADE model using the structural equation modeling program Mx (Neale and Cardon 1992). Whether an ACE or an ADE model is used depends on the pattern of intraclass correlations of MZ and DZ twin pairs (described above). If additive genetic effects are believed to be operating, researchers use an ACE model. Conversely, if dominant genetic effects are also believed to be operating, researchers use an ADE model. Both the univariate ACE and ADE models assume that the independent variables are latent unobservable variables (e.g., additive genetics, dominant

genetics or shared environment, and non-shared environment) that affect some observable characteristic (e.g., antisocial/criminal behavior).

Hundreds of twin studies have examined the genetic and environmental contributions to antisocial behaviors (Rhee and Waldman 2002; Moffitt 2005). Most of the early twin studies relied on crude methods of calculating heritability, such as using intraclass correlations. More recent twin studies, however, use the more quantitative model-fitting approach, such as ACE or ADE models. Together, these studies provide consistent evidence that genetic factors influence variation in externalizing behaviors (see Hicks et al. 2004), psychopathy (see DiLalla et al. 1996), aggression (see Dionne et al. 2003), conduct problems/disorder (Burt et al. 2001; Scourfield et al. 2004; Arseneault et al. 2005), violence (Rushton 1996; Slutske 2001), disruptive behaviors (Hughes et al. 2002), antisocial personality disorder (Grove et al. 1990; Goldstein, Prescott, and Kendler 2001), bullying (O'Connor et al. 1980), and criminal/delinquent behaviors (Taylor et al. 2000). In 2002, Rhee and Waldman conducted a meta-analysis of 51 twin and adoption studies to determine the average genetic and environmental effects on antisocial behaviors. Overall, they found that 32, 9, 16, and 43% of the variance in antisocial behaviors was attributed to additive genetic, dominant genetic, shared environmental, and non-shared environmental effects, respectively. In 2005, Moffitt further reviewed over a hundred twin and adoption studies on antisocial behaviors and concluded that genetic effects (i.e., additive and dominant) account for approximately 50% of the variance in antisocial behaviors, with the remaining variance being attributed to the environment and measurement error.

While the results derived from behavioral genetic analyses provide an overall estimate of the genetic and environmental effects on antisocial/criminal behavior, they do not provide any information on the specific environmental factors that are influencing behavior, such as parenting, neighborhood, and/or education. Nor do these estimates pinpoint the specific genes that are operating either additively or in conjunction with other genes and the environment to affect behavior. First, in terms of environmental influences on criminal behavior, behavioral genetic research points to the

importance of further identifying and examining non-shared environmental factors, that is, to study environmental factors that differ across siblings residing within the same home. This is a step forward in criminological research, as the tradition has often been to study one child and one parent/caregiver per family and then generalize the results to others residing in the home. However, research has shown that children often experience, interpret, and/or react to their environments differently (Plomin 1990). As such, even those experiences that are often thought of as influencing siblings in the same manner, such as having a warm yet restrictive parent, may in fact have different effects on different children within the home. Thus, it is necessary to examine variations in experiences between siblings to pinpoint better the environmental influences that are affecting their behavior.

Next, with regard to the specific genes that are influencing criminal behavior, it must be emphasized that researchers, including biosocial criminologists, are not searching for a "crime gene." Genes are segments of DNA that code for proteins. Researchers are interested in studying protein function and translation to understand behavior better. Since human behavior is such a dynamic process, it likely involves several hundred genes that are acting in an additive and interactive way to influence behavior. To date, several gene–behavior, gene × gene, and gene × environment studies have implicated the following genetic polymorphisms in a variety of maladaptive behaviors: 5-HTTLPR, DAT1, DRD2, DRD4, and MAOA (Reif et al. 2007; Boutwell and Beaver 2008; Guo, Roettger, and Cai 2008; Vaughn et al. 2009). For example, one of the first biosocial empirical studies to take a gene × environment approach to the study of antisocial behavior was conducted by Caspi and his colleagues in 2002. These authors sought to explain why some males who experience maltreatment/abuse go on to be antisocial themselves while others do not. Their analyses revealed that maltreated males who carried an MAOA low-activity allele were at an increased risk of displaying antisocial behaviors compared with maltreated males who did not carry a low-activity MAOA allele. This evidence of a gene × environment interaction, along with hundreds of other studies that incorporate genetic and biological factors, challenges the way in which traditional criminological studies have approached the study of antisocial/criminal behaviors. That is, it is crucial to move beyond simply looking at the environmental factors that influence behavior to incorporate the many ways in which our biology and genes influence our behaviors and our environments.

There are several assumptions to consider when conducting this type of research. First is the equal environment assumption (EEA), which states that environmental factors do not make MZ twins more behaviorally similar to one another compared with DZ twins. However, some researchers have criticized the use of twins as a way to examine the influence of genetics on behavior, by stating that it is the similarity in treatment rather than genetics that accounts for the increased behavioral similarities found in MZ twins relative to DZ twins (Ellis 1982). This increased similarity in behaviors for MZ twins would then artificially overestimate the genetic influences on behavior. It is important to note, however, that in order to violate the EEA two things must occur: (1) MZ twins must experience greater similarities in their environments compared with DZ twins *and* (2) these similar experiences must have an impact on the behavior of interest (Neale and Cardon 1992). With regard to the first assumption, research has shown that MZ twin environments are often more similar (i.e., dressed the same, same peers, same sport teams) compared with DZ twins. However, not all similar experiences will affect the behavior of interest (i.e., the second assumption would not be violated). For example, there is no empirical evidence to suggest that dressing the same as a child would lead to similarities in antisocial behaviors as a teenager. As a result, only one of the two required assumptions would be violated, and the EEA would be supported.

Second, the univariate ACE/ADE model assumes that there is no assortative mating and that there are no gene–environment interactions influencing antisocial/criminal behavior. Assortative mating refers to the nonrandom way in which individuals choose sexual partners. In other words, men and women tend to select mates that are similar to themselves in some way (e.g., physically, personality, cognitively). The effects of nonrandom mating lead to increased similarities

between DZ twins relative to MZ twins, which would underestimate the genetic effects and overestimate the shared environmental effects (Neale and Cardon 1992). It is important to note, however, that Maes and her colleagues (1998) report that the overall levels of assortative mating are quite low and that the biases associated with them are generally quite small. Next, gene–environment interactions refer to the ways in which an individual's genes interact with his/her environment to influence behavior. As mentioned, research has shown that an individual who is genetically predisposed to antisocial/criminal behavior is at an increased risk of exhibiting these types of behavior when coupled with a particularly criminogenic environment.

There are a number of potential avenues for the continued study of delinquent/criminal behaviors from a biosocial approach. For example, the exploration of sex and age differences in the genetic and environmental effects on delinquent/criminal behaviors along with the examination of the co-occurrence of delinquent/criminal behaviors with other antisocial behaviors (e.g., externalizing behaviors, aggression, conduct problems) are providing further insight into the etiology of criminal behaviors. Furthermore, the area of biosocial criminology, which is a true multidisciplinary approach to the study of criminal behavior, is advancing our discipline in new and exciting ways. If we ignore this half of the equation (i.e., genetic and biological factors) when studying criminal behavior, our research will remain at a standstill. On the other hand, if we follow a biosocial approach and incorporate knowledge and research from various scientific disciplines, such as biology, psychology, sociology, neurology, genetics, and evolutionary psychology, we will be better equipped to answer the questions that we have been asking for decades, that is, what causes delinquent and criminal behavior and how we can intervene to prevent people from entering and/or returning to the criminal justice system. Only by examining these issues from a biosocial approach can we fully address these questions and appreciate the complexities of behavior.

SEE ALSO: Biological Theories of Crime; Genetic Theories of Criminal Behavior; Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime.

References

Arsenault, L., Kim-Cohen, J., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2005) Psychometric evaluation of 5- and 7-year-old children's self-reports of conduct problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 33, 537–550.

Boutwell, B., & Beaver, K. (2008) A biosocial explanation of delinquency abstention. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health* 18, 59–74.

Burt, A., Krueger, R. F., McGue, M., & Iacono, W. G. (2001) Sources of covariation among attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, and conduct disorder: The importance of shared environment. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 110, 516–525.

Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., et al. (2002) Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science* 297, 851–854.

DiLalla, D. L., Carey, G., Gottesman, I., & Bouchard, T. J. (1996) Heritability of MMPI personality indicators of psychopathology in twins reared apart. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 105, 491–499.

Dionne, G., Tramblay, R., Boivin, M., Laplante, D., & Perusse, D. (2003) Physical aggression and expressive vocabulary in 19-month-old twins. *Developmental Psychology* 39, 261–273.

Ellis, L. (1982) Genetics and criminal behavior. *Criminology* 20, 43–66.

Goldstein, R. B., Prescott, C. A., & Kendler, K. S. (2001) Genetic and environmental factors in conduct problems and adult antisocial behavior among adult female twins. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 189, 201–209.

Grove, W. M., Eckert, E. D., Heston, L., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N., & Lykken, D. T. (1990) Heritability of substance abuse and antisocial behavior: A study of monozygotic twins reared apart. *Biological Psychiatry* 27, 1293–1304.

Guo, G., Roettger, M., & Cai, T. (2008) The integration of genetic propensities into social control models of delinquency and violence among male youths. *American Sociological Review* 73, 543–568.

Hicks, B. M., Krueger, R. F., Iacono, W. G., McGue, M., & Patrick, C. J. (2004) Family transmission and heritability of externalizing disorders: A twin-family study. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 61, 922–928.

Hughes, C., Oksanen, H., Taylor, A., Jackson, J., Murray, L., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2002) "I'm gonna beat you, SNAP!": An observational paradigm for assessing young children's disruptive behaviour in competitive play. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 43, 507–516.

Maes, H., Neale, M. C., Kendler, K., et al. (1998) Assortative mating for major psychiatric diagnosis in two population-based samples. *Psychological Medicine* 28, 389–1401.

Moffitt, T. E. (2005) Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behaviors: Evidence from behavioral–genetic research. *Advances in Genetics* 55, 41–104.

Neale, M. C., & Cardon, L. R. (1992) *Methodology for Genetic Studies of Twins and Families*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

O'Connor, M., Foch, T., Sherry, T., & Plomin, R. (1980) A twin study of specific behavioral problems of socialization as viewed by parents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 8, 189–199.

Plomin, R. (1990) *Nature and Nurture: An Introduction to Human Behavioral Genetics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., McClearn, G. E., & Rutter, M. (1997) *Behavioral Genetics*. New York: Freeman.

Reif, A., Rösler, M., Freitag, C., et al. (2007) Nature and nurture predispose to violent behavior: Serotonergic genes and adverse childhood environment. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 32, 2375–2383.

Rhee, H. S., & Waldman, I. D. (2002) Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis of twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Bulletin* 128, 490–529.

Rushton, P. J. (1996) Self-report delinquency and violence in adult twins. *Psychiatric Genetics* 6, 87–90.

Slutske, W. S. (2001) The genetics of antisocial behavior. *Current Psychiatry Reports* 3, 158–162.

Scourfield, J., Van den Bree, M. B., Martin, N., & McGuffin, P. (2004) Conduct problems in children and adolescents: A twin study. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 61, 489–496.

Taylor, J., McGue, M., Iacono, W. G., & Lykken, D. T. (2000) A behavioral genetic analysis of the relationship between the socialization scale and self-reported delinquency. *Journal of Personality* 68, 29–50.

Vaughn, M. G., DeLisi, M., Beaver, K. M., & Wright, J. P. (2009) DAT1 and 5HTT are associated with pathological criminal behavior in a nationally representative sample of youth. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 36, 1113–1124.

Self-Control Theory

MATTHEW VALASIK

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argued that the concept of self-control is able to account for the differences in people to partake in a variety of behaviors harmful to themselves or others. While criminologists focus on the aspect of criminality explained by self-control theory, there are analogous noncriminal behaviors that the theory also explains. These similar behaviors include acts which are deviant, sinful, and reckless. Self-control is defined as the propensity to refrain from acts whose long-term costs outweigh their immediate advantages. Individuals who lack self-control will pursue acts that immediately gratify their impulses such as substance abuse, smoking, gambling, speeding in automobiles, and imprudent sexual conduct. These individuals will also be unsuccessful in social settings that require delayed gratification, planning, and sustained effort such as marriage, employment, or school. An individual with high self-control is less likely to engage in crime, risk taking, or delinquency throughout all periods of life and be more successful in these social dimensions. Therefore, the principal tenet of this theory is that individual's who are unable to delay gratification and pursue short-term goals without thinking of long-term consequences lack self-control.

The emergence of self-control theory occurred during a revitalization period for individual-level theories of crime in the 1980s. Unsatisfied with the explanations provided by the discipline of criminology on the nature of crime and criminality, Gottfredson and Hirschi composed their theory. The hallmark of the theory is its consistency with the three facts about crime: age, sex, and race. These elements of crime remain static across both time and space. The first "brute fact of crime" is that the age distribution of criminal individuals is invariant (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1983). That is, there is sudden onset of criminality in the teen years, peaking by the early twenties. Yet, as soon as this criminal group emerges it begins to decline almost as rapidly as its commencement. Independent of the criminality of the individual, desistance of crime continues with maturation. The next stable fact about crime is that males engage in more criminal acts than females (Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis 1981). The final fact about crime is that no subculture, regardless of their ethnic or racial background, condones the use of fraud or force when interacting with other individuals (Korhauser 1978). All groups of people support values of fairness, selflessness, and foresight. Even if an individual engages in unlawful behavior, they condemn the performance of criminal acts. In general, this subcultural theory of crime attests that the commission of a criminal act requires the transmission of norms or others to mimic and learn from. However, there is no perquisite for crime, just momentary fulfillment of immediate impulses.

The development of self-control theory was also influenced by theories of opportunity or routine activities, which stress the situational components of crime (Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garofalo 1978; Felson and Boba 2009). Opportunity theories generally examine conventional characteristics of crime and delinquency such as the places, times, and situations in which an act occurs. Scholars studying these theories attempt to gain an understanding of crime and delinquency by examining the interactions of individuals with these characteristics. According to these theories, crime is seen purely as an opportunistic act that lacks planning, and does not provide much gain for the offender besides providing an immediate thrill.

Gottfredson and Hirschi stress that the introduction of positivism into criminological theory generated an idea that criminals were inherently different from noncriminals and that these differences could be measured. Yet, positivism suggests that specific acts have distinct causes outside the control of the criminal. Self-control theory attempts to address this shortcoming by connecting back to theories of classical criminology, asserting that nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters: pain and pleasure (Bentham 2010 [1789]). That is,

individuals who commit criminal acts do not have any distinct predispositions and are understood as selfish actors pursuing gratification while avoiding discomfort. Therefore, individuals with low self-control do not participate in specific types of crime or analogous behaviors but instead engage in a versatility of offending. The extant literature confirms the versatile nature of criminality among offenders, thereby rebuffing the belief that specification of criminal acts exists (Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin 1972). An offender with low self-control does not have a strong inclination to engage in any particular crime but instead will participate in crimes of opportunity at a high rate satisfying their current needs.

In order to properly test a theory Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) attest that the dependent variable, crime, must first be clearly defined. Self-control theorists generally define crime as an "act of force or fraud undertaken in pursuit of self-interest" (1990: 15). Thus, most crimes are simple, trivial acts that satisfy momentary impulses not requiring planning, the influence of peers, a specific skill set, or distinct traits. The breadth of this definition not only includes criminal acts but also correlated behaviors: riskiness, sinfulness, and deviance. Empirical research has shown that individuals who engage in these types of behavior tend to cluster together (Unnever, Cullen, and Agnew 2006). This definition of crime used by self-control scholars bridges with classical criminological theory addressing all four of Bentham's sanctions: physical, religious, moral, and political.

Traditionally, criminologists tend to inquire about why people partake in criminal acts. Self-control scholars, however, turn the question on its head, instead asking why people do not engage in crime. If the seduction to engage in criminal acts is ubiquitous for everyone, providing immediate gratification for an individual's desires, why is crime not more common? Rationally, this is suggestive that there must be something restraining individuals from participating in crime or analogous behaviors. Since *A General Theory of Crime* (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) argues that criminality develops early in childhood and then remains stable across the life course, this temperance must be established early in children's lives and be influential enough for utilization throughout different social circumstances in life.

Essentially, low self-control is the result of ineffective childrearing. In order for self-control to be conveyed to a youth, a parent must be present to monitor the child's behavior, with the parent being able to recognize deviant conduct when it occurs and punishing such antisocial behavior. Rewarding good behavior is not sufficient; sanctioning is required. Thus, the system is activated by the investment in or affection to the child by the parent. Gottfredson and Hirschi state that all parents desire for their children to be socialized, yet the process can go awry. Parents who insufficiently discipline, supervise, or provide affection to their children fail to establish an ability to delay instant gratification.

A General Theory of Crime proposes that the transmission of low self-control can be passed intergenerationally from parent to child because adults lacking self-control will more than likely be unsuccessful at properly socializing their child. The theory also suggests that the parenting also affects gender differently. While both males and females are socialized similarly by parents, their levels of supervision tend to differ. Females are monitored much more closely by parents than males. As such, females are likely to have greater levels of self-control and are thus less likely to engage in delinquency. Several other factors suggested by self-control theory that directly impact the likelihood of delinquency are increased family size, parental presence, and maternal employment. Recent research has also proposed that a child's level of self-control may be contributed less from parenting techniques and more from heredity (Unnever, Cullen, and Pratt 2003; Wright and Beaver 2005).

When parents are unsuccessful at socializing their child, the school has the capacity to step in and aid in socializing the child. In general, schools effectively monitor the behavior of children, can easily recognize inappropriate conduct, and have the ability to punish. However, a child unsuccessfully socialized by parents will probably dislike school due to the nature of restraints within the institution, which typically delay gratification. Therefore, proper socialization remains difficult and the child may still have a greater likelihood of partaking in delinquent acts. Regardless, of whether the child is socialized through parenting or by the school it must be accomplished before age eight. That is, after that age, the level of

self-control ingrained within a child will remain stable throughout the life course, as witnessed by the invariance of the age effect (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1983).

Accordingly, *A General Theory of Crime* is able to account for all three of the facts about crime. First, the static nature of self-control is able to account for the age effect of crime, since the tendency to engage in criminal acts is stable over the life course. Second, males have lower levels of self-control because they tend to have diminished levels of supervision. Third, any race or ethnicity differences observed in crime rates are produced from poor childrearing practices.

In order to suitably evaluate the concept of self-control, age-sensitive measures need to be utilized since the exhibition of self-control will vary for infants, juveniles, and adults. Behavioral measures are preferred to attitudinal since survey responses will likely be affected by the respondent's level of self-control (Gottfredson 2006). Examples of reliable, non-intrusive behavioral measures assessing 'a general theory of crime' are car accident descriptions. These reports are able to distinguish the riskiness of driving patterns for the individual involved (Junger et al. 2001). Yet, even if behavioral measures are unavailable for a research project, attitudinal measures remain a possibility for self-control scholars. While there are scholars critical of attitudinal measures (Marcus 2003), a meta-analysis conducted by Pratt and Cullen (2000) demonstrates that the estimates of effect size for either attitudinal or behavioral measures are analogous.

Critics argue that the straightforwardness of *A General Theory of Crime* overstates itself in places. While empirical support of self-control theory is able to explain the variation witnessed in criminality, this does not disregard the significance of rival theories. For instance, a recent study by Unnever et al. (2006) found that both low self-control and aggressive attitudes (a social learning theory variable) both independently and interactively significantly predict delinquency. Another major criticism is that self-control theory is an untestable tautology, treating low self-control and the propensity to commit crime as the same thing (Akers 1991). In order to avoid this tautological concern, operational measures of self-control need to be developed that differ from criminal behavior measures. Another issue raised by critics

is that genetic affinity can impact both an individual's ability to socialize and influence criminality. Essentially, self-control theory rebuts this critique by taking the position that the ubiquitous nature of crime does not target a specific individual but instead the advantages from a crime are apparent such that no distinct learning or motivation is required (Hirschi and Gottfredson 2000).

Besides these three general critiques, *A General Theory of Crime* is involved in two ongoing debates in criminology. The first dispute is over the influence of peers on crime and delinquency. Self-control theory would suggest that the correlation between an individual's criminality and the criminality of friends is the result of a selection effect. Thus, "birds of feather flock together, but the feathering comes before the flocking" (Gottfredson 2009). That is, individuals associate with others who are similar to themselves. Joining a group does not cause an individual to become delinquent, instead the group is just a concentration of already delinquent youth. Other criminological perspectives, such as social learning theory, would attest that criminogenic peers maintain alternative norms and values that encourage crime and delinquency. Thus, once an individual joins the group the level of criminality amplifies.

The second major dispute revolves around the assertion that the level of self-control established early in childhood remains stable across the life course. Longitudinal research supporting an age-graded theory of informal social control has proclaimed that throughout the life course there is both continuity and change in offending patterns (Sampson and Laub 1993; Laub and Sampson 2003). Individuals who have meaningful life experiences known as "turning points," such as marriage or employment, augment self-control levels in adulthood leading offenders to conform with society and desist from crime and analogous behaviors. Thus, crime trajectories are not caused by only one variable but instead are at the convergence of both social and individual circumstances. For the anticipated future, this perspective of diverging criminal trajectories by Sampson and Laub seems to be interlocked in opposition to the continuity of offending proposed by *A General Theory of Crime*.

In response to the critiques that the theory was incompatible with social bond theory established in *Causes of Delinquency,* Hirschi (1969)

modified his perception of self-control theory to include the former better. Self-control was redefined as "the tendency to consider the full range of potential costs of a particular act" (Hirschi 2004: 542). Individuals who are able to abstain from crime and analogous behavior do so because they can envision the long-term consequences of these acts. That is, they will lose strong attachments, commitments, involvements, and beliefs to family, friends, and community that have value. It is these social bonds that inhibit an individual with high self-control from engaging in crime or delinquency. Therefore, individuals that have low self-control have weak bonds, which are unable to discourage criminality. While Hirschi was able to provide some consensus between his two control theories, there are still shortcomings that need to be addressed in future research. First, explaining where social bonds are developed, and second, to test the relative stability of social bonds across the life course.

The policy implications proposed by self-control theory dramatically differ from the status quo generally observed in the United States. Because the forerunner of crime (low self-control) is established at an early age, children and parenting must be targeted. A growing body of literature, with rigorous research designs, has shown that prevention programs focusing resources on childcare produce significant preventative effects that are sustainable in reducing an individual's likelihood of engaging in delinquency and crime (Elliot 1997). The most recognized of these preventive programs is Old's "Prenatal/Early Infant Project," which targets financially troubled, first-time mothers. Registered nurses provide care from before birth to the child's second birthday, while promoting general health and well-being along with parental training (Greenwood 2008). The impact of improving childcare significantly reduces child abuse and neglect, produces fewer arrests for both child and mother, lowers child health problems, and decreases signs of misconduct. Thus, these studies suggest that children benefit from having intensified care and human capital during their formative years enabling proper socialization that is not bereft of self-control.

Other policy implications undermine how crime control is exercised in America. Self-control theory would suggest that the attention and incarceration of teenagers and adults by law enforcement are ineffective (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1995). The reason that the criminal justice system has been unsuccessful at controlling crime is because the individuals being targeted are already unable to modify their level of self-control. Therefore, the criminal justice system will only witness minor effects on the likelihood of reducing the magnitude individual-level criminal acts along with the overall crime rate regardless of the strategies employed. According to self-control theory, for the criminal justice system to effectively reduce the crime rate males would need to be incarcerated from ages 13 to 22. Once released, the likelihood of participating in a criminal act is greatly reduced, and on a downward trend for the rest of the life course. This policy seems highly unlikely to ever be realized.

Future investigations of self-control theory that may provide new avenues of research could examine discrete aspects of self-control. For instance, Tittle, Ward, and Grasmick (2004) suggest that the concept of self-control theory is incomplete. It is proposed that self-control is composed of two components: the capacity or ability for self-control and the desire for self-control. Incorporated within the desire for self-control component is the individual's motivation to engage in a criminal act or to refrain from its commission. Recent studies suggest that the capacity and desire for self-control have both independent and interactive effects on different types of misbehavior (Tittle et al. 2004). Regardless of how self-control is examined, the theory's continued influence in the criminological literature for the foreseeable future seems likely due to the quantity of research the theory has stimulated and its incorporation into other theoretical perspectives.

SEE ALSO: Classical Criminology; Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime; Positive Criminology; Routine Activities and Crime; Social Bonding Theory.

References

Akers, R. (1991) Self control as a general theory of crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 7(2), 201–211.

Bentham, J. (2010 [1789]) *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. New York: Clarendon Press.

Elliot, D. (1997) *Blueprints for Violence Prevention*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado.

Felson, M., & Boba, R. (2009) *Crime and Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gottfredson, M. (2006) The empirical status of control theory in criminology. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, and K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 77–100.

Gottfredson, M. (2009) Juvenile delinquency. Lecture notes in C232 Juvenile delinquency at the University of California, Irvine on 4 February 2009.

Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1995) Control theory and the life-course perspective. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention* 4(2), 131–142.

Greenwood, P. (2008) Prevention and intervention programs for juvenile offenders. *The Future of Children* 18(2), 185–210.

Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978) *Victims of Personal Crime*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hindelang, M., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. (1981) *Measuring Delinquency*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T. (2004) Self-control and crime. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 537–552.

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983) Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology* 89, 552–584.

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (2000) In defense of self-control. *Theoretical Criminology* 4(1), 55–69.

Junger, M., West, R., & Timman, R. (2001) Crime and risky behavior in traffic: An example of cross-situational consistency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(4), 439–459.

Korhauser, R. (1978) *Social Sources of Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laub, J., & Sampson, R. (2003) *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marcus, B. (2003) An empirical assessment of the construct validity of two alternative self-control measures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 63(4), 674–706.

Pratt, T., & Cullen, F. (2000) The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. *Criminology* 38(3), 931–964.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tittle, C. R., Ward, D. A., & Grasmick, H. G. (2004) Capacity for self-control and individuals' interest in exercising self-control. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 20(2), 143–172.

Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2006) Why is "bad" parenting criminogenic? Implications from rival theories. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 4(1), 1–31.

Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Pratt, T. C. (2003) Parental management, ADHD, and delinquency involvement: Reassessing Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory. *Justice Quarterly* 20(3), 471–500.

Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Sellin, T. (1972) *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wright, J. P., & Beaver, K. M. (2005) Do parents matter in creating self-control in their children? A genetically informed test of Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of low self-control. *Criminology* 43(3), 1169–1202.

Rational Choice Theory

JANICE AHMAD AND TRAQINA Q. EMEKA

It is generally understood that crime is a natural occurrence in society. To prevent tyranny from occurring and to hold people accountable for their actions, laws are created to protect all individuals. However, for that protection, individuals give up certain rights. Laws are generally created by the government, which is made of individuals elected by the members of society to best serve their interests. Therefore, the social contract between members of society and government allows the government to create sanctions for those who violate the laws of our society. Sanctions are prescribed on the assumption that offenders are accountable and responsible for their wrongdoing and serve as a way to deter or prevent illegal behavior from occurring in the future. Rational choice theory purports that offenders commit crime when the sanctions or risk of punishment or pain is greater than the rewards that will be gained.

Classical School scholars Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham proposed that individuals consider the consequences before they act. Rational choice theory can be used to explain the processes underlying changes in criminal behavior. It is believed that when one considers committing a crime, the individual actually weighs the pains associated with breaking the law and the pleasures that may be gained from breaking the law. Therefore, it can be argued that criminal offending, from the rational choice perspective, is grounded in selfishness and personal gain. Considering this theory, individuals are completely culpable and responsible for their actions. In this way, crime can be prevented by increasing the pains associated with committing crime.

Neoclassical theory was created as a modification to classical theory to explain that certain factors might inhibit the exercise of free will. Neoclassical theory introduced premeditation to measure the varying degrees of intent. Neoclassical theory allows for rehabilitative punishment and mitigating circumstances. Neoclassical theorists assume that different circumstances can hinder a person's ability to make rational choices. However, this response to the Classical School generally explains contemporary rational choice theory. Contemporary rational choice theory takes into account the mitigating circumstances of age and mental capacity. It is generally understood that juveniles and those suffering from mental illness should not be held responsible and culpable for their actions.

The Positive School holds a completely different view of criminality. The Positive position suggests individuals are not responsible for their behavior. This school of thought helped to create the medical model and the need for treatment to prevent criminal behavior. The medical model holds that criminals are sick and can be cured if diagnosed and treated properly. In other words, offenders should not be punished because the Positive School suggests behavior should be treated as opposed to punished.

In and after 1975, rehabilitation efforts were challenged and criticized as an excuse for offending and it was argued that those who committed crimes did so as a rational choice (Lanier and Henry 1998). Proponents of the rational choice perspective hold that punishment is the best approach to prevent criminal offending. Rational choice theories suppose individuals choose to engage in criminal activities and that these individuals are rational and have the ability to weigh the benefits of crime against the costs associated with crime. This assumes that offenders have the information they need to make rational, well-informed decisions. However, frequently offenders may not have all the information or may have inaccurate information and thus have limited rationality (Williams and McShane 2004). Given it is very difficult to explain why individuals commit crime, it is very important to understand the situational factors that create the opportunity to offend.

Rational choice theory is important to conservative ideology in that it illustrates the idea that people weigh the risks against the rewards before committing crime. Therefore, punishment is *just*

deserts for those who choose to commit crime. Proponents of rational choice theory support a "get tough on crime" approach and generally support longer prison terms and more severe punishments to prevent crime. Many also support preventive detention, incapacitation, and mandatory sentencing. These sanctions give credence to the idea that criminals, as a result of their actions, should suffer the consequences of their actions. Deterrence is generally used as a means to discourage criminal behavior. In the field of criminal justice, deterrence is generally viewed in two ways: general deterrence and specific deterrence. General deterrence applies to all individuals in society. In general deterrence, the criminal justice system makes an example of one person's punishment to deter other people from committing crime. If members of society view incapacitation as a consequence of breaking the law, most will be deterred from breaking the law. For many, the existence of laws serves as a deterrent because most individuals abide by the rules of society. Specific deterrence serves to discourage an individual from breaking the law. If an individual is sanctioned for committing a criminal offense, the sanction is used as a means to prevent subsequent criminality by that particular person. In other words, the pain of the sanction should prevent future offending by the person upon whom the punishment was imposed.

Clarke and Cornish (1985) are credited with one of the most recent reiterations of the rational choice theory. The first of their theory's basic tenets is that offenders commit crime in an effort to benefit themselves and do so after making decisions based on the information available at the time including their competence; therefore, offenders are viewed as rational. The decision-making process can be over a period of time or it can occur in a matter of seconds. For example, the decision to commit a theft by an offender who is walking down the street and sees a garage door open with no one nearby and a set of expensive golf clubs leaning against the wall can be made within seconds. Whereas another offender may plan a theft from a jewelry store for months and incorporate elaborate and skilled strategies. Another assumption is that this theory is crime specific. In other words the decisions to be made and the skills required for one type of crime are different from other crimes. For example, a bank robbery requires different information and skills than a strong-armed robbery in the parking lot of a tavern. Therefore, as Cornish and Clarke (1986) explain, the theory focuses on the crime as well as the offender. If crime is a focus, then something can be done to prevent the crime from occurring. Third, this theory attempts to explain the criminal event, not the process for becoming involved in becoming an offender, as each of these require different thought processing.

Cornish and Clarke (1986) contend that the purpose of this theory is for the development of policy and rightly so. Much of criminal justice policy for at least a decade after the development of this theory was based on the first assumption – that offenders are rational beings and make decisions to commit crime. The latter two assumptions are used less often for policy; however, they are the foundation of situational crime prevention.

Rational choice perspective is the core of both routine activities theory and lifestyle theory. Both theories hold the basic assumption that individuals choose to commit crime. A response, again, would be to prevent crime by decreasing the opportunity and the access to offend (Cornish and Clarke 1986). Routine activity theory is considered a rational choice theory because it views the offender as motivated to commit crimes if the situation permits. In line with the Classical School, the theory assumes that individuals are free-willed and thus weigh the pleasures against the pains before committing criminal acts. The Classical School stressed the criminal as free-willed and in need of control. The routine activities approach has been generally accepted as an explanation for crime and criminal behavior because it supported the ideological view of its time: deterrence and punishment.

Routine activities theory supposes that crime occurs when there is a convergence of a motivated offender, the absence of a capable guardian, and a suitable target (Cohen and Felson 1979). The routine activities theory recognizes victimization and seeks to address crime prevention by addressing those areas conducive to criminal activity. Thus, target hardening has been an approach to decrease criminal offending (Lanier and Henry 1998). For example, if a motivated offender is seeking to enter and steal from a dwelling, that individual

may choose to not engage in crime if there is a visible security company sign or if there is a guard dog in the back yard. In essence, the risk may be perceived as greater than the benefit. Further, the target is deemed less attractive and thus, there may be a decrease in the motivation to offend. This is an example of target hardening and this approach has been used successfully to prevent crime.

Lifestyle theory is another example using the rational choice perspective. Lifestyle theory approaches crime from the perspective of explaining why certain individuals and groups are at a greater risk of victimization (Williams and McShane 2004). Hence, an individual's daily activities, occupation, recreation, and relationships can lead to different victimization. This theory examines individuals and their role in society as a way to classify risk. Lifestyle theory supposes that the higher one's position in society, the less likely the risk of victimization. If a certain location is known to have constant delinquent activity, the presence of police officers may be increased in that area. Hot spots are areas known to have high levels of criminal offending. Increasing the visibility of police presence in these areas will likely decrease the opportunity for criminal offending. If hot spots remain unmonitored, individuals may commit crime after rationally concluding there is a minimal chance of arrest. However, increased police presence in these hot spot areas may cause offenders to move to an area that has less police presence, a phenomenon known as crime displacement.

The application of rational choice theory would likely include measures to reduce the attractiveness of crime. In other words, if crime is considered as not beneficial, an individual may avoid criminal activities. The United States is a country driven by capitalist principles and ideals. The fast paced, ever changing economy may cause many to seek wealth through illegitimate means. According to rational choice theory, the decision to commit crime is made by a rational person who calculates the risks involved to attain resources. Rational persons may resort to crime if they hold the belief that crime is a viable way to be successful. Rational theory may explain deviance among those looking for a painless way to attain wealth. It can be said that many individuals will succumb to criminal offending if given an opportunity.

Rational choice theory holds the offender accountable for their actions given the assumption that individuals choose to engage in criminal behavior. This approach represents a movement towards a *just deserts* model. This model is a contemporary revival of the Classical School of thought. An implication of rational choice theory includes limited discretion in the court system. The focus is more on the offense than the individual motivations of an offender. In this way, punishment is a desired goal: equal punishment for equal crime. Individual choice would include greater accountability and, in many cases, sanctions that would likely deter future criminality.

Rational choice theory takes the victim into account; given the focus on victimization, punishment would likely be based on harm. Crime prevention strategies give victims some responsibility to decrease the availability and opportunity for offenders to commit crime (Williams and McShane 2004). Given the earlier argument that access to wealth increases the likelihood of criminal offending, a macro-level approach to prevent crime would be the creation of legitimate opportunities for would-be offenders. Specifically, increasing the gains from lawful employment is a viable strategy to decrease the attractiveness of illegitimate activities.

Rational choice theory has been tested and results are mixed in the support for this theory. Several studies have examined the types of crime that repeat offenders commit and some support was found in that offenders have needs that they seek to fulfill and will commit offenses that meet those needs (Cornish and Clarke 1989; Guerette, Stenius, and McGloin 2005). These researchers found that if the purpose of the original offense was monetary gain, then successive offenses were more likely to be committed to fulfill that same need. In a study of college students and deterrence, Bouffard (2007) found that students who had previously shoplifted without detection were more likely to report that the legal costs of future acts were irrelevant. However, those previously involved in fights and who were not arrested reported that they would be less likely to repeat the behavior for fear of being arrested. Bouffard concluded that differences exist between individuals and between types of offenders and these differences should be considered during punishment

if its purpose is deterrence. Earlier studies of deterrence and rational choice theory revealed that not all decisions made by the offenders were based only on rewards versus pain; Tunnell (1990) found that repeat property offenders were not deterred knowing that they faced additional punishment. Rather these offenders repeated their offense in an effort to earn income and in the belief that they would not be caught. Therefore, their decision they were based on gain and did not include the pain of punishment, and as such they were not making completely rational decisions. Earlier research by Paternoster and colleagues (1983) found that the more experience offenders had in the criminal justice system the lower their perceived risk of punishment. Perhaps then, increased sanctions for some offenders are not a deterrent.

Rational choice theory recognizes and gives credibility to the position that individuals choose to commit crime after a rational thought process however long that process may be. This approach gives significant support to "get tough" policies within the criminal justice system. Further, rational choice theory recognizes the influences of the environment and opportunity for criminal offending.

SEE ALSO: Classical Criminology; Capital Punishment and Deterrence; Routine Activities and Crime.

References

Bouffard, J. A. (2007) Predicting differences in the perceived relevance of crime's costs and benefits in a test of the Rational Choice Theory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 51(4), 461–485.

Clarke, R. V., & Cornish, D. B. (1985) Modeling offenders' decisions: A framework for policy and research. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, vol. 6. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 147–185.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44(4), 588–608.

Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1986) Introduction. In D. B. Cornish & R. V. Clarke (eds.), *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending.* New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 1–16.

Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1989) Crime specialisation, crime displacement and rational choice theory. In H. Wegner, F. Losel, & J. Maisch (eds.), *Criminal Behavior and the Justice System.* Berlin: Springer-Verlag, pp. 103–117.

Guerette, R. T., Stenius, V. M. K., & McGloin, J. M. (2005) Understanding offense specialization and versatility: A reapplication of the rational choice perspective. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 33(1), 77–87.

Lanier, M. M., & Henry, S. (1998) *Essential Criminology.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Paternoster, R., Saltzman, L. E., Waldo, G. P., & Chiricos, T. G. (1983) Estimating perceptual stability and deterrent effects: The role of perceived legal punishment in the inhibition of criminal involvement. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 74(1), 270–297.

Tunnell, K. D. (1990) Choosing crime: Close your eyes and take your chances. *Justice Quarterly* 7(4), 673–690.

Williams, F. P., & McShane, M. D. (2004) *Criminological Theory* (4th edn). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Further Readings

Clarke, R. V., & Cornish, D. B. (2000) Rational choice. In R. Paternoster & R. Bachman (eds.), *Explaining Crime and Criminals: Essays in Contemporary Criminological Theory.* Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury, pp. 23–42.

Clarke, R. V., & Felson, M. (1993) *Routine Activity and Rational Choice.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Cornish, D. (1993) Theories of action in criminology: Learning theory and rational choice approaches. In R. V. Clarke & M. Felson (eds.), *Routine Activity, and Rational Choice*, vol. 5. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, pp. 351–382.

Cornish, D. (1994) The procedural analysis of offending and its relevance for situational prevention. In R. V. Clarke (ed.), *Crime Prevention Studies*, vol. 3. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 151–196.

Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1986) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1987) Understanding crime displacement: An application of rational choice theory. *Criminology* 25(4), 933–947.

Eck, J. E., & Weisburd, D. (1995) Crime places in crime theory. In J. E. Eck & D. Weisburd (eds.), *Crime and Place* vol. 4. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 1–33.

Farrell, G. (1995) Preventing repeat victimization. In M. Tonry & D. P. Farrington (eds.), *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, vol. 19. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 469–534.

Felson, M. (1986) Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control, and criminal outcomes. In D. Cornish & R. V. Clarke (eds.), *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 119–128.

Hechter, M., & Kanazawa, S. (1997) Sociological rational choice theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 23, 191–214.

Johnson, S. D., & Bowers, K. J. (2003) Opportunity is in the eye of the beholder: The role of publicity in crime prevention. *Criminology and Public Policy* 2(3), 497–524.

Opp, K. D. (1997) 'Limited rationality' and crime. In G. Newman, R. V. Clarke, & S. G. Shohan (eds.), *Rational Choice and Situational Crime Prevention*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, pp. 47–64.

Petrosino, A. J., & Brensilber, D. (2003) The motives, methods and decision making of convenience store robbers: Interviews with 28 incarcerated offenders in Massachusetts. In M. J. Smith & D. B. Cornish (eds.), *Theory for Practice in Situational Crime Prevention*, vol. 16. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 237–264.

Sherman, L.S., Gartin, P. R., & Buerger, M. E. (1989) Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place. *Criminology* 27(1), 27–55.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1987) Rational choice and the framing of decisions. In R. M. Hogarth & M. W. Reder (eds.), *Rational Choice: The Contrast between Economics and Psychology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 67–94.

General Strain Theory

CAMIE MORRIS and JENNIFER L. HUCK

Agnew's general strain theory and all earlier versions of strain theory are sociological in nature; they explain crime by reference to a person's social relationships (Agnew 1992). These theories are distinguished from other sociological theories of crime in two important ways. First, strain theories focus upon negative relationships between people. More specifically, strain theorists study the effects of situations in which people are not being treated in the manner they wish to be treated. These negative relationships, according to strain theorists, can lead to delinquency. This focus on negative relations distinguishes strain theories from that of social control theory, for example, which is concerned with the absence of important conventional relationships. According to control theorists, delinquency is likely to occur in the absence of these vital connections (Hirschi 1969). Second, strain theories differ from other sociological theories of crime in their explanation of the motivation behind crime. Strain theories contend that people are pressured into crime by negative affective states, especially anger, which frequently ensue from negative relationships (Agnew 1992). In contrast, the motivation behind crime for a control theorist does not center on pressure resulting from negative affective states, but on how the absence of important relationships frees a person to engage in crime (Hirschi 1969). Thus, whereas other sociological theories of crime are concerned with the absence of significant interpersonal relations, positive relations, or some other type of interpersonal relation, strain theory stands alone in focusing on negative relations.

Early strain theorists, namely, Merton (1938), Cohen (1955), and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), typically concentrate on one negative relationship where individuals are prevented from attaining positively valued goals. These researchers emphasize the lower class and their tendency to have their goals, such as achieving financial success or moving into the middle class, blocked. In early theories, strain is thus treated as a social structural variable. Strain theories tend to focus upon adolescents, and more modern strain theories maintain that adolescents are not interested only in future financial goals, but also in succeeding in aspects such as good grades, popularity, and athletics (Agnew 1985; Elliot, Huizinga, and Ageton 1985). Even these more recent contributions, however, place their focus on people's attempts to attain positively valued goals and on the effects of failing to achieve these goals. Agnew (1985; 1992) broadens the focus of previous strain theories by developing a more complete typology of the sources of strain in his general strain theory.

In an effort to address the criticisms of traditional strain theories, Robert Agnew (1992) developed a revised, general strain theory. In his modified theory, Agnew (1992) laid out a more intricate description of the relationship between strain and crime than what had been expressed by traditional strain theorists. In agreement with traditional theorists, Agnew argued that strain (i.e. negative relations with others) could lead to crime and delinquency, but unlike his predecessors, he suggested the link was conditional on other factors. Specifically, crime and delinquency would most likely result from strain when particular negative affective states, such as anger, were present, and legitimate coping strategies were absent (Agnew 1992). He further suggested that coping strategies (criminal and otherwise) were shaped by both individual-level and macro-level variables. Ultimately, Agnew hoped that in setting out a more elaborate explanation of the link between strain and crime, he would renew interest in some of strain theories' promising, theoretical foundations.

Specifically, Agnew (1992) identifies three major sources of strain, each of which represents a certain type of negative relationship with others. In particular, others may (1) prevent an individual from attaining positively valued goals, (2) take away or threaten to take away a person's positively valued stimuli, (3) present or threaten to present a person with negatively valued stimuli (Agnew 1992: 50). Although traditional

strain theories, such as Merton (1938), focus only on the first type, whereby strain results from individuals failing to achieve positively valued goals, Agnew (1992) presents evidence that the other two types of strain, the removal of positively valued stimuli and presenting individuals with negatively valued stimuli, are even more important for understanding why and when strain leads to delinquency. These types of strain are more prone to delinquency and crime because they are more likely to produce anger and frustration.

Illustratively, Agnew argues that a person is more likely to become angry when a positively valued stimulus is taken away, as in a breakup with a boyfriend or girlfriend, or when an individual is presented with negatively valued stimuli, as in child abuse, than they are when they fail to achieve positively valued goals, like monetary success. Anger, as opposed to other negative affective states, such as depression, fear, and disappointment, is particularly important to Agnew because he believes it impacts a person in many ways that encourage delinquency (Agnew 1992). Although delinquency could result from other negative emotions, it is less likely to do so than when anger is present. Anger escalates a person's "level of felt injury, creates a desire for retaliation/revenge, energizes the individual for action, and lowers inhibitions" (Agnew 1992: 60).

By identifying the three major types of strain, Agnew (1992) addresses criticisms of earlier versions of strain theory. For example, traditional strain theories are criticized for not being able to explain why middle-class delinquency is so widespread. In Agnew's general strain theory, he attempts to consider all events with the potential for creating strain through the three major types of strain he identifies. Thus, he focuses not only on the fact that many people in the lower class have goals such as monetary success blocked, but also on the ability of such events as divorce, death of a friend, and child abuse to cause strain, and therefore potentially lead to delinquency. Thus, Agnew's general strain theory is used to explain a larger array of crimes and criminal behavior.

The weak empirical support facing traditional strain theories possibly results from these theories' failure to consider all the sources of strain identified by Agnew (1992). The additional types of strain, as indicated above, are more likely to lead to negative emotions such as anger and frustration and therefore to delinquent outcomes. Agnew (1992) further argues that strain is likely to have a cumulative impact on individuals. More specifically, a single negative relation is not likely to influence an individual, but people who experience an accumulation of negative relations in short periods of time are likely to be negatively impacted by these events. Yet, empirical tests of traditional strain theories often only measure a person's failure to achieve one or two positively valued goals, while ignoring all other types of strain. According to Agnew (1992), this also could add to the explanation of why traditional strain theories lack empirical support.

Traditional strain theories are also critiqued because they do not provide an adequate explanation as to why only some people who experience strain turn to delinquency as an adaptation or coping strategy (Agnew 1992; Kubrin, Stucky, and Krohn 2009). Agnew tackled this limitation as well in his general strain theory. After recognizing that there are many ways to cope with strain and the negative emotions strain produces, Agnew (1992) separates these into the emotional, cognitive, and behavioral coping strategies often used by individuals who face strain. Most of these are not taken into account in earlier strain theories. Further, as Agnew notes, coping strategies are not equally accessible to all people.

For example, certain groups, such as the urban poor, may have to deal with unique constraints, such as the lack of conventional social support, that make non-delinquent coping strategies more challenging. Constraints to coping strategies, then, are important in Agnew's (1992) theory, as they serve as an explanation for why only some strained persons choose delinquent versus non-delinquent coping strategies. Agnew suggests that those who chose delinquent coping strategies might do so because they want to escape from their strain (e.g. child abuse), seek revenge against the source of their strain (e.g. assaulting a school bully) or to make themselves feel better (e.g. by using drugs) (Agnew 2009). Additionally, Agnew (1992) argues that whether an individual will use delinquent coping strategies is partly conditional on that person's disposition to delinquency, especially as it relates to association with delinquent peers. The failure of traditional strain theories

to consider both constraints to coping strategies and people's disposition to delinquency, which potentially condition the relationship between strain and delinquency, is another "fundamental reason for the weak empirical support for strain theory" (Agnew 1992: 75).

Many recent studies support Agnew's (1992) general strain theory. In one experimental study researchers found that individuals who experience strain, are more likely to experience anger and engage in theft (Rebellon et al. 2009). Additionally, studies find that anger and poor coping skills link strain to delinquency, whereas other negative emotions such as depression do not (Aseltine, Gore, and Gordon 2000; Huck et al. 2012). Further, different sources of strain seem to influence criminal versus non-criminal coping strategies and distinct negative affective states (Piquero and Sealock 2000; Tittle, Broidy, and Gertsz 2008). Lastly, empirical studies tend to support general strain theory cross-nationally (Byongook et al. 2009).

Agnew's (1992) general strain theory significantly differs from and broadens the focus of traditional strain theories. In particular, general strain theory views strain as a social psychological variable that can develop from three types of negative relations, unlike earlier versions of strain theory which see strain as a social structural phenomenon, which focuses on the poor and their barriers to monetary success.

SEE ALSO: Cloward, Richard; Merton, Robert; Ohlin, Lloyd; Strain Theory.

References

Agnew, R. (1985) A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces* 64(1), 151–167.

Agnew, R. (1992) Foundation for a general strain theory of crime. *Criminology* 30(1), 47–87.

Agnew, R. (2009) General strain theory. In M. D. Krohn, A. J. Lizotte, & G. P. Hall (eds.), *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*. London: Springer, pp. 169–182.

Aseltine, Jr., R. H., Gore, S., & Gordon, J. (2000) Life stress, anger and anxiety, and delinquency: An empirical test of general strain theory. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 41, 256–275.

Byongook, M., Morash, M., McCluskey, C. P., & Hwang, H. (2009) A comparative test of general strain theory: Key strains, situational and trait based negative emotions, conditioning factors and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 46(2), 182–212.

Cohen, A. (1955) *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free Press.

Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. (1960) *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: Free Press.

Elliott, D., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. (1985) *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Huck, J. L., Lee, D. R., Bowen, K. N., et al. (2012) Specifying the dynamic relationships of general strain, coping, and young adult crime. *Western Criminology Review* 13(2), 36–45.

Kubrin, C. E., Stucky, T. D., & Krohn, M. D. (2009) *Researching Theories of Crime and Deviance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Merton, R. (1938) Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3, 672–682.

Piquero, N. L., & Sealock, M. D. (2000). Generalizing general strain theory: An examination of an offending population. *Justice Quarterly* 17, 449–484.

Rebellon, C., Piquero, N. P., Piquero, A., & Thaxon, S. (2009) Do frustrated economic expectations and objective economic inequality promote crime? A randomized experiment testing Agnew's general strain theory. *European Journal of Criminology* 6(1), 47–71.

Tittle, C. R., Broidy, L. M., & Gertz, M. G. (2008) Strain, crime, and contingencies. *Justice Quarterly* 25, 283–312.

Strain Theory

TANA MCCOY and MANDI PUGH

Originated by Robert Merton (1910–2003), strain theory has been one of the most influential explanations of crime. Its central ideas have formed the foundation for theories developed by many subsequent criminologists, most notably Albert Cohen (1955) and Richard Cloward and Loyd Ohlin (1960). Strain theories include a number of explanations of criminal behavior characterized by the idea that crime occurs when an individual attempts to alleviate strain or frustration. While the specific causes of strain vary among theories, most attribute strain to societies that promote goals for their members without the appropriate opportunities to achieve them.

In 1938, Merton first published his model of strain in the *American Sociological Review*. Merton drew heavily from the ideas of French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858–1917) and his ideas examining the role of social change in producing deviant behavior. However, their views on the precise role played by social factors varied considerably. Durkheim (1893/1933) viewed deviance as the result of a lack of social regulation. In times of profound change, particularly evident during the Industrial Revolution, social norms were weakened and expectations regarding appropriate behavior became blurred. People were unsure of what was expected of them. For the first time, people were encouraged to pursue individual interests, lessening the effect of traditional behavioral restraints. In contrast, Merton contended that societal expectations can also produce deviance; particularly the tendency in US society to stress economic goals without corresponding the appropriate ways to attain them. Although Merton differed from Durkheim in this respect, his emphasis on the social structure was undoubtedly influenced by Durkheim. Both Durkheim and Merton viewed crime as a normal response to various aspects of the social structure and rejected the view that criminals were biologically inferior.

Merton proposed that the relationship between cultural goals and institutional means were key factors in producing disproportionately high crime rates in the United States. Cultural goals are the objectives a society defines as legitimate goals for members to attain. Societies will have many cultural goals, ranging from religious faith to hard work and thrift. According to Merton, the United States was unique in its emphasis on the importance of acquiring material wealth. Also known as "the American Dream," Merton observed that materialism represented the preeminent goal in the United States and is communicated in a variety of socializing forces. The family, school, and media emphasize that material wealth is paramount to success in life (Messner and Rosenfeld 1994).

The cultural goal of material wealth is not unique to the United States. Few societies communicate a disdain for economic success. Two uniquely American characteristics, however, directly impact crime. First, the cultural emphasis on wealth as the primary reflection of individual merit has reduced the value of other goals such as community service, education, and spiritual discipline. Consequently, the economy has assumed such an elevated position that the effectiveness of other institutions has been usurped. Politics, family, and education have become devalued except in their usefulness in achieving wealth.

Societies also define the appropriate ways or institutional means individuals should use to pursue cultural goals. Although other methods are acceptable, the cultural blueprint for material success consists of graduating from college, obtaining a white-collar job, and diligently working and saving one's way to financial security. The easiest and quickest methods to achieve cultural goals are forbidden by most societies. Most societies pass laws that criminalize using culturally unapproved methods to achieve cultural goals. Individuals who choose to "cut corners" are punished, to discourage others from doing the same.

It is not uncommon for societies to sometimes place a greater emphasis on either cultural goals or institutional means. In religious life, for example,

societies may overemphasize the standard means for salvation, such as church attendance, without an equal focus on the actual goal of salvation itself. Those societies which do not maintain a rough balance between the culturally-approved goals and the approved means to attain them can become particularly unstable. Merton referred to this imbalance as "normlessness." Merton felt that normlessness in the United States resulted from an emphasis on wealth without validating the importance of the means to achieve it. To illustrate normlessness, Merton referred to competitive athletics. Ideally, athletes derive satisfaction from both the competitive effort and actually winning the contest. The motto "it's not whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game" emphasizes the satisfaction derived from hard work, sportsmanship, and following the rules. At times, however, an unhealthy emphasis is placed on winning, and following the rules of the game become secondary and may fail to provide satisfaction in and of themselves. In these situations, "winning isn't everything; it's the only thing."

While strain theory predicts that poverty will be associated with crime, Merton did not assert that poverty alone will account for crime. Key to the disproportionately high rates of crime in the United States is the expectation that all persons are capable of ascending the economic ladder on their own merit, characterized by diligence, hard work, and frugality. The concept of meritocracy assumes that the acquisition of wealth in the United States is available to everyone and is limited only by one's talents and efforts. Meritocracy ignores the barriers posed by social class and blames the failure to achieve wealth on individual inadequacies. This creates considerable strain on those who are unsuccessful. Merton used the Indian caste system to illustrate the impact of culture on the individual's response to material deprivation. Although poverty was pervasive, crime rates were very low. The cultural goal of materialism was not extended to all classes. While merchants and bankers were expected to pursue economic success, the lower classes were restricted from such pursuits. American society, however, extends the goal of materialism to all and those failing to achieve it are more likely to resort to a variety of adaptations to deal with their frustrations.

According to Merton, crime in the United States is the result of a significant proportion of the population facing unequal access to the means and opportunities for achieving wealth. Subsequent strain theorists expanded on the primary obstacles to financial success. Cohen (1955) proposed that inferior socialization provided to children in poor families handicapped their ability to compete with their middle-class counterparts, particularly in school. Racial discrimination has also significantly hindered minority access to quality education (Cloward and Ohlin 1960; Messner and Rosenfeld 1994). Economic changes in the United States have also presented considerable obstacles for inner-city residents in finding meaningful employment. Blue-collar jobs paying significant wages have largely disappeared as the United States has transitioned from an economy based on manufacturing to a service economy (Wilson 1987). Thus, a significant portion of society is repeatedly faced with failure but continually urged to engage in the struggle to achieve the elusive goal of wealth. Merton (1968: 193) points out that the cultural manifesto is clear: "one must not quit, must not cease striving, must not lessen his goals, for not failure, but low aim, is crime."

Individuals lacking the means to financial success experience strain. Individuals can adapt to strain in several ways. Merton proposed that conformity, innovation, retreatism, ritualism, and rebellion are the primary ways people respond to strain. While each adaptation is unique, people can rely on several to alleviate strain, depending on the circumstances. Conformity occurs when individuals accept both the cultural goals and the means approved by a society. This adaptation is the most common behavioral response in any society. Conformity occurs when an individual has both accepted cultural goals and utilizes the socially-approved methods to attain them. Merton's focus, however, was on deviant behavior.

Individuals who seek to achieve the cultural goal of wealth, yet find institutional means blocked, may innovate by substituting new ways to succeed. Innovative methods can include theft, robbery, white-collar crime, and selling drugs. Merton proposed that innovation would occur most often in societies that strongly emphasize certain goals without providing effective means for their achievement. Innovation accounts for the overrepresentation of the poor in official

crime statistics who face limited opportunities to achieve wealth, but cannot also explain white-collar crimes. Merton (1968: 190) felt that white-collar crime resulted from an American culture of insatiability regarding money, whereby even the most successful want "just a bit more."

Ritualism occurs when the individual rejects the cultural goals yet accepts the institutional means. Individuals unable to attain wealth will experience considerable anxiety and self-doubt. Finding crime an unacceptable response, the individual psychologically adjusts to strain by lowering aspirations while emphasizing the socially-approved means. Often lower middle-class, wealth is no longer a goal for this individual, who adapts to strain by focusing on the routine and predictability of daily work.

Some people may retreat as a response to strain. These persons drop out of society, rejecting both the cultural goals and institutional means. Like the ritualist, the retreatist is faced with repeated failure to achieve cultural goals; however, the retreatist also rejects the means. Faced with no chance of winning, the retreatist refuses to play the game at all.

Merton's final adaptive response was rebellion, whereby the individual rejects both the goals and means endorsed by society and substitutes new ones. Political revolutions often result from the rebellious response to strain. Religious cults also represent rebellious adaptations to strain. Individuals resorting to rebellion are often treated with the greater hostility than criminals because they are viewed as a genuine threat to the social order.

The influence of strain theory has varied dramatically, peaking in the 1960s then virtually disappearing as a valid explanation of crime after many theorists questioned its central arguments and empirical support. After reading Cloward and Ohlin's *Delinquency and Opportunity*, Attorney General Robert Kennedy appointed Lloyd Ohlin to develop federal delinquency prevention programs and policy. Consequently, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was passed in 1961. Mobilization for Youth created social programs that improved education, employment, and recreational opportunities for at-risk and delinquent youth and their families. These programs were expanded by Lyndon Johnson in the "War on Poverty" which targeted all impoverished families. Immensely unpopular, the programs were widely believed to be unsuccessful and were discontinued under Richard Nixon.

The influence of strain theories continued to decline in the 1970s, to be replaced by control theories (Hirschi 1969), which stressed supervision and surveillance, not opportunities, as keys to preventing delinquency. Ruth Kornhauser's highly critical book, published in 1978, also contributed to the theoretical demise of strain. One of the more widely analyzed facets of Merton's work was his contention that economic success values are universally held by Americans. Hyman (1953: 427) believed the poorer individual aspires for less success and "knows he couldn't get it if he wanted and doesn't want what help might get him success." Perhaps the most damaging criticism of strain theory has been that empirical research does not support Merton's hypotheses. Specifically, multiple studies have shown no relationship between social class and crime (Tittle, Villemez, and Smith 1978; Krohn et al. 1980; Elliott, Huizinga, and Ageton 1985). Although Merton was not proposing that poverty alone caused crime, he did contend that the lack of opportunities available to the underclass leads them to be over-represented in the "innovative" response. Farnworth and Leiber (1989) asserted that research has measured strain incorrectly. Examining juveniles, researchers have relied upon greater educational aspirations coupled with lower educational expectations as evidence of strain at the individual level. Farnworth and Leiber provided empirical support for strain theory using the juvenile's economic goals and educational expectations.

The 1990s marked a resurgence in the influence of strain theory, with the publication of works by Agnew (1992) and Messner and Rosenfeld (1994). In *Crime and the American Dream*, Messner and Rosenfeld presented the most comprehensive extension of Merton's work since Cloward and Ohlin (1960). The authors relied upon the primary structural argument provided by Merton: Crime in the United States can be traced to an overemphasis on the attainment of wealth without providing legitimate avenues to obtain wealth to a large segment of the population. Consequently, issues related to the economy

dominate public policy while noneconomic institutions, such as the family, are relegated to a subservient status, weakening their effectiveness. While Agnew presented a revised strain theory grounded in social psychology, it contributed to an intellectual climate more open to Mertonian strain theory.

SEE ALSO: Cloward, Richard; Durkheim, Emile; General Strain Theory; Institutional Anomie Theory; Ohlin, Lloyd.

References

Agnew, R. S. (1992) Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* 30(1), 47–83.

Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (1960) *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Cohen, A. (1955) *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1893/1933) *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press.

Elliot, D. E., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. S. (1985) *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Farnworth, M., & Leiber, M. J. (1989) Strain theory revisited: Economic goals, educational means, and delinquency. *American Sociological Review* 54, 263–274.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hyman, H. H. (1953) *The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social-Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Kornhauser, R. (1978) *Social Sources of Delinquency: An Appraisal of Analytical Models*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Krohn, M. D., Akers, R. L., Radosevich, M. J., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1980) Social status and deviance. *Crimonology* 18, 308–318.

Merton, R. K. (1938) Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3, 672–682.

Merton, R. K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.

Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (1994) *Crime and the American Dream*. Belmont, CA: Wadworth Publishing Co.

Tittle, C. R., Villemez, W. J., & Smith, D. A. (1978) The myth of social class and criminality: An empirical assessment of the empirical evidence. *American Sociological Review* 43, 643–656.

Wilson, W. J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Differential Opportunity Theory

LESLI BLAIR

Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin are often associated with strain theory. Indeed, their theory of differential opportunity derives many aspects from Emile Durkheim and Robert K. Merton, noted grandfathers of classic strain theory. However, their theory extends beyond strain theory to include elements of cultural transmission and differential association for which the Chicago School of criminology is known. The result is one of the first integrated theories of crime. Drawing on the motivation from strain theory and the learning mechanisms from the Chicago School, differential opportunity theory explains why some who feel strain do not react with delinquency. Additionally, Cloward and Ohlin described how different adaptations to strain come about via subcultural variations in the socializing of different age groups and access to both conventional and nonconventional others.

Differential opportunity theory has clear roots in the anomie/strain tradition of criminology. Typically understood as a kind of macro-level view of strain, the concept of anomie can be traced to French sociologist Emile Durkheim's original *Le Suicide* (1897; translated to English in 1951). In the words of Cloward and Ohlin, anomie, or normlessness, "refers to a state in which social norms no longer control men's actions" (1960: 78). Durkheim believed that anomie resulted from a society's inability to suppress the goals of its people. With unlimited goals, Durkheim believed, man would go to any lengths to achieve those goals. Across the Atlantic Ocean, the unlimited goals of the "American Dream" permeate the culture. However, not everyone resorted to any means necessary to achieve the "American Dream", as Durkheim might expect. Robert K. Merton (1938) saw a need to revise the theory. With everyone aspiring to lofty goals, Merton believed there to be a disjunction between these culturally defined goals and equal access to legitimate means of achieving those goals. Merton agreed with Durkheim that man would go to any length to achieve his goals. Therefore, when society blocks legitimate avenues of success for some of its members, those individuals may turn to illegitimate means of achieving the American Dream. In short, Merton believed it is differential access to culturally ascribed *legitimate* means of success that leads to criminal activity. As described in detail later, Cloward and Ohlin emphasize differential access to *illegitimate* means as well. This aspect of the theory of differential opportunity stems from the Chicago School.

Cullen (1988) noted that most scholars had focused too much on Cloward and Ohlin's theory as simply another version of Merton's strain theory. In fact, Merton himself (1959) remarked that differential access to illegitimate opportunities was an important missing element to his original theory. In addition to not getting their due respect for fundamentally expanding strain theory, Cullen (1988) pointed out that researchers often completely overlooked the connection between Cloward and Ohlin's work and Chicago School theorists, specifically Edwin Sutherland, Clifford Shaw, and Henry McKay.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) credited the works of Shaw (1930, 1931), Shaw and McKay (1942), and Sutherland (1937, 1947) with indirectly introducing the importance of differential access to illegitimate means. Specifically, Cloward and Ohlin noted that Shaw and McKay established that areas with high rates of crime showed stability over generations, implying "cultural transmission" of illegitimate means from one generation to the next. Sutherland, they noted, described the mechanism of learning via "differential association" with more criminal than conventional others. "Thus the first theory stresses the value systems of different areas; the second, the systems of social relationships that facilitate or impede the acquisition of these values" (Cloward and Ohlin 1960: 146).

Therefore, differential opportunity theory draws the motivation for criminal behavior from strain theory and the means for criminal

behavior from the Chicago School. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) believed that Merton's strain theory could explain the drive to commit crime. However, it is important to explain why not all who feel strain turn to crime to ease their strain. Hence, differential opportunity theory integrates the idea of differential opportunities for learning criminal behavior from Chicago School theorists. Differential opportunity can be seen as an intervening mechanism between strain and crime. Cloward and Ohlin's important contribution to classic strain theory, therefore, was the introduction of differential access to illegitimate means. Not only must those who turn to delinquency be blocked from legitimate avenues to achieving culturally ascribed goals, but they must also have access to *illegitimate* avenues of achieving those goals. Simply being motivated to achieve the American Dream by any means necessary does not guarantee that one has the criminal associates from whom to learn illegitimate paths to success. However, Cloward and Ohlin go a step beyond joining these two seemingly separate ideas in criminology; they also noted the existence of variation in the "types of illegitimate adaptation that are available to persons in search of solutions to problems of adjustment arising from the restricted availability of legitimate means" (1960: 152).

The theory of differential opportunity outlined three distinct subcultures of delinquency and the aspects of social structure that cause their emergence. Namely, the variation in what Cloward and Ohlin called the "integration of different age-levels of offender" (1960: 153) and the "integration of conventional and deviant values" (1960: 154) leads to variation in the types of delinquent subcultures. The integration of different age levels of offender refers to the mechanism of cultural transmission from one generation to the next, as posited by Shaw and McKay. The extent to which younger age groups interact with older age groups affects the transmission of delinquent values and skills from the older generation to the younger generation. In other words, the greater the integration of these different age levels, the greater the transmission of the deviant subculture from one generation to the next. Additionally, Cloward and Ohlin noted the importance of the integration of conventional

and deviant values in differential access to illegitimate means. They draw on the work of Whyte (1955) and Kobrin (1951) to explain that in order for delinquent subcultures to thrive, they need the cooperation of those who occupy legitimate or semilegitimate roles. Examples include a fence to sell stolen goods or a corrupt police officer to look the other way. Cloward and Ohlin argued that variation in these two aspects of the social structure (integration of different age levels of offender and integration of conventional and deviant values) leads to three different delinquent subcultures: the criminal subculture, the conflict subculture, and the retreatist subculture.

The criminal subculture provides the clearest illustration of differential opportunity theory. This subculture type is characterized by criminal values, or the "hustle." Those in the criminal subculture are able to ease the strain brought on by blockage of legitimate paths to monetary success via a rich network of illegitimate opportunities. These illegitimate paths to attaining goals are paved by the integration of age-levels and the integration of conventional and deviant values, as described above. Older criminals serve as role models for the younger generation. They also provide rewards for the learning and performance of crime. The integration of both deviant and conventional values is crucial to the survival of the criminal subculture as well. In addition, to access the deviant values that allow the illegitimate pathway to success, the criminal subculture needs cooperative access to people with conventional values as well. It is through relationships with the conventional world that the criminal subculture can turn a profit and avoid detection or prosecution. Without the integration of both individuals who hold deviant and individuals who hold conventional (albeit loose) values, the criminal subculture would not succeed. Cloward and Ohlin note that although criminal subcultures may contain violence, it is only when it is instrumental to their "hustle," rather than as a way of expression.

The conflict subculture, conversely, is characterized by violence solely as a means of expression. Violence in the conflict subculture is used to attain a reputation for toughness and a willingness to defend oneself and the honor of one's gang. Unlike the criminal subculture, the conflict

subculture is cut off from both legitimate and illegitimate means for goal achievement. Areas where the conflict subculture exists are characterized by the social disorganization described by Shaw and McKay (1942); such areas lack a sense of unity and interconnectedness. Without the integration of either age levels or people with different value systems, the conflict subculture also has little social control over its members. Cloward and Ohlin noted that lack of opportunity tends to coincide with lack of social control. In a conflict subculture, frustration is maximized due to lack of *any* means of goal achievement at the same time that social control is very low. The result is the use of violence as a means of achieving status. Using violence as a means of status transcends traditional opportunity structures, because *anyone* can demonstrate a willingness to risk injury or death for the sake of their reputation or the reputation of their gang.

Finally, the retreatist subculture is characterized by a detachment from conventional norms, and pervasive drug use. A member of the retreatist subculture will "hustle," but only to obtain funds with which to purchase drugs. Cloward and Ohlin hypothesized that the retreatist subculture forms among those who not only do not have access to legitimate means of success, but have also failed to achieve success via illegitimate means as well. Therefore, Cloward and Ohlin call them "double failures." They describe four avenues to the retreatist subculture, involving different illegitimate opportunities (i.e. the criminal and conflict typologies) and the ways in which they are blocked. The first and second retreatist adaptations come about due to internalized prohibitions against both violent and criminal means of goal achievement. The third and fourth paths to a retreatist subculture involve failure within either the conflict or criminal subculture, respectively. Cloward and Ohlin noted that there is only room for a limited number of deviants in both the criminal and conflict subcultures. Therefore, there must be an adaptation for those who fail to achieve status in one of those subcultures. They contend that some of these "double failures" may simply lower their expectations for success. However, those who are unable to lower their expectations for success become disengaged from the social structure and form the retreatist subculture.

Differential opportunity theory has been applied to a variety of domains outside of American delinquency. For example, differential opportunity theory has even been hypothesized to explain premarital sex among college students (Schulz et al. 1977). Hindelang (1978) used differential opportunity theory to explain findings of disparity in crime involvement of African Americans (as opposed to discrimination in the legal system). Additionally, Fisher (1970) tested the application of the theory to delinquency in England.

There has been mixed empirical support for these specific subcultural adaptations. However, Cloward and Ohlin's differential opportunity expansion of strain theory has shown empirical promise. It has also generated further adaptations of both differential opportunity theory and classic strain theory. As noted by Cullen (1988), most studies claiming to test differential opportunity theory actually test the classic strain theory construct of the disjunction between aspirations and expectations. These tests miss the main contribution of Cloward and Ohlin to classic strain theory; differential opportunity theory explicitly adds the intervening mechanism of variation in access to illegitimate means. However, several empirical tests have been conducted on the main concepts of differential opportunity theory. As an example, Short, Rivera, and Tennyson (1965) examined both variation in illegitimate opportunities, and criminal and conflict subcultures. They found support for the hypothesis that gang affiliated youth perceive themselves to have more illegitimate opportunities than legitimate opportunities, whereas non-gang affiliated youth perceive themselves to have more legitimate opportunities than illegitimate opportunities. However, they also found that conflict subculture behavior (i.e. fighting) was *not* related to a perceived lack of either legitimate or illegitimate opportunities. This, of course, is contrary to Cloward and Ohlin's explanation of the conflict subculture, which they posit comes about due to lack of *any* opportunities, legitimate or otherwise. On the contrary, Schreck et al. (2009) found support for the conflict subculture in that social elements that suggest disorganization were found to be more strongly related to violent crime than to nonviolent crime. This is in line with Cloward and Ohlin's conception of conflict subcultures being located in areas characterized by social disorganization.

There are a couple of notable theoretical elaborations that involve differential opportunity theory. The first is that of Murphy and Robinson (2008). They posited that Cloward and Ohlin's emphasis on the importance of both legitimate and illegitimate means for goal attainment could be used to add an additional adaptation style to Merton's classic strain theory: the maximizer. As it sounds, Murphy and Robinson hypothesized the maximizer adaptation to strain as maximizing chances of goal attainment by incorporating the use of *both* legitimate and illegitimate means for success. Additionally, Hoffman and Ireland (1995) updated differential opportunity theory by integrating modern strain theory and emphasizing the importance of peer networks. They argued that Robert Agnew's general strain theory and the empirical knowledge of the influence of peers are fully compatible with Cloward and Ohlin's theory.

SEE ALSO: Cloward, Richard; Differential Association Theory; Durkheim, Emile; McKay, Henry; Merton, Robert; Ohlin, Lloyd; Shaw, Clifford; Social Disorganization Theory; Strain Theory; Sutherland, Edwin.

References

Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (1960) *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: The Free Press.

Cullen, F. T. (1988) Were Cloward and Ohlin strain theorists? Delinquency and opportunity revisited. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 25(3), 214–241.

Fisher, R. (1970) Borstal recall delinquency and the Cloward–Ohlin theory of criminal subcultures. *British Journal of Criminology* 10(1), 52–63.

Hindelang, M. J. (1978) Race and involvement in common law personal crimes. *American Sociological Review* 43, 93–109.

Hoffman, J. P., & Ireland, T. O. (1995) Cloward and Ohlin's strain theory reexamined: An elaborated theoretical model. In F. Adler & W. S. Laufer (eds.), *The Legacy of Anomie Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 247–270.

Kobrin, S. (1951) The conflict of values in delinquency areas. *American Sociological Review* 16(5), 653–661.

Merton, R. K. (1938) Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3(5), 672–682.

Merton, R. K. (1959) Social conformity, deviation, and opportunity structure: A comment on the contributions of Dubin and Cloward. *American Sociological Review* 24(2), 177–189.

Murphy, D. S., & Robinson, M. B. (2008) The maximizer: Clarifying Merton's theories of anomie and strain. *Theoretical Criminology* 12(4), 501–521.

Schreck, C. J., McGloin, J. M., & Kirk, D. S. (2009) On the origins of the violent neighborhood: A study of the nature and predictors of crime-type differentiation across Chicago neighborhoods. *Justice Quarterly* 26(4), 771–794.

Schulz, B., Bohrnstedt, G. W., Borgatta, E. F., & Evans, R. R. (1977) Explaining premarital sexual intercourse among college students: A causal model. *Social Forces* 56(1), 148–165.

Shaw, C. R. (1930) *The Jack-Roller*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C. R. (1931) *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Short, J. F., Jr., Rivera, R., & Tennyson, R. A. (1965) Perceived opportunities, gang membership, and delinquency. *American Sociological Review* 30(1), 56–67.

Sutherland, E. H. (1937) *The Professional Thief*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sutherland, E. H. (1947) *Principles of Criminology*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Whyte, W. F. (1955) *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Further Readings

Cloward, R. A. (1959) Illegitimate means, anomie, and deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review* 24(2), 164–176.

Durkheim, E. (1951) *Suicide*. New York: The Free Press.

Hoffman, J. P., & Ireland, T. O. (2004) Strain and opportunity structures. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 20(3), 263–292.

Kobrin, S., Puntil, J., & Peluso, E. (1967) Criteria status among street groups. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 4, 98–118.

Makkai, T., & Braithwaite, J. (1991) Criminological theories and regulatory compliance. *Criminology* 29(2), 191–220.

Menard, S. (1997) A developmental test of Cloward's differential opportunity theory. In N. Passas & R. Agnew (eds.), *The Future of Anomie Theory*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, pp. 142–186.

Social Bonding Theory

OMI HODWITZ

Control theories are premised on the assumption that criminal behavior need not be explained; instead, these theories stipulate that all people are born with innate hedonistic tendencies and, therefore, deviance is a natural expression of human nature (Hirschi 1969). Rather than asking why some people engage in crime, control theories address the question of why some people do *not* engage in crime. Social bonding theory (also known as "social control theory") is one of the more prominent control theories in the criminological field. In response to the question, "why do people obey the law?," social bonding theory posits that the bonds that an individual establishes with people, institutions, and value systems play an important and influential role in behavior.

Travis Hirschi introduced social bonding theory in 1969 in his doctoral dissertation and subsequent book titled *Causes of Delinquency*. Using a sample derived from the Richmond Youth Project consisting of male middle school and high school students from Western Contra Costa County in the San Francisco area, he sought to identify, as his title indicates, the underlying causes of juvenile delinquency and deviance. He hypothesized that youth would commit deviant acts when their bonds to conventional society were weak or broken. According to Hirschi, there were four elements to a bond: attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. He predicted that each of these elements, individually and collectively, would influence behavior. Diminished attachment or commitment, for example, would indicate a weakened or broken social bond; that broken bond would free the individual to cater to his or her inherent self-interested and delinquent desires. The presence of these elements would inhibit the individual and lead to conforming behavior.

Attachment was a prominent feature of early control theories and provided the basis upon which these theories were built (e.g., Reiss 1951; Nye 1958). Sometimes referred to as a stake in conformity, attachment is the emotional component of the bond; it concerns the level of sensitivity the individual has towards the opinions of others (Briar and Piliavin 1965). Hirschi (1969) posited that the individual's relationships to parents, peers, and school were particularly important for the development of attachment; the extent to which an individual internalized the norms or values of these significant others and institutions would influence whether he or she was free to violate these norms.

Commitment is the rational element of conformity; it refers to the investment that an individual may make towards conventional goals, relationships, or activities (Hirschi 1969). The basic premise of commitment is the expectation that the greater the time and energy invested in such things as work, education, or partnership, the lower the probability of offending. The potential offender would weigh conventional commitments against the consequences of offending; if the offender had a great deal to lose by engaging in criminal behavior, he or she would choose not to deviate.

At first glance, *involvement* appears to be similar to commitment. This element is also premised on the idea that an increase in time spent engaging in conventional activities leads to a decrease in offending (Hirschi 1969). However, while commitment refers to the potential offender's reluctance to compromise his or her investments, involvement relates to the availability of the individual. A person busy with a variety of activities would have less opportunity and ability to engage in delinquency.

The fourth and final element of the social bond is *belief*. The validity of belief as a construct relies on the acknowledgment of social consensus or a shared set of values in society (Hirschi 1969). Belief is premised on the idea that offending behavior will be curbed by the extent to which the offender respects and feels obligated to follow the rules of conventional society. An individual who did not feel obligated to comply with social norms would be less likely to feel bound by them and, therefore, would be more likely to violate them.

Hirschi (1969) put the four elements of social bonding to the test using police records, school records, and self-report surveys from the Richmond Youth Project sample. Regarding *attachment*, Hirschi looked at three aspects, namely parental, school, and peer attachment, and produced results that supported the hypothesis that attachment had an influential relationship with offending. For parental attachment, Hirschi found that closeness, identification, and affection for parents had a negative relationship with delinquency. Hirschi interpreted these results as meaning that attached children felt bound to parental expectations, which translated into restraint by larger social norms and rules.

A variety of measures of school attachment also demonstrated the predicted relationship; higher test scores were related to lower delinquency, as were self-perceptions of academic competence (Hirschi 1969). In addition, concern regarding the opinions of teachers was negatively related to offending. Detailed analysis pointed to a causal chain of events, beginning with academic incompetence, leading to poor academic performance and subsequent negative opinions of school, resulting in the rejection of school, and ending with delinquency.

Peer attachment was the last measure of attachment that Hirschi (1969) examined. While other theories stipulate that peers serve a socializing function (e.g., Cohen 1955), control theorists posit that a lack of attachment leads to the formation of groups of like-minded individuals (Hirschi 1969). Specifically, weakened attachment causes both offending behavior among individuals *and* the formation of deviant groups, rather than deviant groups causing both offending behavior among individuals *and* weakened attachment (Sutherland 1947). Results supported this supposition; while deviant youth were more likely to have deviant friends than were nondeviant youth (supporting both control and social learning theories), Hirschi's (1969) results indicated that individuals with strong peer attachment were more likely to also have strong parental attachment (if peers are a source of delinquency, then it is unlikely that both peer and parental attachment are present). Further results indicated that attached youth were more concerned about parental opinions than peer opinions and that peer attachment did not appear to foster attitudes

conducive to norm violation. Finally, delinquent youth were less likely to have close relationships with each other than were conforming youth. These results challenged the social learning supposition that deviant peers cause delinquency and, instead, supported the bonding perspective that attachment serves a restraining function on self-interested inclinations.

The validity of *commitment* as an influential element of the bond was also supported by Hirschi's (1969) research. According to Hirschi, as youth age, they can become committed to adult status, educational paths, and occupational paths. Ideally, educational commitment would phase into occupational commitment at the same time that the youth achieved adulthood status. In practice, Hirschi argued, some youth experience a gap between the completion of education and the beginning of occupation, which undermines the achievement of adult status. This gap is due to a lack of aspirations or commitment to a particular career path, which can be aggravated by working-class status (aspirations are minimized, given the lack of opportunities). These youth may revel in adult enjoyments as they seek to gain adult status, without carrying the weight of adult responsibility. Hirschi argued that these unrestrained enjoyments are often typical of working-class status, they are age-inappropriate, and they facilitate delinquency, such as early drinking, smoking, and sexual activity. Hirschi tested this hypothesized chain of developments and found support for it. Specifically, he found that early expression of adult behaviors was related to an increase in offending. He also found that, as hypothesized, educational expectations and aspirations were negatively related to delinquent behavior. The most ambitious participants in the sample were the least likely to engage in deviance. In contrast, youth who had limited expectations of receiving formal education or advanced occupational status were more likely to become delinquent. Overall, these results supported the basic premise that personal investment in conventional goals and activities decreases offending, while a lack of commitment to these goals increases offending.

Involvement is premised on the argument that the busier a person is with conventional activities, the less time and opportunity they have to engage in delinquency. What the individual

is involved in is highly relevant; not all activities are necessarily inhibitive. Hirschi (1969) determined that, amongst his sample, involvement in school-related activities (homework) was negatively related to a preoccupation with and engagement in deviant activities. Youth who reported feeling like they had nothing to do (no involvements) were more likely to be delinquent. Hirschi also identified that there were two clusters of leisure activity that play an influential role: activities related to school and education and those related to adult practices (e.g., smoking, drinking). Involvement in the former had a negative relationship with deviance while involvement in the latter had a positive relationship. Involvements that did not fall within these clusters tended to have a negligible impact on deviant behavior.

Social bonding theory is built on the supposition that it is not the presence of law-violating *beliefs* that causes delinquency but, instead, the absence of law-abiding beliefs that contributes to deviance. According to social bonding theory, attachment leads to rewards for conformity, which fosters beliefs in social norms. Hirschi's (1969) analysis supported this perspective, demonstrating that participants who believed that they should obey the law were more likely to do so, while those that did not hold these beliefs were more likely to offend. Respect for the law was associated with delinquency independent of respect for police and ties to conforming adults. Based on these results, Hirschi concluded that the element of belief had a direct relationship with offending.

While Hirschi (1969) found support for the elements of the bond and, therefore, for social bonding theory, he was not the only researcher to test it. Forty years after the presentation of social bonding theory, approximately 100 studies tested, redefined, and revised the theory (Akers and Sellers 2008). Of particular interest were the uncovered trends concerning the four elements of the bond, illustrating that the elements were not equally important in facilitating deviance (Kempf 1993). Attachment consistently proved to be the weakest predictor of juvenile delinquency, despite the variety and sheer number of measures of attachment that were tested. This was an important discovery, given the central role that attachment plays in early control theories (e.g., Briar and Piliavin 1965). The more important

indicators of attachment tended to be affection for parents (especially mothers), attachment to school, and peer pressure. This last finding had notable implications, given that possible peer effects (delinquency resulting from an association with deviant peers) did not support one of the main premises of control theories: that peers are the result, not the cause, of weakened bonds (Matsueda 1982).

Involvement also appeared less relevant and tended to be tested less than other elements (Kempf 1993). Later theorists made the argument that involvement was a component of commitment and chose to subsume the former under the latter (Krohn and Massey 1980). The logic behind this amalgamation was that most individuals do not get heavily engaged in activities to which they feel indifferent (Conger 1976). Hirschi (1969) himself conceded that the element of involvement was given a level of importance in the original theory that was not warranted. When paired with commitment, involvement in conventional activities took on more significance (Kempf 1993). Commitment tended to be tested more than the other elements, with the exception of attachment. While commitment often demonstrated a strong relationship with offending (Krohn and Massey 1980), results between different studies varied widely and no definitive conclusions could be drawn (Kempf 1993). Belief also produced mixed results, although researchers began to recognize that attachment and belief may not be independent of one another.

There were also specific results uncovered that went beyond the validity of the elements of the bond. Some of the main questions addressed by researchers included whether Hirschi's (1969) results were generalizable. Specifically, researchers began to look closely at whether results could be replicated with a different population and the types of offending that the theory best explained. Questions regarding the causal ordering of events also arose.

Hindelang (1973) was one of the first authors to focus on replicating Hirschi's results with a different population. He extended Hirschi's analysis to a population that was comprised of both male and female youths in New York State. Hindelang's results supported social bonding theory in many respects. However, Hindelang found that attachment to peers was positively related to

delinquency, indicating the possible presence of a peer effect.

While Hindelang (1973) found support amongst a different population, Krohn and Massey (1980) sought to determine whether the theory applied well to both general and specific offending behaviors. The authors found that social bonding theory was a better fit for minor forms of deviance but did not do well at explaining serious offending.

One area that was left unexplored by Hirschi (1969) was the causal ordering of events. It has been argued that the weakening of social bonds does not cause delinquency, but conversely that it is *delinquency* that weakens social bonds (Sutherland 1947). This proposition was tested by Agnew in 1985 and again in 1991. In 1985, Agnew determined that, when tested with longitudinal data, the theory explained a very small amount of the variance in delinquency. In a follow-up study with improved longitudinal data, Agnew (1991) confirmed his earlier results, concluding that the importance of the theory had been exaggerated, but may still have limited relevance, particularly for younger offenders, minor delinquency, and the onset of offending, rather than persistent offending (Paternoster and Triplett 1988).

Therefore, 40 years of testing has aided in the determination of the importance of each element of the bond in explaining delinquency. It has also helped to determine how well the theory holds up amongst diverse populations and among diverse offending behaviors. Finally, it has led to some conclusions regarding the causal relationship between the social bond and delinquency, as well as regarding the stage of offending at which the bond may be most relevant. As this vast array of empirical tests and publications indicate, social bonding theory maintains its status as one of the most prominent and highly debated control theories in the criminological literature. In addition to its contribution to empirical undertakings, the theory has also served to facilitate the development and growth of two subsequent control theories, one of which was co-created by Hirschi. In 1990, Gottfredson and Hirschi published *A General Theory of Crime*, which focuses on self-control, rather than social control. According to this theory, social bonds (particularly parental bonds) serve to create an environment within which children can develop self-control, the main

cause of conforming behavior. In 1993, Sampson and Laub presented life course theory to the academic community; their theory was heavily influenced by the concept of social bonds too, but they incorporated the premise that bonds could change over time. Social bonds, therefore, continue to hold a prominent position in theoretical endeavors.

SEE ALSO: Hirschi, Travis; Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime; Peer Groups and Delinquency; Reiss, Albert; Self-Control Theory; Social Control Theories; Social Learning Theory.

References

Agnew, R. (1985) Social control theory and delinquency: A longitudinal test. *Criminology* 23(1), 47–61.

Agnew, R. (1991) A longitudinal test of social control theory and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 28(2), 126–156.

Akers, R. L., & Sellers, C. S. (2008) *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Briar, S., & Piliavin, I. (1965) Delinquency, situational inducements, and commitments to conformity. *Social Problems* 13(1), 35–45.

Cohen, A. (1955) *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. New York: Free Press.

Conger, R. (1976) Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior: A synthesis. *Criminology* 14(1), 17–40.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hindelang, M. J. (1973) Causes of delinquency: A partial replication and extension. *Social Problems* 20(4), 471–487.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kempf, K. (1993) The empirical status of Hirschi's control theory. In F. Adler & W. S. Laufer (eds.), *New Directions in Criminological Theory: Volume 4*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 143–188.

Krohn, M. D., & Massey, J. L. (1980) Social control and delinquent behavior: An examination of the elements of the social bond. *The Sociological Quarterly* 21(4), 529–543.

Matsueda, R. L. (1982) Testing control theory and differential association: A causal modeling approach. *American Sociological Review* 47, 489–504.

Nye, F. I. (1958) *Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Paternoster, R., & Triplett, R. (1988) Disaggregating self-reported delinquency and its implications for theory. *Criminology* 26(4), 591–625.

Reiss, A. J. (1951) Delinquency as the failure of personal and social controls. *American Sociological Review* 16(2), 196–207.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sutherland, E. H. (1947) *Principles of Criminology*, 4th edn. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Social Learning Theory

DANIELLE R. KLECKNER

Ronald L. Akers' theory of social learning builds on Edwin H. Sutherland's theory of differential association. According to Sutherland, criminal behavior is learned through an individual's differential associations, that is, relationships with family, school, peers, and so on. Sutherland's theory, however, fails to explain "the *mechanisms* and *processes* through which criminal learning takes place" (Lilly, Cullen, and Ball 2007: 48). Recognizing this limitation, Akers sought to extend Sutherland's theory by combining the principles of differential association with the learning principles developed by behavioral psychologists (Paternoster and Bachman 2001). While differential association theory and social learning theory are often pitted against one another, Akers' theory was meant to complement Sutherland's theory, not rival it (Paternoster and Bachman 2001).

In the initial phases of the development of social learning theory, Akers and his colleague, Robert Burgess, published a paper (Burgess and Akers 1966) that "sought to explain the precise learning mechanisms behind differential associations" (Paternoster and Bachman 2001: 179). Recognizing that they could combine Sutherland's nine propositions of differential association theory with the principles developed by behavioral psychologists, Burgess and Akers developed the theory of differential association-reinforcement, based on B. F. Skinner's principles of operant conditioning and reinforcement theory and Albert Bandura's social learning theory (Skinner 1963; Bandura 1977; Akers and Jensen 2003). The mechanism borrowed from operant conditioning was that "behavior is influenced by its consequences" (Paternoster and Bachman 2001: 179). However, while Skinner's emphasis was on operant conditioning and how an individual learns behaviors, another behavioral psychologist, Albert Bandura, focused on cognitive psychology and "the symbolic interaction between persons and their environments" (Paternoster

and Bachman 2001: 181). Bandura argued that "by arranging environmental inducements, generating cognitive supports, and producing consequences for their own actions, people are able to exercise some measure of control over their own behavior" (Bandura 1977: 13). In essence, it was with the consideration and understanding of these two particular learning mechanisms – Skinner's operant conditioning theory and Bandura's social learning theory – that Burgess and Akers established their differential association-reinforcement theory (Paternoster and Bachman 2001).

Differential association-reinforcement theory took Sutherland's nine propositions, stated in differential-association theory, and restated them as seven propositions that were reanalyzed and recreated to include the concepts of behavioral theory (Burgess and Akers 1966; Paternoster and Bachman 2001). Burgess and Akers' (1966: 137–144) restated seven propositions are as follows:

1. Criminal behavior is learned according to the principles of operant conditioning.
2. Criminal behavior is learned both in non-social situations that are reinforcing or discriminative and through that social interaction in which the behavior of other persons is reinforcing or discriminative for criminal behavior.
3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs in those groups that comprise the individual's major source of reinforcement.
4. The learning of criminal behavior, including specific techniques, attitudes, and avoidance procedures, is a function of the effective and available reinforcers, and the existing reinforcement contingencies.
5. The specific class of behaviors that are learned and their frequency of occurrence are a function of the reinforcers that are effective and available, and the rules or norms by which these reinforcers are applied.
6. Criminal behavior is a function of norms that are discriminative for criminal behavior, the learning of which takes place when such

behavior is more highly reinforced than non-criminal behavior.

7. The strength of criminal behavior is a direct function of the amount, frequency, and probability of its reinforcement.

In the development of his theory of social learning, Akers argued that there are four distinct components to learning criminal behavior: (1) differential association, (2) definitions, (3) differential reinforcement, and (4) imitations (Akers 1998). The first component, *differential association*, is a direct reference to Sutherland's theory of differential association. Akers argued that differential associations are made up of two separate dimensions: an interactional and a normative dimension. The first, interactional dimension, consists of how individuals interact with, and directly associates themselves with, others who engage in particular types of behavior, such as criminal behavior. The second, normative dimension, consists of the "different patterns of norms and values" that individuals become exposed to while interacting with others within their differential associations (Akers 2001: 194). Akers reinforced Sutherland's concept of differential association as a major component in the explanation of how criminal behavior is learned; however, the learning process does not stop once the individual chooses whom to interact and associate with.

The second component in the learning process of criminal behavior, according to Akers, concerns the *definitions* that an individual is exposed to throughout their lifetime. Akers characterized "definitions" as "one's own attitudes or meanings that one attaches to given behavior" (Akers 2001: 195). While there are definitions that can promote prosocial behavior, there are also definitions that can promote antisocial (i.e., criminal) behavior. As Sutherland stated in his sixth proposition ("the principle of differential association"), "a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law" (Sutherland and Cressey 1974: 75–76). It is when an individual's definitions that favor the violation of law exceed those definitions that do not favor the violation of law that the individual becomes delinquent. As Akers argued, "the more one's own attitudes

approve of a behavior, the greater the chances are that one will do it" (Akers 2001: 195).

The third component of the learning process concerns *differential reinforcement*. Differential reinforcement "refers to the balance of anticipated or actual rewards or punishments that follow or are consequences of behavior" (Akers 2001: 195). For a behavior to continue, it is important that that behavior be reinforced through rewards, while for a behavior to be stopped, it is important that that behavior be reinforced through punishments. It is this process of differential reinforcement that is largely based on Skinner's principles of operant conditioning (Skinner 1963; Akers and Jensen 2003). While reinforcement is needed in order to continue or curb a behavior, the reinforcement can come in either a positive or negative manner. Positive reinforcement involves an action or behavior being more likely to be committed or repeated because that particular action or behavior allows the individual to receive a reward when that behavior or action is completed (e.g., approval, money) (Akers 2001). Negative reinforcement involves an action or behavior that is more likely to occur when it allows the individual to avoid any unpleasant consequences due to their actions (Akers 2001). Like reinforcement, punishment can be either positive (direct) or negative (indirect). Direct punishment consists of attaching painful consequences to a particular behavior; indirect punishment consists of removing the reward for a particular behavior. As Akers argues, "whether individuals will refrain from or commit a crime at any given time depends on the past, present, and anticipated rewards and punishments for their actions" (Akers 2001: 196). According to Akers, then, criminal behavior will be repeated and become persistent if it is reinforced.

The fourth and final component of the learning process concerns *imitation*, which "refers to the engagement of behavior after the observation of similar behavior in others" (Akers 2001: 196). Akers emphasized that imitation is an important component in the learning process, especially during the initial acquisition phase of the criminal behavior. Once the individual adopts a particular behavior, the maintenance of that behavior relies on the reinforcement received by others with whom that individual associates.

Having laid out the four components involved in learning criminal behavior, Akers (1998: 50–51) hypothesized that an individual is more likely to engage in criminal behavior when:

1. He or she differentially associates with others who commit, model, and support violations of social and legal norms.
2. The violative behavior is differentially reinforced over behavior in conformity with the norm.
3. He or she is more exposed to and observes more deviant than conforming models.
4. His or her own learned definitions are favorable toward committing the deviant acts.

Akers et al. (1979) conducted an empirical test on social learning theory, specifically focusing on data that concerned adolescent abuse of alcohol and marijuana. The results of the study showed that the four components of his theory – viz. differential association, definitions, differential reinforcement, and imitations – could explain "55% of the variance in drinking behavior and 68% of the variance in marijuana behavior" (Akers et al. 1979: 642). However, while the core components of social learning were shown to explain the variance in the antisocial behavior of adolescents, Akers et al. (1979) came to the conclusion that those components did not all impact learning behavior to the same degree. The effectiveness of the components were ranked as follows (in decreasing order): differential association, definitions, differential social reinforcement, and imitations (Akers et al. 1979).

Pratt et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of empirical tests of social learning theory. They reached three conclusions. First, there is as much empirical support for social learning theory as there is for other such criminological theories. Second, the theory's concepts of differential association and definitions have been tested extensively not only by researchers testing social learning theory, but also by those testing all theories related to individual explanations of crime. Third, and as Akers et al. (1979) also discovered in their own previous research, differential association and definitions are the strongest predictors regarding how criminal behavior is learned, while differential reinforcement and imitations are the weakest (Pratt et al. 2010).

The major objection to social learning theory concerns the core concept of differential association and how it affects delinquency (Akers and Sellers 2004). Akers (1998) argues that differential association drives delinquency and the criminal learning process; the objection is that this gets things exactly the wrong way around – "rather than delinquent associations causing delinquency, delinquency causes delinquent associations" (Akers and Sellers 2004: 98). In other words, it is a case of "birds of a feather flocking together." Akers responds that while this common adage is true, also true is that "if you lie down with the dogs you get up with fleas" (Akers 1999: 480). Akers explains that the "tendency for persons to choose interaction with others with behavioral similarities" and the "tendency for persons who interact to have mutual influence on one another's behavior," are part of the same learning process (Akers 1998: 56). The process of both selecting and socializing with delinquent associations is, as Akers (1998: 56) explains, "simply the learning process operating at different times." Social learning theory can thus meet this particular objection.

SEE ALSO: Criminology; Differential Association Theory; Social Bonding Theory; Social Control Theories; Theory and Public Policy.

References

Akers, R. L. (1998) *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Akers, R. L. (1999) Social learning and social structure: Reply to Sampson, Morash, and Krohn. *Theoretical Criminology* 3(4), 477–493.

Akers, R. L. (2001) Social learning theory. In R. Paternoster & R. Bachman (eds.), *Explaining Criminals and Crime: Essays in Contemporary Criminological Theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury, pp. 192–210.

Akers, R. L., & Jensen, G. F. (eds.) (2003) *Social Learning Theory and the Explanation of Crime: Advances in Criminological Theory*, vol. 11. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Akers, R. L., Krohn, M. D., Lanza-Kaduce, L., & Radosevich, M. (1979) Social learning and deviant behavior: A specific test of a general theory. *American Sociological Review* 44, 636–655.

Akers, R. L., & Sellers, C. S. (2004) *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*, 4th edn. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Bandura, A. (1977) *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Burgess, R. L., & Akers, R. L. (1966) A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems* 14(2), 128–147.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2007) *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences*, 4th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paternoster, R., & Bachman, R. (2001) *Explaining Criminals and Crime: Essays in Contemporary Criminological Theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Sellers, C. S. et al. (2010) The empirical status of social learning theory: A meta-analysis. *Justice Quarterly* 27(6), 765–802.

Skinner, B. F. (1963) Operant behavior. *The American Psychologist* 18(8), 503–515.

Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1974) *Criminology*, 9th edn. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

Social Process Theories

JENNIFER L. HUCK and CAMIE MORRIS

Social process theories are a grouping of criminological theories that propose that criminal behavior is created by the learning or socialization process of human behavior. Social process theories are a categorical grouping that includes the theories of differential association, social learning, social control, and labeling.

Social process theories hold that individual behavior is created through the process of socialization. Socialization is the formal process of learning the cultural and social structural elements required to become a prosocial adult. The socialization process is internalized by the individual in connection with the interactions with the social environment, including social attributes and social structure. Social attributes are the personality traits people develop through interactions with others. Social structure is the organizations, institutions, and processes built through relationships and interactions. In short, attributes are gained from communication with others, whereas structure is where the communication and interaction occur as part of societal institutions and groups. In essence, social process theories argue that individuals engage in criminal behavior because the connections they encounter and develop during socialization demonstrate that criminal acts are an appropriate and legitimate behavior.

Social process theories have three main tenets. First, social process theories are micro-level theories that define behavior as a result of social pressures upon the individual. These theories all have a strong sociological base but, unlike social structural theories, they are most concerned with individual interaction. The second tenet of social process theories is the belief that crime is a normal part of society; all societies function with some level of crime. The third tenet of social process theories is the belief that crime is a social attribute. As a social attribute, crime becomes an individual trait gained through interaction with others in the social structure. Social process theories, therefore, suggest that crime is a normal behavior created through social interactions during the life-long process of socialization.

One of the first social process theories of criminology, differential association theory, was developed by Edwin Sutherland. Differential association theory explains criminal behavior as being learned through personal networks, communication, and interaction (Sutherland 1947; Cressey 1967). Differential association theory thus takes criminal behavior to be learned through social interaction like all other behaviors. Sutherland (1947) outlined the following propositions to explain differential association theory: (1) criminal behavior is learned; (2) criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication; (3) the principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups; (4) learning includes techniques as well as the direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes; (5) the direction is learned from definitions of legal codes as favorable or unfavorable; (6) criminality occurs with an excess of definitions unfavorable to the legal codes; (7) differential association may vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity; (8) learning criminal behavior is the same process as any other learned behavior; (9) criminal behavior is not explained by needs and values. The more people holding favorable views of crime an individual meaningfully and closely connects with, the more likely it is that that individual will engage in crime. When individuals interact and communicate with people who suggest that behaviors such as drug use, shoplifting, or burglary are a normal part of life, these crimes become justified behavior in their eyes whereas individuals who learn that honesty and fairness are the way to live, and that criminal behavior is wrong, will avoid crime.

Differential association theory has been criticized for not directly specifying from whom criminal behaviors are learned and for not identifying the specific manner in which people learn criminal behavior (Burgess and Akers 1966). Differential association does indicate that behaviors are learned through interaction with those people

closest to an individual, but does not present the mechanisms through which the learning takes place. Ron Akers advanced Sutherland's theory by applying classic, operant, and social learning concepts to criminal behavior to better specify how criminal behaviors are learned (Burgess and Akers 1966; Akers 1985).

These behavioral learning theories are a helpful tool in seeing the mechanisms by which humans learn (for a discussion related to criminology, see Bernard et al. 2011). First, classic conditioning suggested that individuals learn through repeated exposure to stimuli. The stimuli would evoke a response and eventually that response would become automatic. The classic study of Pavlov's dog is an example. A bell rings when food is placed in front of the dog; the dog salivates because of the food. After time, the dog will salivate due to hearing the bell even without the food being present. People learn to engage in criminal acts because there is a motivation or incitement to engage in the act given an appropriate opportunity. Second, operant conditioning demonstrates that people learn appropriate behavior through punishments and reinforcements that are negative and positive. In this manner, punishments are given when you want someone to stop a behavior and rewards are provided to encourage the continued wanted behavior. With operant conditioning, then, individuals learn to continue behavior due to not wanting punishments or to wanting reinforcements. Third, social learning, as a behavioral theory, holds that humans are unique in their ability to engage in social learning, whereas other animals only react from classic and operant conditioning. In short, social learning is the human ability to learn from conditioning and through cognitive processes that allow us to interpret experiences and engage in behavior. Social learning suggests that humans do not require direct experience to learn; we can learn by watching others and the punishments or rewards they receive. We then engage in behaviors we have defined as appropriate.

Akers applied the human behavioral learning concepts to Sutherland's differential association theory and developed social learning theory, which explains criminal behaviors by explaining how social learning operates in the context of societal institutions and structures (Akers 1985; Akers and Jensen 2006). Social learning theory contends that individuals learn criminal behavior like all other behaviors, as defined through the concepts of differential association, definitions, differential reinforcement, and imitation (Akers 1985). Akers' understanding of differential association is similar to Sutherland's, in that individuals learn behaviors through the various groups they come into contact with throughout life, especially as a product of socialization. These various primary and secondary groups include family members, classmates, co-workers, and friends. Depending on the strength of the relationship with these groups, individuals are more or less likely to learn behaviors, such as criminal behavior, from them. What the individual learns from these associations are the favorable and unfavorable beliefs or values regarding criminal behavior, in addition to the knowledge needed to actually commit crime. The more favorable beliefs learned and the increased opportunity to learn how to commit the crime, the more likely the individual will behave criminally. Differential reinforcement is adopted from operant conditioning with the understanding that the more reinforcement and less punishment a person is exposed to, the more likely the individual will be to participate in crime. The last concept, imitation, suggests that crime can be learned when an individual has witnessed others engaging in an act and subsequently models their behavior.

These four concepts of differential association, definitions, differential reinforcement, and imitation are interwoven and cannot be simply separated when discussing why people conduct criminal behaviors or become criminals (Akers 1985). These social learning terms work together to determine why criminal behavior occurs. The definition of learning, differential reinforcement, and imitation all occur in the presence of differential associations. You learn definitions because of the reinforcement you witness or encounter from the various people you know. You receive reinforcement or punishment because of the beliefs and values of your associations. You are more likely to imitate the people closest to you because of your definitions and experiences with reinforcement. In short, the creation of criminal behavior does not occur in a vacuum but is an evolving construction based upon continued socialization throughout life's process.

The next social process theory is social control, which explains criminal behavior in a unique manner. Most theories explain why people engage in criminal behaviors; social control theory, on the other hand, explains why individuals do *not* commit criminal acts. This theory, developed by Travis Hirschi (1969), holds that everyone is born with the propensity to become a criminal or delinquent and it is the socialization process that creates positive social bonds and proper levels of control to help people stay clear of the criminal path. In this manner, social control theory explains positive socialization, and social bonds limit individuals' connection and exposure to criminality.

Socialization is the process of development that each individual goes through to learn how to be positive a social citizen. This socialization aids with the creation and appreciation of formal and informal social control mechanisms. Formal social control is the official means by which a society controls its citizenry. The most influential mechanism of formal social control is the criminal justice system. Informal social control is the social sanctions delivered by such people as parents, grandparents, and peers to help individuals learn the norms of life that are not dictated by law. Social bond theory argues that proper socialization leads to the creation of societal bonds, which in turn protect individuals from criminal involvement.

According to Hirschi (1969), social bonds are the connections to socially acceptable norms, values, and beliefs. Social bonds can be measured through four interconnecting concepts of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. Attachment is the affection and sensitivity toward others or the connection that one has with people. Attachment suggests that when individuals have strong regard for others (including family members, peers, friends, co-workers, and teachers), they will be more concerned about how their actions influence others. In this light, the person will not want to disappoint those closest to them. Affection aids in the development of prosocial bonds, because it provides an individual with a group of people to be concerned about (and vice versa).

Commitment is the person's stake in conformity (Hirschi 1969). In other words, it describes how much time and energy a person spends working toward conventional success, as defined by the conventional beliefs of an individual's culture and society, whereas attachment is to people, commitment is to the organizations and institutions of involvement. Typically, it is viewed as the willingness and desire to prepare for their future successes and goals. These goals are viewed as conventional, such as those relating to education and employment. Commitment suggests that the more individuals want to achieve in education and employment, the more likely they are to stay away from delinquency and crime, because they understand that a criminal lifestyle will be an obstacle to legitimate forms of success.

Involvement is the physical act of participating in conventional organizations and institutions (Hirschi 1969). The idea behind involvement is that the busier a person is, the less likely he or she will be to engage in criminal behavior. Some examples of prosocial engagements are sports, school, work, religious activities, and volunteer work. Arguably, it is not necessarily the amount of time available to the person that is decisive, but rather the fact that increased involvements can lead to more attachments and commitments for the individual.

Belief is the acceptance of conventional values, beliefs, and norms of the individual's culture and society (Hirschi 1969). The "glue" that holds attachments, commitments, and involvement together are the beliefs and values that the person develops to ensure appropriate connections to positive social bonds. Beliefs such as honesty, trustworthiness, and morals aid individuals to accept the conventional viewpoints of achievement and goals, as well as the means to obtain these traditional forms of success. Prosocial beliefs provide the motivation to stay away from criminality and create a legitimate lifestyle.

Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory suggests that each of these elements is necessary for prosocial bonds to develop within an individual and that these concepts are not independent of each other. Attachment and commitment are often regarded as the most important reasons why people do not engage in criminal acts; however, it is difficult to compare studies on the matter, as they employ different definitions and means of measurement (Kempf 1993; Costello and Vowell 1999; Bernard et al. 2011). Involvement is perhaps the foundational element of social bonds because if an individual does not participate in

activities, organizations, or institutions such as church, school, and family, then that individual does not have anyone or anything to serve as the basis for requirements of attachments and commitments. Involvement is inextricably linked to the people one cares about and who in turn care about one, as well as the movement toward achievement. Beliefs become the incentive for individuals to stay connected as legitimate success looms in the future; individuals hold on to the belief that to achieve goals and have positive relationships particular values and norms must be adhered to. In essence, the development of positive social bonds results from purposive socialization that keeps people from engaging in delinquency and crime.

Labeling theory originates in symbolic interactionism and ideas such as the "looking glass self" (Cooley 1902) and self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton 1957) that ultimately suggest that self-image is created through social interactions (Blumer 1969; Stryker 1980). Becker (1963) and Lemert (1951), the forefathers of labeling theory, hold that the labels individuals receive from society are decisive factors in their ability to interact and connect; some labels, such as "criminal," have devastating results. Labeling theory is not concerned with the primary act of crime, but rather with the criminal justice system and society's response to the first act of crime. Labeling theory is thus best seen as seeking to explain secondary acts of deviance and crime, answering the question: Why do individuals continue to engage in crime after sanctions and punishments have been received?

Labeling theory holds that crime is a social construct; that is to say, crime is a creation of cultures and societies, and as such, definitions of crime can differ from one to the other. It is not the behavior in and of itself that is the punishable act; the behavior is not viewed as wrong or bad until society labels it as such through the process of criminalization (Tannenbaum 1938; Lemert 1951). Hence, until an act is codified and criminalized, society does not view it as a crime. Connected to this is the concept of the criminal and who is labeled as one. Various definitions of "criminal" exist; for example, "criminals are simply those who break the law," or "criminals are those who break the law and are processed through the criminal justice system."

Society determines who is called "criminal," just as it determines what behavior is called "crime." Therefore, crime and criminals are nothing more than labels.

According to labeling theory, various factors might explain why individuals start to commit deviant, delinquent, and criminal acts; it is, however, the social and systemic response that causes *continued* deviance. A process approach illustrates how a person becomes a criminal (Lemert 1951). First, the initial act becomes detected by the justice system, which arrests, charges, convicts, and sentences the individual. Once this is accomplished, the individual is seen as a criminal who has committed a crime. This is the creation of a new identity, which both the individual and society can accept or reject. Labeling theory argues that in many societies the "criminal" label becomes a master status that an individual cannot ignore, as it shapes numerous interactions and future opportunities. For instance, once a person is a felon and applies for employment, their felon status is known or becomes known through criminal background checks. The status of criminal is overpowering and the other accomplishments of the individual are pushed to the side (Becker 1963). Once the "criminal" label is accepted by the individual and society, the individual has few opportunities to engage in legitimate experiences to become successful in conventional society. This promotes additional criminal behaviors and deviance because other opportunities are not available. In short, the criminal justice system and society as a whole create a "criminal" label that the individual cannot escape and which in fact spurs the individual to continue engaging in criminal behavior.

SEE ALSO: Akers, Ronald; Criminology; Differential Association Theory; Hirschi, Travis; Labeling and Symbolic Interaction Theories of Crime; Social Control Theories; Social Learning Theory; Sutherland, Edwin.

References

Akers, R. L. (1985) *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*, 3rd edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Akers, R. L., & Jensen, G. F. (2006) The empirical status of social learning theory of crime and deviance: The

past, present, and future. In F. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory. Advances in Criminological Theory, vol. 15*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, pp. 37–76.

Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press.

Bernard, T. J., Snipes, J. B., Vold, G. B., & Gerould, A. L. (2011) *Vold's Theoretical Criminology*, 6th edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspectives and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burgess, R. L., & Akers, R. L. (1966) A differential association reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems* 14, 128–147.

Cooley, C. H. (1902) *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Scribner.

Costello, B. J., & Vowell, P. R. (1999) Testing control theory and differential association: A reanalysis of the Richmond Youth Project data. *Criminology* 37, 815–842.

Cressey, D. R. (1967) Culture conflict, differential association, and normative conflict. In M. E. Wolfgang (ed.), *Crime and Culture: Essays in Honor of Thorsten Sellin*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc, pp. 43–54.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kempf, K. L. (1993) The empirical status of Hirschi's control theory. In F. Adler & W. S. Laufer (eds.), *New Directions in Criminological Theory*, vol. 4. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, pp. 143–185.

Lemert, E. (1951) *Social Pathology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Merton, R. K. (1957) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Stryker, S. (1980) *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Menlo Park, CA: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company.

Sutherland, E. (1947) *Principles of Criminology*, 4th edn. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott.

Tannenbaum, F. (1938) *Crime and the Community*. Boston, MA: Ginn.

Further Readings

Akers, R. L., & Sellers, C. S. (2009) *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Kubrin, C. E., Stucky, T. D., & Krohn, M. D. (2009) *Researching Theories of Crime and Deviance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lilly, J., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2010) *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences*, 5th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Social Disorganization Theory

SUSAN MCNEELEY

At the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars started to reject early theories of crime that focused on individual traits in favor of explanations of crime as a product of the social environment. The Chicago School of criminology argued that cities themselves contained criminogenic properties that influenced individuals' deviant behavior. One of the most important theories originating in the Chicago School was social disorganization theory. Social disorganization theory maintains that differences in crime rates across neighborhoods can be explained by socioeconomic characteristics of the community that inhibit the residents' ability to exert informal social control to prevent crime.

Social disorganization theory is based, in part, on concentric zone theory (Park, Burgess, and McKenzie 1925). Park and Burgess argued that, like living organisms, cities evolve naturally. Specifically, the competition for scarce resources within the area, especially land, leads to spatial differentiation of the city into zones. In the center of the city lies the central business district, which contains businesses and governmental institutions. The area surrounding the city center, called the "zone of transition," contains the manufacturing industry available in the city; low-priced housing is available for rent in this zone as well. The outer zones are residential, with the quality (and therefore the price) of housing increasing with distance from the city center.

These zones experience change due to succession, in which residents and businesses move away from the center of the city into more desirable areas in the outer zones. Because of this expansion of the central business district, landlords in the zone of transition are interested in selling their property to businesses or factories. This results in poor living conditions in the zone of transition due to landlords' unwillingness to invest in the property, which contributes to high residential turnover in the zone. Housing in the zone of transition is typically occupied by immigrants or other poor workers, who move to better parts of the city when they have made enough money to do so.

Park and Burgess' theory led to the assumption that undesirable outcomes, such as unemployment or crime, would be clustered in the zone of transition. Furthermore, their work also encouraged the use of mapping in sociological research. Both of these contributions are important for understanding the development of social disorganization theory.

Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay's (1942) classic study mapped addresses of juvenile delinquents to determine whether they were equally distributed throughout the city. The results showed that crime was concentrated across neighborhoods. Specifically, several neighborhoods were high-crime areas across several time periods, regardless of the ethnic composition of those communities. This finding demonstrated the importance of environmental factors in the etiology of crime. In particular, Shaw and McKay noted that high-crime neighborhoods shared other characteristics. Neighborhoods with high rates of juvenile delinquents also had high rates of poverty, racial or ethnic heterogeneity, and residential instability.

Shaw and McKay argued that these characteristics affected delinquency in three major ways. First, social disorganization prevented residents of the community from forming relationships with one another, which was considered to be necessary for the successful exercise of informal social control. Because of the inability of these communities to control crime, delinquency rates increased. Second, since the residents of these communities were likely to experience poverty and other undesirable social conditions, they were likely to engage in delinquency due to strain. It was posited by Shaw and McKay that the lack of opportunities to achieve legitimate success in these communities would lead residents to turn to crime. Third, Shaw and McKay included an element of cultural transmission in their original

theory of social disorganization. They argued that adult criminals in the community would serve as role models for younger children and adolescents, encouraging them to adopt delinquent values and engage in delinquent activities.

In *Social Sources of Delinquency* (1978), Ruth Kornhauser reformulated the original conception of social disorganization theory into what became known as the systemic model of social disorganization. The systemic model removes two of the intervening mechanisms, cultural transmission and strain, and focuses on the mediating effect of community social systems, which permit residents to prevent crime through informal social control.

In formulating the systemic model, Kornhauser (1978) rejected the inclusion of strain and cultural deviance into social disorganization theory. First, she rejected strain theory, arguing that members of all social groups can experience strain due to their perception of relative deprivation. Second, she argued that subcultural theories and control theories cannot be integrated due to incompatible underlying assumptions. Subcultural theories of crime maintain that there is cultural conflict; in other words, there are groups within society that do not agree on appropriate values and behavior. According to these theories, individuals commit crime because they have cultural values favoring those activities; therefore, they perceive their behavior as proper rather than deviant. Control theories, on the other hand, assume that all members of society agree on the proper values and agree on what activities should be considered deviant. Kornhauser rejected the assumption of cultural deviance theories and therefore focused on the element of informal social control. She did, however, include a discussion of cultural disorganization, in which neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics could weaken individuals' belief in traditional cultural values, which could increase their involvement in crime.

Bursik and Grasmick (1993) identified three types of social ties within communities. First are private ties, or the relationships between members of the community. This type of social network focuses on the strength of the friendships amongst neighbors. Second are public ties, which involve the connections that individual community members have with community organizations or institutions, such as religious institutions and community centers. Third, "parochial ties" refer to the level of interaction between community members and government entities, such as the police department or prosecutor's office.

While several early studies found support for the effect of the exogenous socioeconomic variables on crime rates, the systemic model of social disorganization was not fully tested until Sampson and Groves' classic study in 1989. Sampson and Groves used data from the British Crime Survey (BCS) to test whether poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, residential instability, family disruption, and urbanization affected crime rates indirectly through sparse friendship networks, unsupervised teenage peer groups, and low organization participation. Lowenkamp, Cullen, and Pratt (2003) successfully replicated Sampson and Groves' study with later BCS data, adding additional support for the systemic model. Further, Sun, Triplett, and Gainey (2004) also replicated the study using US data, demonstrating the ability of the systemic model of social disorganization theory to explain variances in crime rates across neighborhoods in US cities.

However, the findings of other studies question the systemic model. Several scholars argue that the strength of social ties amongst residents of a community does not necessarily increase informal social control. Specifically, a number of studies indicate that social ties do not have to be strong to influence crime rates. Bellair (1997) found that communities in which residents socialize together at least once a year had significantly lower crime rates than did communities with residents who socialized less often. Similarly, not all types of social ties affect crime rates in the same way. Rountree and Warner (1999) found that social ties amongst women affected crime rates, while social ties amongst male residents were not as important in differentiating between high- and low-crime areas.

Strong community ties can sometimes be problematic for the use of informal social control. Pattillo's (1998) ethnographic study of black middle-class communities in Chicago demonstrates that criminal networks are often highly integrated with other community networks. Community members may even see gangs and other criminal networks as performing important tasks within the neighborhood. This familiarity with the neighborhood's criminal element

prevents community members from effectively controlling crime; they are close to those engaging in criminal behavior and therefore may be unwilling to disrupt their activity. Similarly, Wilkinson (2007) conducted interviews with young males to determine when adult members of their communities intervened in undesirable situations. The study showed that informal social control in the form of intervention was used when social ties were moderately strong, but adults tended not to intervene in situations in which they had strong ties to the parties involved.

In response to these criticisms of the systemic model, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) developed the theory of collective efficacy. "Collective efficacy" refers to a community's level of trust and willingness to intervene in undesirable situations. Rather than focusing on the systems of social networks within the community and assuming that closer-knit communities more effectively control crime, collective efficacy focuses on the extent to which community members actually intervene or would intervene in situations involving crime or delinquency. According to Browning and Dietz (2004), since collective efficacy can be hindered by social networks, which provide social capital for offenders, collective efficacy must be considered separately from the strength of social ties within a neighborhood. Research on the impact of collective efficacy on community crime rates indicates that higher levels of collective efficacy are related to lower levels of offending and victimization (Sampson et al. 1997; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Browning and Dietz 2004; Pratt and Cullen 2005). Further, individuals' perceptions of their community's collective efficacy are related to fear of crime, with those who perceive their neighborhoods as possessing higher collective efficacy reporting less fear (Gibson et al. 2002).

Critics of social disorganization theory have argued that Shaw and McKay's theory of the evolution of neighborhoods is no longer applicable and that the attributes they associated with high-crime areas (poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential instability) are no longer found in inner-city neighborhoods. In response to this criticism, modern studies testing social disorganization theory use concentrated disadvantage as the exogenous variable. The term "concentrated disadvantage," coined by

Wilson in *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987), refers to historical processes that contributed to extreme disadvantage in inner cities and the characteristics that these communities exhibit. Wilson argued that current impoverishment of the inner city has its roots in deindustrialization, when manufacturing jobs became less available to those in the lower classes. This caused unemployment and poverty to increase in the inner city, where factories were traditionally located. The deterioration of these areas caused out-migration of middle-class white and minority residents, which compounded the high rates of poverty, and businesses, moving many low-skill jobs in the service industry away from residents of these communities. Due to these historical processes, disadvantaged communities in the inner cities are distinguished by high rates of poverty and unemployment, high rates of African American or Hispanic residents, and low rates of residential mobility.

Following Kornhauser's removal of cultural transmission from the model of social disorganization, the role of culture in mediating the effect of neighborhood characteristics on crime rates was ignored until the 1990s. The reintegration of cultural disorganization into social disorganization theory began with Sampson and Wilson's (1995) argument that residents of disadvantaged communities have a diminished ability to effectively communicate regarding shared goals and values, leading to the emergence of sets of nontraditional values that either encourage or simply allow participation in crime or other deviant activities.

A notable example of work on the emergence of deviant values comes from Elijah Anderson's *Code of the Street*, published in 1999. Basing his theory on his ethnographic work in Philadelphia, Anderson argued that the impoverishment in inner-city neighborhoods, coupled with the social isolation experienced by their residents, creates a lack of opportunity for members of such communities to achieve conventional goals and gain the respect of other community members in traditional ways, such as obtaining legitimate employment and starting a family. Due to this lack of opportunity, residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods reject traditional values and instead adopt the code of the street. Anderson describes the code of the

street as a set of informal rules regarding appropriate behavior in public situations. These rules describe the many ways in which one can earn or lose respect. Most notably for criminologists, the code of the street emphasizes masculinity and toughness as ways to gain respect and avoid trouble. Any real or perceived slight is taken as a sign of disrespect; one must respond violently to insults in order to avoid "losing face."

Empirical work has been supportive of Anderson's code of the street hypothesis. Individuals who adhere to beliefs in accordance with the street code are more likely to engage in violent behavior (Stewart and Simons 2006). Furthermore, Stewart and Simons (2010) found that neighborhood levels of cultural values are related to individual offending. This finding indicates that behavior is affected not only by one's personal values but also by the values held by others in the neighborhood. In addition to violent offending, the code of the street affects one's risk of victimization. Those who hold values from the code of the street are more likely to experience violent victimization than are those who do not (Stewart, Schreck, and Simons 2006).

Social disorganization theory was formulated through Shaw and McKay's belief that delinquency is caused by the social environment in which juveniles live. In particular, individuals who live in disorganized neighborhoods are encouraged to participate in criminal activity by two factors: (1) the community's loss of control over others' behavior, and (2) the exposure to criminal culture.

SEE ALSO: Collective Efficacy; Fear of Crime; Juvenile Street Gangs; McKay, Henry; Shaw, Clifford.

References

Anderson, E. (1999) *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Bellair, P. (1997) Social interaction and community crime: Examining the importance of neighbor networks. *Criminology* 35, 677–703.

Browning, C. R., & Dietz, R. D. (2004) The paradox of social organization: Networks, collective efficacy, and violent crime in urban neighborhoods. *Social Forces* 83, 503–534.

Bursik, R. J., & Grasmick, H. B. (1993) *Neighborhoods and Crime*. New York: Macmillan.

Gibson, C. L., Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Gaffney, M. J. (2002) Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly* 19, 537–564.

Kornhauser, R. (1978) *Social Sources of Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lowenkamp, C. T., Cullen, F. T., & Pratt, T. C. (2003) Replicating Sampson and Groves's test of social disorganization theory: Revisiting a criminological classic. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 40, 351–373.

Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001) Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology* 39, 517–558.

Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W., & McKenzie, R. D. (1925) *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pattillo, M. E. (1998) Sweet mother and gangbangers: Managing crime in a middle class neighborhood. *Social Forces* 76, 747–774.

Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2005) Assessing macro-level predictors and theories of crime: A meta-analysis. In M. Tonry (ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, *Volume 32*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 373–450.

Rountree, P. W., & Warner, B. (1999) Social ties and crime: Is the relationship gendered? *Criminology* 37, 789–814.

Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989) Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 94, 774–802.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997) Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277, 916–924.

Sampson, R. J., & Wilson, W. J. (1995) Toward a theory of race, crime and urban inequality. In J. Hagan & R. D. Peterson (eds.), *Crime and Inequality*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 37–54.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stewart, E., Schreck, C. J., & Simons, R. L. (2006) I ain't gonna let no one disrespect me: Does the code of the street reduce or increase violent victimization among African American adolescents? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 43, 427–458.

Stewart, E., & Simons, R. L. (2006) Structure and culture in African-American adolescent violence: A partial test of the code of the streets thesis. *Justice Quarterly* 23, 1–33.

Stewart, E., & Simons, R. L. (2010) Race, code of the street, and violent delinquency: A multilevel investigation of neighborhood street culture and individual norms of violence. *Criminology* 48, 569–605.

Sun, I. Y., Triplett, R., & Gainey, R. R. (2004) Neighborhood characteristics and crime: A test of Sampson and Groves' model of social disorganization. *Western Criminology Review* 5, 1–16.

Wilkinson, D. L. (2007) Local social ties and willingness to intervene: Textured views among violent urban youth of neighborhood social control dynamics and situations. *Justice Quarterly* 24, 185–220.

Wilson, W. J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collective Efficacy

SALIH HAKAN CAN

Contrary to the ideas on human nature by classicists and economics, Einstadter and Henry (1995) stated that social ecologists accepted the idea that, "people are not just free rationally calculating atomic beings" but they are the ones with imaginations and momentous social worlds shaped by the social environment surrounding them. They emphasized that individual freedoms are constrained by the interdependence of humans and the reflection of this is in their natural tendency to form organized communities. Therefore, according to social ecologists, human behavior is the product of an environmentally structured choice.

One of Emile Durkheim's arguments was that rapid social change was associated with increases in crime due to the breakdown of social controls. Durkheim discusses the *mechanical* (simple) versus the *organic* society (modern) society. Mechanical societies are those dominated by a collective conscience, bound together by friendliness, neighborliness, and kinship; whereas, organic societies are characterized by a division of labor and societal interdependence. Lack of collective conscience in organic societies led to a state of anomie, or confusion, insecurity, and normlessness. According to Durkheim, restoration of social solidarity in organic societies had to come through a new "collective conscience," which created values and norms and imposed them on the individual. In organic societies, people must cooperate, love one another, and be willing to sacrifice the self to the group in order to promote solidarity (Durkheim cited in Einstadter and Henry 1995).

Bonding social capital refers to the interactions within a group that reinforce its borders. Conversely, bridging social capital involves interactions among groups, linking groups to one another. Both kinds of social capital facilitate social interactions and contribute to rapid dissemination of information and effective response to crime. However, if only binding social capital is present in the area affected by the crime, as Barton's (1969) "segmental integration" indicates, communication with outside groups may be slow, problematic, or largely nonexistent. Barton identifies social factors influencing willingness to help and act together within communities. He also refers to the influence of group culture on people's collective behavior by recognizing that there is a "normative mechanism" at work. If many people in a community collectively help each other to overcome problems, the local perception is likely to be that people are expected to help, establishing a helping norm in the group culture (Barton 1969).

Social capital provides a useful framework for understanding community response to crime. As an idea, social capital has enjoyed tremendous popularity and many scholars have adopted the concept in a variety of ways. Particularly useful here is the idea that social capital is a characteristic of the collectivity, whereas more recent treatments of social capital tend to focus on an individual's use of social ties and group membership for instrumental means. Social capital facilitates productive activity and therefore helps explain why some communities can mobilize resources better than others. Putnam (2000) defines social capital as the "features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (Putnam 2000: 23, 183). He argues that institutions that function well are found in regions having many formal and informal organizations. High levels of social participation by citizens in a variety of organizations seem to be the key to institutional efficiency. For instance, Putnam (2000: 183) states, "In the most civic regions citizens are actively involved in all sorts of local associations; literary guilds, local bands, hunting clubs, cooperatives and so on." Further, Coleman (1990) attempted to identify how social relations translate into social capital by identifying six forms of social capital: obligations and expectations, information potential, norms and effective sanctions, authority relations, appropriable social organization, and intentional organization.

In Shaw and McKay's (1942) classic work, they argue that three structural factors: low economic status, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential mobility led to the disruption of community social organization, which, in turn, accounted for variations in crime and delinquency. Sampson and Groves (1989) carried social disorganization to a different level and referred to the inability of a community structure to realize the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls. They offered that the structural dimensions of a community's social disorganization can be empirically measured in terms of the prevalence and interdependence of social networks in a community, both informal and formal, and in the span of collective supervision that the community directs toward local problems. They concluded that communities characterized by sparse friendships and networks, unsupervised teenage peer groups, and low organizational participation had disproportionately high rates of crime and delinquency. Besides, they stated that the variations in these dimensions of community social disorganization were shown to mediate in large part the effects of community structural characteristics. Sampson and Groves (1989) indicated that because of their research design's deficiencies, it should be noted that while local friendship networks, organizational participation, and control of teenage peer groups are all dimensions of the systemic concept of social disorganization, they are conceptually distinct and hence not different measures of the same variable.

Sampson and Wilson (1995) investigated the relation between neighborhoods and crime in an attempt to determine how community structures and cultures create different crime rates. Poor neighborhoods have higher crime rates, but they found that poverty itself is not related to crime. Rather poverty combined with residential mobility seems to be associated with higher levels of violent crime. Neighborhood rates or family disruption are strongly related to rates of violence; neighborhoods with larger minority populations have higher crime rates, but race itself tends to drop out when family disruption and poverty are taken into account; neighborhoods with high population density, many apartments, and high concentrations of individuals tend to have higher rates of crime and violence. Sampson and Wilson (1995) explained this pattern of research findings

with Shaw's concept of social disorganization. They defined social disorganization as the "inability of the community to realize its common values." They acknowledged that there are many reasons why communities cannot realize common values, but one reason is social capital – the networks or relationships among people that facilitate common actions and makes possible the achievement of common goals. Sampson and Wilson (1995) proposed a variety of policy recommendations for changing places not people: hot spot locators, cleaning up neighborhoods in order to stop the spiral of decay.

Sampson and Laub (1995) theorized the importance of informal social ties and bonds to society at all ages. They indicated that all previous studies of social control have focused either on adolescents or on official social control mechanisms such as arrest and imprisonment. As a result, most criminological studies have failed to examine the processes of informal social control from childhood through adulthood. They argued that the important institutions of informal social control vary across the life span. The dominant institutions of social control in childhood and adolescence are the family, school, peer groups, and the juvenile justice system. Within this framework, their organizing principle derives from the central idea of social control theory – crime and deviance result when an individual's social bond to society is weak or broken. Sampson and Laub adopted a general conceptualization of social control as the capacity of a social group to regulate itself according to desired principles and values, and hence to make norms and rules effective. They further emphasized the role of informal social controls that emerge from role reciprocities and structure of interpersonal bonds linking members of society to one another and to wider social institutions such as work, family, and school. They examine the extent to which social bonds inhibit crime and deviance early in the life course and the consequences for later development. They scrutinized social ties to both institutions and other individuals in the adult life course, and identify the transitions within individual life trajectories that relate to changes in informal social control. In this context, they contended that pathways to crime and conformity were mediated by social bonds to key institutions of social control.

While investigating safe and productive neighborhoods, Putman (2000) stated that researchers believed that social capital or lack of it is a significant factor in determining youth crime in neighborhoods. He claimed that presence of social capital allows for the enforcement of the positive standards for youth and offers them access to mentors, role models, educational sponsors, and job contacts outside the neighborhood, together with "emotional and financial support for individuals and supply political leverage and volunteers for community institutions" (Putman 2000: 312). Absence of positive community associations, informal adult friendship and kin networks, he claimed, leaves kids to their own devices, in which youth are most likely to act on shortsighted or self-destructive impulses (Putman 2000). Putman agrees with Sampson while stating that in the absence of social capital, youth are most prone to create their own social capital in the form of gangs or neighborhood crews.

Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) investigated why crime, specifically violent crime, was not evenly distributed throughout the United States even though there was strong support that violence had been associated with the low socio-economic status and residential instability of neighborhoods. In their six-year long longitudinal survey of 8,782 residents in 343 Chicago, Illinois neighborhoods, they found two significant characteristics: mutual social trust and altruism among neighbors, and their willingness to intervene when they see the children misbehaving were factors in explaining why some neighborhoods are less crime prone than others. They stated that a neighborhood's "collective efficacy" was a better predictor than was its poverty or residential instability of whether a person is likely to be victimized in the neighborhood. In this particular study of Chicago neighborhoods, other measures of social capital including individual participation in local organizations, the number of neighborhood programs, and the extent of kin and friendship ties in the neighborhood, did not seem to make much of a difference. The researchers concluded that "reduction in violence appears to be more directly attributable to informal social control and cohesion among residents" (Sampson et al. 1997: 922).

Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush (2001) revisit the collective efficacy concept again in their study "Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence." They stated that in order to clarify their systematic model it is needed to differentiate the resource potential represented by personal ties and the shared expectations among neighbors for engagement in social control represented by collective efficacy. By referring to Bursik's (1999) study, they acknowledged that "social networks foster the conditions under which collective efficacy may flourish, but they are not sufficient for the exercise of control" (Morenoff et al. 2001: 3). Accordingly, they have indicated that collective efficacy may be seen as a logical extension of systemically-based social disorganization and social capital theory, since they have discussed that even if rooted in weak personal ties, collective capacity for social action might constitute the more proximate social mechanism for understanding between-neighborhood variation in crime rates (Morenoff et al. 2001). Morenoff et al. (2001) concluded that spatial proximity to violence, collective efficacy, and alternative measures of neighborhood inequality emerged as the most consistent predictors of variations in homicide. Their test of racial "spatial regimes" suggested that the effect of collective efficacy is strongest in black neighborhoods. Different from the previous study of Sampson et al. (1997) and as accepting the reality that criminological theory has overstated the benefits to be derived from local forms of institutional organization, they unexpectedly found that organizations and voluntary associations are relatively unimportant. Another finding is that unity joined by social control seems to be the more immediate correlate of lower homicide relative to dense social ties (Morenoff et al. 2001). Some other studies have found a significant relationship between collective efficacy and intimate violence and street violence. Such works on crime and collective efficacy are now seen as the basis of macro-level theorizing of crime rates for later studies (Bellair 2000; Browning 2002; Bursik 1999; Peterson, Krivo, and Harris 2000).

SEE ALSO: Durkheim, Emile; McKay, Henry; Race/Ethnicity; Shaw, Clifford; Social Disorganization Theory.

References

Barton, A. H. (1969) *Communities in Disaster: A Sociological Analysis of Collective Stress Situations*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Bellair, P. (2000) Informal surveillance and street crime: A complex process. *Criminology* 38, 137–170.

Browning, C. R. (2002) The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64, 833–850.

Bursik, R. J. (1999) The informal control of crime through neighborhood networks. *Sociological Focus* 32, 85.

Coleman, J. S. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Einstadter, W. J., & Henry, S. (1995) *Criminological Theory: An Analysis of its Underlying Assumptions*. London: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001) *Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence*. University of Michigan, Population Studies Center, the Institute for Social Research Report No. 00–451.

Peterson, R. D., Krivo, L. J., & Harris, M. A. (2000) Disadvantage and neighborhood violent crime: Do local institutions matter? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37, 31–63.

Putman, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989) Community structure and crime: Testing social disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 94, 774–802.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1995) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sampson, R. J., & Wilson, W. J. (1995) Toward a theory of race, crime, and urban inequality. In John Hagan and Ruth Peterson (eds.), *Crime and Inequality*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 37–56.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997) Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277, 918–924.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Conflict Theories of Crime

PAMELA BLACK

Theories of crime causation and criminality have gone in and out of fashion, some being abandoned entirely and some being modified to explain more accurately more contemporary phenomena. Historically, however, criminological paradigms have evolved throughout human history, some having been discarded and many still having supporters and detractors.

The earliest explanations were spiritual explanations, attributing crime and deviance to otherworldly explanations. God or the gods were believed to protect the innocent and reveal the guilty. While spiritual explanations have been dismissed as unscientific, natural explanations have a basis in scientific observation, and natural explanations for deviance have been applied throughout human history and continue to be to this day. Paradigms that view crime as an expression of free will, that view crimes as a result beyond the control of the individual, and that view crime as a function of the way laws are written and enforced are classified as natural explanations.

Classical criminology views crime as behavior the individual chooses to engage in. From this perspective humans are intelligent and rational and elect to engage in crime after weighting the costs and benefits of criminality. For the past century criminologists have most often viewed criminal behavior not as something that is chosen, but as something that is caused by factors beyond the individual's control. Contemporary theories, including some conflict criminological theories, view most crime as something that is caused by external factors.

Conflict theory, and conflict criminology, trace back to Karl Marx. The early years of Marx's career saw the industrialization and urbanization of many nations, as well as the general unrest in Europe culminating in the March revolution of 1848 in the German states. The revolution of 1848 was not successful, and many liberals (including Marx) were forced to flee or felt permanently exiled. While not specifically addressing criminal or deviant behavior, Marx did study changes wrought in the laws of several countries during the Industrial Revolution. He noted that some nations enacted laws criminalizing certain traditional behaviors and ways of life that may have impeded the progress of industrialization, and anticipated the use of the law as a means to protect and further the interests of the capitalist class.

In order to understand conflict criminology it is necessary to differentiate between the conflict and consensus perspectives on the social contract. The consensus perspective argues that society is organized to represent the interests of the majority of its members, and that it makes decisions and creates policies that are based on the will of the people and are designed to further the common good. Even though the consensus perspective acknowledges the presence of competing groups in any society, proponents of this perspective believe that the state mediates between competing interest groups, and that society reflects the norms and interests of most members.

The conflict perspectives argues that the function of the state is not to mediate between the inevitable conflicting interest groups, but to represent the interests and reflect the values of the group or groups that have sufficient power to control the state. While the consensus perspective considers agreement and harmony the glue that holds society together, the conflict perspective states that society is actually held together by a balance of "opposing group interests and efforts" (Vold 1958: 204).

Conflict criminology encompasses two aspects of criminology: it seeks to explain the behavior of the law, and it examines crime as a by-product of group and culture conflict. *Law* is a formal form of social control, differing from other types of social control in that its form and sanctions are determined and exercised by the state. The conflict perspective of the law acknowledges the existence of consensus; however, from the conflict perspective the behavior of the law and the

criminal justice system can best be explained as resulting from conflict between groups and an exercise of power. The most powerful group in society creates definitions of normalcy and deviance that are favorable to, and serve to protect, their interests. The powerful group is in a position to create the law, described by Quinney (1970: 16) as *the formulation of criminal definitions*, and also in a position to apply the law and its sanctions, described by Quinney (1970: 16) *as the application of criminal definitions*. Conflict theorists studying the behavior of the law differ in their interpretations of who the powerful group or groups are. Some conflict theorists recognize the pluralistic nature of power groups, stating that most societies have multiple power centers with at least some control and input over criminal definitions and their applications and acknowledge that the laws of society (and their enforcement) reflect at least some common values. Other conflict, and particularly Marxists criminologists of the 1960s and 1970s argue against the pluralistic model and instead focus on the role of an all-powerful "power-elite" in determining laws, which then reflect not the common interests of society, but the values and interests of the power-elite.

Crime, or criminal behavior, reflects the conflict between social, economic, and political interest groups. Crime can be the result of either culture conflict or of group conflict. Culture conflict occurs when people act within the normative parameters of their own group; however, this behavior conflicts with the norms and standards of the dominant group, who make the laws. Thus, many laws reflect the standards of behavior adopted by the powerful groups in society. The behavior of less powerful groups, when it is not part of norms of the powerful group, is considered deviant or criminal. Crime is not, however, only the result of mismatched norms and rules of social behavior. While this is sometimes the case, crime, from a conflict criminological perspective, may also be the result of overt group conflict and competition. This type of crime is a direct result of group competition for scarce goods and resources. Individuals or groups may commit deviant or criminal acts as a means of acquiring goods and resources they have unequal access to. Groups and the individuals in them may also engage in crime as political action, designed to get their group more power, and to help the

group reposition itself in a more powerful position within society.

One of the earliest conflict theories was Thorsten Sellin's (1938) culture conflict theory. Crime, for Sellin, was the result of conflicting conduct norms. Homogeneous societies are characterized by a high percentage of shared norms and values, and therefore a consensus model of the law is an accurate model. As homogeneity decreases, and heterogeneity increases, the law is less likely to represent a common set of values. Hence, crime is greater in heterogeneous societies because of fewer shared conduct norms. Crime rates are lower in homogeneous societies because more people share the same conduct norms. Culture conflict is a complex process, with both primary and secondary culture conflict contributing to crime and criminalization. Primary cultural conflicts are those that occur between two distinct cultures, and can occur in three ways: (i) as a result of colonization when the colonizer replaces the colonized groups' norms with their own; (ii) at border areas, where divergent groups cross into each other's territories (and normative structures); or (iii) as a result of migration, when members of an outside group enter into the dominant group's territory. Secondary cultural conflict processes are virtually the same; however, it occurs through conflict between different subcultures, or between the dominant culture and one or more subcultures.

Vold (1958) developed an early model of group conflict theory based not on cultural conflicts, but on conflicts of interest. Groups are created by individuals with common interests, and these interests can best be furthered through the group. Furthermore, groups change, evolve, and disappear, and the process of creating and working with a group creates group identification and loyalty, leading to emotional attachment to the group, inspiring its members to actively seek to further the group's interests. The social interaction arising out of this process leads to social stability through the system of checks and balances arising out of continual group mobilization. Crime, from this perspective, is carried out not by individuals, but by groups for the good of the group; it may also be carried out by individuals acting under the auspices of the group.

Richard Quinney (1970) first posited that crime was not necessarily "real," but that it was socially

created. The social reality of crime makes the following assumptions about crime: (i) crime is a definition of human conduct created by authorized agents in a politically organized society; (ii) criminal definitions describe behaviors in conflict with the interests of those with enough power to shape public policy; (iii) criminal definitions are applied by those in society that have the power to shape the enforcement and administration of criminal law; (iv) behavior patterns are structured in relation to criminal definitions, and in this context persons engage in actions that have a probability of being defined as criminal; (v) conceptions of crime are constructed and spread throughout society by various means of communication; (vi) the social reality of crime is constructed by the formulation and application of criminal definitions, development of behavior patterns related to criminal definitions, and the constructions of criminal conceptions. Simply stated, power groups in society define what crime is, they usually define crime as behavior that conflicts with their interests, the same power groups have the ability to enforce their definition of crime, and the same power groups disseminate their definition of crime throughout society.

Turk (1969) argues that social order will be maintained only when the authority group is able to find the right balance between consensus and coercion. In other words, if a society becomes too coercive, or too egalitarian, conflict (and criminality) will erupt. Turk distinguishes between social and cultural norms. Cultural norms are the laws as they are written, social norms the laws as they are enforced. Conflict (and crime) result when authorities actively enforce the law as it is written, and when the conflict group is able to explain their "criminalized behavior" within the framework of their social norms. Another way to understand this concept is that laws are unlikely to be enforced when they conflict with the authority group's own values; only when the laws reflect the values of the authority group are they likely to be enforced. Other factors contribute to the likelihood of conflict or criminality: organized, technologically sophisticated conflict groups are more likely to be engaged in conflict with the authority group when the authority group lacks organization and/or sophistication. However, while these factors contribute to conflict, conflict does not necessarily translate into criminality or criminalization. The primary factor leading to criminalization is the attitude of the different levels of enforcers to a prohibited act. If all levels (police, legal system) find an act repellent there will be high arrest rates, high conviction rates, and stiff sentences. When police find behavior offensive, but higher levels (prosecutors, judges) do not, there will be high arrest rates but low conviction rates and less severe sentences. If police do not find an act repellent, but higher-level enforcers do, arrest rates will be lower, but conviction rates will be higher and sentences more severe.

William Chambliss and Robert Seidman (1971) utilized an organizational approach to the behavior of the criminal justice system, using an analysis of the everyday functioning of the system to determine if the state uses its power to peacefully resolve conflict (consensus theory) or if the power of the state itself is a prize available to the strongest of competing interest groups within a society. The main points of this theory are: (i) law enforcement agencies are bureaucratic organizations; (ii) organizations and their members replace the official goals and norms of the organization with policies that will maximize rewards to, and minimize the strains experienced by, the organization; (iii) goal substitution can occur because there is little to no motivation for members of organizations to resist goal-substitution, and the nature of criminal law allows for considerable discretion by its agents; (iv) the agencies of law enforcement are dependent on political organizations of resources; (v) as a rational organization (which maximizes benefits and minimizes costs) law enforcement agencies will process the politically weak, and avoid processing the politically powerful; (vi) it is to be expected that a disproportionately high number of the weak will be processed by the police and courts, and it is to be expected that the violations of the powerful will be mostly ignored.

In 1986 Vold and Bernard developed a theory of crime and law incorporating elements of conflict theory and social learning theory, as well as drawing from Vold's earlier (1958) work, Quinney, and Chambliss and Seidman. This theory includes the following propositions: (i) complex societies are composed of groups, each with different norms, values, and interests; (ii) individuals

behavior is in accordance with their own interests, and is reflected in their groups, which tend to develop distinct behavior patterns; (iii) the more power a group has, the less likely it is that its norms and values will come into conflict with the norms and values of society; (iv) bureaucracies (including law enforcement) strive to maximum benefits and minimize costs and hence will prosecute those with less power; (v) the official crime rates of groups are inversely proportional to their political and economic power, independent of other factors.

Empirical tests of hypotheses based on a conflict theory of criminal behavior are rare. The results of the few studies that have been carried out have yielded inconclusive results. A study by Brunk and Wilson (1991) found no relationship between the number of interest groups and crime rate, but did find a relationship between crime and the type of interest groups. The usefulness of conflict models of criminality and the law is limited by the fact that society is not just a system of conflicting and competing interest groups. Vold (1958) expressly excluded irrational criminal acts from his theoretical framework, stating that some acts are not a reflection of warring interest groups. He also warned that "group conflict hypothesis should not be stretched too far" (Vold 1958: 219). Conflict theory has, however, been used to explore organized and white-collar crime, arrest and sentencing patterns, and crime patterns of various minority groups.

Some contemporary research does seek to test hypotheses based on conflict criminology. Conflict theory has been used to explore the link between police expenditures and perceived minority threat (Holmes et al. 2008; Ruddell and Thomas 2010). It is also used in studies of racial profiling and police brutality (Holmes and Smith 2006). Sentencing disparity (majority/minority group) has also lent itself to conflict theory analysis. Jacobs and Kent (2007) used execution data since 1951 to test a modified version of conflict theory, finding that a perceived minority threat affected public support for executions.

Traditional conflict theory can be described as focusing on crime as the result of intergroup conflict over scarce resources; it also considers crime relative and socially defined, and as such presented a view of crime that differs considerably from the micro (individual) level theories of crime

causation prevalent since the dawn of criminology. Despite the difficulty in testing and limited scope of conflict theory, Curran and Renzetti (2001) point to the importance of conflict theory as the framework for other, more inclusive theories of crime and criminality, such as critical and Marxist criminology. Conflict criminology has also contributed to some feminist criminologies, and Sellin's culture conflict theory is a precursor of the more contemporary subcultural theories of crime.

SEE ALSO: Classical Criminology; Critical Criminology; Feminist Theories of Criminal Behavior; Marxist Criminology; Peacemaking Criminology; Social Process Theories; Subcultural Theories of Crime.

References

Brunk, G. G., & Wilson, L. A. (1991) Interest groups and criminal behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 28, 157–173.

Chambliss, W. J., & Seidman, R. B. (1971) *Law, Order, and Power*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Curran, D. J., & Renzetti, C. M. (2001) *Theories of Crime*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Holmes, M., & Smith, B. (2006) Race, threat, and police brutality: A social psychological perspective. *Conference Papers – American Society of Criminology* 1.

Holmes, M. D., Smith, B. W., Freng, A. B., & Muñoz, E. A. (2008) Minority threat, crime control, and police resource allocation in the southwestern United States. *Crime and Delinquency* 54(1), 128–152.

Jacobs, D., & Kent, S. L. (2007) The determinants of executions since 1951: How politics, protests, public opinion, and social divisions shape capital punishment. *Social Problems* 54(3), 297–318.

Quinney, R. (1970) *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Ruddell, R., & Thomas, M. O. (2010) Minority threat and police strength: An examination of the Golden State. *Police Practice and Research* 11(3), 256–273.

Sellin, T. (1938) *Culture Conflict and Crime*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Turk, A. T. (1969). *Criminality and the Legal Order*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Vold, G. B. (1958) *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vold, G. B., & Bernard, T. J. (1986). *Theoretical Criminology*, 3rd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Further Readings

Akers, R. L. (2000) *Criminological Theories: Intro-
duction, Evaluation, and Application*. Los Angeles:
Roxbury Publishing Company.

Bernard, T. J. (1983) *The Consensus–Conflict Debate:
Form and Content in Social Theories*. New York:
University Press.

Black, D. (1976) *The Behavior of Law*. New York:
Academic Press.

Dooley, B., & Delisi, M. (2007). Racial Profiling:
Rhetoric Or Reality? *Conference Papers – American
Society of Criminology* 1–31.

Glaser, D. (1978) *Crime in Our Changing Society*.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McShane, M. D. (1987) Immigration processing and
the alien inmate: Constructing a conflict perspective.
Journal of Crime and Justice 10, 171–194.

Quinney, R. (1980) *Class, State, and Crime*, 2nd edn.
New York: Longman.

Turk, A. T. (1966) Conflict and criminality. *American
Sociological Review* 31, 338–352.

Turk, A. T. (1977) Class, conflict and criminalization.
Sociological Focus 10, 20–220.

Turk, A. T. (1982) *Political Criminality*. Beverly Hills:
Sage Publications.

Williams, F. P., III, & McShane, M. D. (1993) *Crimi-
nology Theory: Selected Classic Readings*. Cincinnati:
Anderson Publishing Co.

Williams, F. P., III (1980) Conflict theory and differen-
tial processing: An analysis of the research literature.
In J. A. Inciardi (ed.), *Radical Criminology: The Com-
ing Crises*. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 213–232.

Institutional Anomie Theory

SEKSAN KHRUAKHAM

Institutional anomie theory (IAT) was proposed by Messner and Rosenfeld in 1994. The theory drew heavily from Merton's (1938) strain theory, itself developed from the conceptualization of anomie proposed by Emile Durkheim (1951, 1964). The aim of institutional anomie theory is to explain crime rates at the aggregate level. In particular, the higher crime rate is attributed to the cultural pressure exerted by economic goals and the "American dream," coupled with weakened controls of noneconomic social institutions.

There are different versions of anomie theory and the concept of anomie is somewhat different in each version. Since the development of the concept of anomie by Durkheim, others have built upon the theory, including Merton (1938), Cohen (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960), Agnew (1992), and Messner and Rosenfeld (1994).

According to Durkheim, anomie is normlessness, occurring as a result of rapid industrial changes in modern societies. Rapid industrial growth, coupled with a lack of moral regulation, produces anomie, which is characterized as limitless status-seeking and insatiable desires (Bernburg 2002). Anomie is a product of the breakdown of social norms in advanced industrial societies, where the individual conscience is unable to control human desires. As a result, people become more selfish and do not care about one another's welfare, which leads to anomie (Smith and Bohm 2008). Originally, anomie was used to explain the increased rate of suicide and other crime (Durkheim 1951).

In 1938, Merton, an American sociologist, used Durkheim's concept of anomie to explain high crime rates in the United States. Merton's anomie/strain theory differs from Durkheim's anomie theory; while Durkheim argued that human aspirations are inherent and often limitless, Merton contended that human aspirations were culturally induced, not inherent (Smith and Bohm 2008). In US society, aspirations are culturally induced by material goals, but people have limited access to socially-structured means or opportunities, especially those who belong to the lower classes. This situation produced anomie or strain, and people developed various types of adaptation including conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion (Merton 1938). Three of these five types of adaptation, namely innovation, retreatism, and rebellion, are likely to manifest in deviant behavior (Smith and Bohm 2008).

In 1955, Cohen further developed anomie theory in his book, *Delinquent Boys*. His version of anomie theory emphasized the frustrations and strains among working-class people, especially for males who eventually joined delinquent gangs. Cohen argued that working-class people experience frustration and strain, because they do not have enough skills to compete with middle-class males and to participate in a society shaped by middle-class values. Many working-class males become gang members in order to acquire social status; they may often act in a non-utilitarian, malicious, and negativistic way. In this sense, Cohen's anomie theory is quite different from Merton's. While Merton suggested that human behavior is driven by materialism, Cohen argued that human behavior is non-utilitarian.

In 1960, Cloward and Ohlin developed another version of anomie theory in their work *Delinquency and Opportunity*. They contended that delinquency is an essential element of subcultures. There are three types of subcultures available for young, marginalized males to join, namely a criminal subculture, which involves property crimes, a conflict subculture involving violent crime, and a retreatist subculture, which is likely to involve use of controlled substances. They suggested that although people in economically depressed areas have cultural goals, there are no legitimate means to reach those goals; the people would not turn to delinquency if those means existed (Williams and McShane 2004).

In 1992, Agnew expanded anomie theory to cover a wider range of strain. His general strain

theory includes the removal of positive stimuli, the presence of negative stimuli, and the failure to achieve positively valued goals as additional sources of strain (Agnew 2001, 2006). General strain theory places greater emphasis on the emotional effects of strain on individuals. Agnew argued that individuals who lose positive stimuli, experience negative stimuli, or fail to achieve positively valued goals tend to have negative emotions including anger, sadness, resentment, dissatisfaction, disappointment, and unhappiness, which can lead to criminal behaviour. Unlike previous versions of anomie theory, Agnew's theory was intended to explain crime at the micro rather than macro level.

In 1994, the latest version of anomie theory, commonly known as institutional anomie theory, was developed by Messner and Rosenfeld in their work *Crime and the American Dream*. Drawing heavily from Merton's anomie theory, it was intended to explain high crime rates in the United States by appealing to the "American dream." However, what is different from Merton's anomie theory is the inclusion of the weakened noneconomic social institutions. Messner and Rosenfeld try to explain crime by focusing on the interplay between culture and social structure.

Messner and Rosenfeld define the American dream as the "commitment to the goal of material success, to be pursued by everyone in society, under conditions of open, individual competition" (1994: 69). The culture underpinning the American dream is characterized by individualism, universalism, achievement, and materialism. In the United States, the cultural values of the American dream give rise to anomie by encouraging an overemphasis on material success while simultaneously reducing the pressure to employ legitimate means to achieve material success. Thus, people under these circumstances are more likely to take the most effective means necessary to achieve their goals.

In addition, institutional anomie theory emphasizes the roles of social institutions (e.g., the family, school, polity, and market economy) in relation to anomie and crime. Messner and Rosenfeld argue that social institutions, both economic and noneconomic, develop to assist people in adapting to their surroundings, deploying resources to achieve collective goals,

and socializing individuals to comply with fundamental social norms (Messner and Rosenfeld 1994). Specifically, the family provides care and support for its members and controls sexual behavior. The school conveys knowledge, skills, and cultural standards to young citizens. The polity is responsible for mobilizing power to achieve collective goals. Finally, the economy is responsible for producing and distributing goods (Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008). When these various social institutions have equal power and function effectively in society, the institutional balance of power is established.

Messner and Rosenfeld (1994) suggest that the institutional balance of power between economic and noneconomic institutions would be fairly stable in an ideal society, but when the capitalist market economy dominates the society and becomes more powerful than the noneconomic social institutions, it may disrupt the regulative functioning of those noneconomic social institutions. Under these circumstances, the economic norms penetrate the noneconomic social institutions and devalue them (Bernburg 2002). Instead of promoting their normative goals, noneconomic social institutions support the cultural goals of material success and monetary achievement. For example, parents often encourage their children to seek monetary rewards as ultimate goals, and family time is mostly used for economic purposes. Similarly, education is primarily used as a means to achieve an occupational goal, which is economic success. People often further their study in order to enhance their job opportunities, and many educational institutions are established to produce employable workers for the labor market. Therefore, the ability of noneconomic social institutions to control people's behavior in society is weakened by the dominance of the economic institution in the institutional balance of power.

According to Messner and Rosenfeld (1994), the dominance of economic institutions tends to support and breed cultural values characterized by the American dream culture found not only in the United States but also in other capitalist countries. Therefore, institutional anomie theory can be expanded to explain crime in other capitalist countries, and it can be used to explain how anomie is sustained and reinforced (Bernburg 2002).

Messner and Rosenfeld's institutional anomie theory mainly explains the relationship between culture, anomie, social structure, and crime. Specifically, culture creates pressures for economic success or monetary attainment; anomie and social structure contribute to the dominance of the economic institutions and weaken the normative role of the noneconomic ones. It is expected that culture and social structure influence each other and anomie mediates the effect of culture on crime rates, while weakened noneconomic institutions mediate the effect of social structure on crime rates.

Institutional anomie theory has been criticized on a number of grounds. For example, the theory's high level of abstraction makes empirical tests difficult (Messner and Rosenfeld 2006; Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008); the theory ignores other dominant cultural ideologies in American society (Deitbert 2003); the theory does not address the relationship between nonmonetary cultural ethos and crime; the theory cannot address how crime rates change over time (Lafree 1998); and the theory focuses on a narrow range of crime, namely profit-motivated crime, and ignores the role of individuals in creating and reinforcing the cultural values of the American dream (Deitbert 2003).

Institutional anomie theory is indeed quite difficult to test empirically because the aggregate-level data needed to directly test the theory have not been systematically collected and made available (Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008). Messner and Rosenfeld (2006) agree with this criticism. Nevertheless, a fair amount of research has attempted to test the theory since its inception: Chamlin and Cochran 1995, 1997; Piquero and Piquero 1998; Savolainen 2000; Batton and Jensen 2002; Jensen 2002; Maume and Lee 2003; Pratt and Godsey 2003; Stucky 2003; Cao 2004; Cullen, Parboteeah, and Hoegl 2004; Schoepfer and Piquero 2006; Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008. However, most of these studies have relied on partial or indirect tests due to data limitations. In addition, most of the research on institutional anomie theory heavily relied on data in the United States (e.g., Chamlin and Cochran 1995; Piquero and Piquero 1998; Maume and Lee 2003; Stucky 2003; Schoepfer and Piquero 2006), although a few studies did employ cross-national data (e.g., Savolainen 2000; Jensen 2002; Pratt and Godsey

2003; Cao 2004; Cullen et al. 2004; Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008).

There are two types of analytical domains for empirically testing institutional anomie theory, namely institutional dynamics and cultural dynamics (Messner and Rosenfeld 2006). Most of the research on institutional anomie theory has focused on the analysis of institutional dynamics, but a few studies have also examined the cultural dynamics (Chamlin and Cochran 1997; Jensen 2002; Cao 2004; Cullen et al. 2004). For the analyses of institutional dynamics, it is generally hypothesized that the impact of the economy, commonly measured by economic deprivation, on crime rates is mediated or moderated by the effect of the strength of noneconomic social institutions. (For property crime rate, see Chamlin and Cochran 1995; Piquero and Piquero 1998; and Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008. For violent crime rate, see Piquero and Piquero 1998 and Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008. For homicide, see Messner and Rosenfeld 1997; Savolainen 2000; Batton and Jensen 2002; Jensen 2002; Maume and Lee 2003; and Pratt and Godsey 2003. For total crime rate, see Maume and Lee 2003 and Stucky 2003.)

As for the findings of empirical tests of institutional anomie theory, supportive evidence has been found in Chamlin and Cochran (1995, 1997), Messner and Rosenfeld (1997), Savolainen (2000), Maume and Lee (2003), Pratt and Godsey (2003), and Stuckey (2003). However, some studies found no support for institutional anomie theory (Jensen 2002; Cao 2004), and others found mixed evidence (Piquero and Piquero 1998; Batton and Jensen 2002; Cullen et al. 2004; Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008). However, it is worth noting that the empirical findings of institutional anomie theory are very sensitive to the operationalization of the key concepts (Messner and Rosenfeld 2006; Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008).

For supportive research, Chamlin and Cochran (1995) found that the strength of noneconomic institutions moderated the effect of poverty on the property crime rate. Similarly, Chamlin and Cochran (1997) tested the theory in terms of cultural dynamics and confirmed significant negative impacts of social altruism on property and violent crime rates. Moreover, the moderating effects of noneconomic institutions on the effect

of the economy on crime were also identified in Savolainen (2000), Pratt and Godsey (2003), and Stuckey (2003). Messner and Rosenfeld (1997) verified the main impacts of decommodification (an indicator of the balance between the economy and polity) on the homicide rate across 45 nations, while Maume and Lee (2003) found mediating effects of noneconomic institutions for the linkage between economic inequality and the rate of instrumental homicide.

The major policy implications of institutional anomie theory are the needs to improve economic conditions, the social welfare system, and employment opportunities, as well as the need to strengthen internal social control. Moreover, the normative roles of the family, the educational system, religion, and the polity should be restored to maintain the institutional balance of power, which would help prevent crime.

For future work on institutional anomie theory, researchers need to address both the social-structural and cultural dimensions, especially the cultural dynamics in which empirical testing is limited. More research will be needed to clarify whether the ineffectiveness of noneconomic institutions mediates or moderates the effect of the economy on crime rates. More research is needed, too, on the application of institutional anomie theory in countries other than the United States. (This research may be hindered by the fact that few countries systematically collect the data needed for testing the theory.) Lastly, institutional anomie theorists have to work on the complexity of the theory and the sensitivity of its operationalization; otherwise, the theoretical testing will need to rely on indirect or partial tests and the empirical findings will remain mixed in their support of the theory (Bjerregaard and Cochran 2008).

SEE ALSO: Cloward, Richard; Durkheim, Emile; Merton, Robert; Ohlin, Lloyd; Strain Theory.

References

Agnew, R. (1992) Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* 30(1), 47–87.

Agnew, R. (2001) Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(4), 319–361.

Agnew, R. (2006) General strain theory: Current status and directions for further research. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 101–123.

Batton, C., & Jensen, G. (2002) Decommodification and homicide rates in the 20th century United States. *Homicide Studies* 6(1), 6–38.

Bernburg, J. G. (2002) Anomie, social change, and crime: A theoretical examination of institutional anomie theory. *British Journal of Criminology* 42(4), 729–742.

Bjerregaard, B., & Cochran, J. K. (2008) A cross-national test of institutional anomie theory: Do the strength of other social institutions mediate or moderate the effects of the economy on the rate of crime? *Western Criminology Review* 9(1), 31–48.

Cao, L. (2004) Is American society more anomic? A test of Merton's theory with cross-national data. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 28(1), 17–31.

Chamlin, M. B., & Cochran, J. K. (1995) Assessing Messner and Rosenfeld's institutional anomie theory: A partial test. *Criminology* 33(3), 411–429.

Chamlin, M. B., & Cochran, J. K. (1997) Social altruism and crime. *Criminology* 35(2), 203–228.

Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (1960) *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A. K. (1955) *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Cullen, J. B., Parboteeah, P., & Hoegl, M. (2004) Cross-national differences in managers' willingness to justify ethically suspect behaviors: A test of institutional anomie theory. *Academy of Management Journal* 47(3), 411–421.

Deitbert, G. (2003) Teens, drugs and the American Dream: A partial test of American institutional explanations of crime. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta Hilton Hotel, Atlanta, GA.

Durkheim, E. (1951) *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. New York: Free Press. (Originally published 1897.)

Durkheim, E. (1964) *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press. (Originally published 1893.)

Jensen, G. (2002) Institutional anomie and societal variations in crime: A critical appraisal. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 22(1), 45–74.

Lafree, G. (1998) *Losing Legitimacy: Street Crime & the Decline of Social Institutions in America*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Maume, M. O., & Lee, M. R. (2003) Social institution and violence: A sub-national test of institutional anomie theory. *Criminology* 41(4), 1137–1172.

Merton, R. K. (1938) Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3(5), 672–682.

Messner, S., & Rosenfeld, R. (1994) *Crime and the American Dream*. Belmont, CA: Wadswoth.

Messner, S., & Rosenfeld, R. (1997) Political restraint of the market and levels of criminal homicide: A cross-national application of institutional anomie theory. *Social Force* 75(4), 1393–1416.

Messner, S., & Rosenfeld, R. (2006) The present and future of institutional-anomie theory. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 127–148.

Piquero, A., & Piquero, N. L. (1998) On testing institutional anomie theory with varying specifications. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention* 7(1), 61–84.

Pratt, T., & Godsey, T. W. (2003) Social support, inequality, and homicide: A cross-national test of an integrated theoretical model. *Criminology* 41(3), 611–643.

Savolainen, J. (2000) Inequality, welfare state, and homicide: Further support for the institutional anomie theory. *Criminology* 38(4), 1021–1042.

Schoepfer, A., & Piquero, N. L. (2006) Exploring white-collar crime and the American Dream: A partial test of institutional anomie theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 34(3), 227–235.

Smith, H. P., & Bohm, R. M. (2008) Beyond anomie: Alienation and crime. *Critical Criminology* 16(1), 1–15.

Stucky, T. D. (2003) Local politics and violent crime in U.S. cities. *Criminology* 41(4), 1101–1135.

Williams, F. P., III, & McShane, M. D. (2004) *Criminological Theory*, 4th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson–Prentice Hall.

Subcultural Theories of Crime

PAMELA BLACK

Subcultural theories of criminality view criminal behavior as *normal* learned behavior. Acts of crime are not considered abnormal or deviant, but behavior (such as crime) that would be considered criminal or deviant by the dominant culture in a society is considered normative, and even desirable in some subcultures. This behavior is not instinctive, nor is it the result of biology or genetics. It is behavior that develops and is internalized during the process of socialization. As a learning theory, subcultural theory shares its history with Sutherland's differential association theory (1924) and Bandura's (1969) modeling theory.

In order to understand more contemporary subcultural theories of crime and deviance it is vital to have a basic grasp of Sutherland's differential association theory. Briefly, Sutherland (1924) claimed that crime and deviance were learned in the same manner humans learned all other behavior – namely, from others during the process of socialization. Differential association theory is characterized by nine tenets: (1) criminal behavior is learned behavior; (2) criminal behavior is learned in interaction with others through communication; (3) the principal part of learning criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups; (4) this learning includes techniques of committing crime and the direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes toward crime; (5) these motives are learned from definitions of the law as either favorable or unfavorable; (6) we become criminal or deviant when we hold more unfavorable definitions of the law than favorable ones; (7) differential associations (associations with individuals holding unfavorable definitions of the law) vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity; (8) the process involved in learning criminal definitions is the same as in any other

learning; and (9) while criminal behavior is an expression of needs and values, it cannot be explained by those needs and values, since noncriminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values.

Cultural or subcultural theories of crime focus on the content of learned behavior rather than the process of learning that behavior. For example, Miller (1958) used lower-class culture to explain delinquent behavior amongst lower-class youth, stating that deviance is normative in lower-class cultures. Akers' (1985) social learning theory focuses on the process by which individuals internalize deviant norms – for example, when and why do people elect to adopt norms favorable to deviance? Subcultural theories tend to focus on class and ethnic cultures, including lower social class, inner-city communities, and even rural southern subcultures.

One of the earliest true subcultural theories of crime or delinquency was Walter Miller's lower-class focal concern theory (1958). Focusing on gang delinquency, Miller claimed that the lower class had a unique, identifiable culture that differed significantly from the dominant, middle-class culture of the United States. Whereas the middle class had values (positive goals such as success or achievement), the lower class had "focal concerns," attitudes and attributes that defined the lower class, and to which it aspired. These focal concerns include: (1) trouble: getting into and staying out of trouble; (2) smartness: street rather than book smartness; (3) excitement: the search for thrills; (4) fate: the idea that one's future is out of one's control; and (5) autonomy: resentment of authority and rules. These focal concerns, and specifically youths' attempts to live up to them, create a climate favorable to crime and delinquency. Coupled with a surplus of female-headed households (also characteristic of lower-class life), delinquency was to be expected, and in fact was often rewarded. Thus, normative behavior for lower-class youth is also behavior that is criminal or delinquent.

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) postulate a "subculture of violence" in order to explain the high rate of homicide amongst young male

African Americans. Briefly, some members of this community view violence as not only an appropriate response to any number of provocations, but in fact a required response. There are seven components to Wolfgang and Ferracuti's theory: (1) no subculture is completely different from the society of which it is a part, nor is any subculture totally in conflict with this society; (2) the existence of a subculture of violence does not mean that the subculture's members must express violence in every situation; (3) the willingness to engage or the actual engagement in violence as a response to a variety of situations defines the subculture of violence; (4) the subculture of violence may be shared by all age groups in a subculture, but it is most prominent amongst individuals from the late teens to middle age; (5) the counter-norm is nonviolence; (6) the development of favorable attitudes toward violence in a subculture is learned behavior, although not all individuals exposed to these norms will adopt them; and (7) the use of violence in this subculture is not viewed as deviant conduct, so individuals who use violence do not have to deal with feelings of guilt. Violence, according to Wolfgang and Ferracuti's theory, is behavior individuals drift in and out of, useful in some, but not all, situations.

One of the most influential subculture of violence theories is Elijah Anderson's (1990) *Streetwise*. Anderson describes a "code of the streets," prevalent in inner-city African American communities. He states emphatically that most residents of these communities do not subscribe to these violent norms; however, residents, especially young males, are under pressure to respond to specific situations with violence. Violence is considered the appropriate response, especially when one is treated disrespectfully. Anderson is particularly interested in the reasons why some residents react in accordance to the subcultural norms, while most do not. African American families in inner-city areas can be classified as either *decent* or *street*. All families in these neighborhoods share the same values, such as safety, security, and self-respect. They differ in their codes: the patterned ways they behave, talk, and interact with others. While the "code of the streets" is a subcultural theory of crime, it draws on labeling theory, as decent and street families

tend to define themselves as such and behave in accordance with these definitions.

According to Anderson, in decent families the values and codes match, while in street families they do not. Decent families are those that are committed to middle-class values, while street families adopt the culture of the streets. Middle-class values protect children of decent families (to a certain extent) from the street culture; they do not protect street families. Decent parents (whether married couples or single parents) are typically better off than street parents. Most are classified as working poor. They are well aware of the dangerousness of their environment, and as a consequence are exceptionally well attuned to trouble in their neighborhoods and spend considerable time trying to help their children avoid it. Polite and considerate, they instill these values in their children. They are hardworking, self-reliant, and make big sacrifices. They often look to their church and have faith in their future and in the future of their children. Decent families try to maintain a positive attitude and a spirit of cooperation with others.

Street parents, although they may love their children, are unable to cope with both their own needs and the needs of their children. When street parents are involved with their children, they are more likely than decent parents to socialize their children into the ways of the street and are more likely to use violence to control their children and other family members. Street families are very poor, perhaps destitute. Children are allowed to run wild, sometimes even fending for themselves. Street parents often seem oblivious to the future effects of their current behavior and disregard the consequences of irresponsible, deviant, and criminal behavior. While decent parents may try to discourage their children from following the code of the streets, street parents may not only encourage it but even punish children who fail to live up to it.

While earlier subcultural theory of crime focused on delinquency and minor criminality, beginning with Wolfgang and Ferracuti subcultural theorists have used subcultural theories most often to explore violent behavior. Both Wolfgang and Ferracuti and Anderson focused specifically on violence in African American urban/inner-city communities; however, the

subculture of violence thesis has been applied to a variety of cultural groups.

The southern subculture of violence was first suggested in 1975 by Howard Erlanger; he stated that southerners "do have a tendency to appeal to force to settle differences." Early research on the southern subculture of violence has historical roots in pre-Civil War culture and a sense of honor which was part of the character of the "southern gentleman" (Vold and Bernard 1986). Horowitz (1982) also used the southern subculture of violence thesis to explain the high rate of firearm homicides in the South, hypothesizing that the intent is not always to kill but a socially expected reaction to some perceived insult. The high rate of gun ownership in the South has also been linked to the southern subculture of violence (O'Connor and Lizotte 1978; Dixon and Lizotte 1987). A study by Hayes and Lee (2005) stated that if there is a subculture of violence in the United States, it is most common amongst rural white males rather than urban black males. Research is also beginning to examine the effects of the southern subculture of violence on violence by rural southern white females (D'Antonio-Del Rio, Doucet, and Chauvin 2010). Other variations of the subculture of violence theory include examinations of the link between violence and machismo expectations amongst Latin American men (Chon 2011) and amongst young men in Northern Ireland (Harland 2011).

SEE ALSO: Differential Association Theory; Labeling and Symbolic Interaction Theories of Crime; Social Process Theories; Sutherland, Edwin.

References

Akers, R. L. (1985) *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*, 3rd edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Anderson, E. (1990) *Streetwise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bandura, A. (1969) *Principles of Behavior Modification*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Chon, D. (2011) Contributing factors for high homicide rate in Latin America: A critical test of Neapolitan's regional subculture of violence thesis. *Journal of Family Violence* 26(4), 299–307.

D'Antonio-Del Rio, J. M., Doucet, J. M., & Chauvin, C. D. (2010) Violent and vindictive women: A re-analysis of the southern subculture of violence. *Sociological Spectrum* 30(5), 484–503.

Dixon, J., & Lizotte, A. (1987) Gun ownership and the "southern subculture of violence." *American Journal of Sociology* 93(2), 383–405.

Erlanger, H. S. (1975) Is there a "subculture of violence" in the South? *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 66(4), 483–490.

Harland, K. (2011) Violent youth culture in Northern Ireland: Young men, violence, and the challenges of peacebuilding. *Youth & Society* 43(2), 414–432.

Hayes, T. C., & Lee, M. R. (2005) The southern culture of honor and violent attitudes. *Sociological Spectrum* 25(5), 593–617.

Horowitz, W. (1982) Guns, Murder & Southern Violence: A Theoretical Alternative to Gastil-Hackney. PhD thesis. Florida State University.

Miller, W. B. (1958) Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues* 14(3), 5–19.

O'Connor, J. F., & Lizotte, A. (1978) The "southern subculture of violence" thesis and patterns of gun ownership. *Social Problems* 25(4), 420–429.

Sutherland, E. H. (1924) *Criminology*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E. H. (1947) *Criminology*, 4th edn. Philadelphia PA: Lippincott.

Vold, G. B., & Bernard, T. J. (1986) *Theoretical Criminology*, 3rd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracuti, F. (1967) *The Subculture of Violence*. London: Tavistock.

Further Readings

Browning, C. (2008) Violent street codes at home: Adolescents' time use and violent victimization. *Conference Papers – American Society of Criminology* 1–24.

Cohen, A. (1955) *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free Press.

Ellison, C. G. (1991) An eye for an eye? A note of the southern subculture of violence thesis. *Social Forces* 69, 1223–1123.

McGloin, J., Schreck, C. J., Steward, E. A., & Ousey, G. D. (2011) Predicting the violent offender: The discriminant validity of the subculture of violence. *Criminology* 49(3), 767–794.

Nesbitt, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996) *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Pridemore, W., & Freilich, J. D. (2006) A test of recent subcultural explanations of white violence in the United States. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 34(1), 1–16.

Psychological Theories of Crime

J. SCOTT LEWIS

The various theories that make up the psychological approach to crime begin with the assumption that individual differences in personality, biology, or social interactions predispose certain people to criminal acts. These theories are usually expressed in developmental terms and rooted in motivational and learning processes. Two of the most common motivational factors are hedonism and selfishness. On views of this sort, humans are generally seeking pleasure and avoiding pain; accordingly, they are motivated to maintain an optimal level of arousal, and they seek to increase arousal when it falls below desired levels. In addition to proposing motivational factors that may lead to crime, many psychological theories of crime also attempt to explain the development of inhibiting factors – for instance that of the conscience, or the internalization of normative rules.

Psychoanalytic theory has its roots in the work of Sigmund Freud (1856–1939). Freud suggested that humans have instinctual drives that are repressed in the unconscious mind. These drives are often opposite to social norms. Thus all humans have a tendency toward deviance. Through the processes of socialization, which begins in childhood, these antisocial tendencies are suppressed in most people. However, incomplete or faulty socialization as a child may fail to suppress the instinctual drives toward criminal behavior. Freud argued that in most cases criminal behavior is driven by the child's faulty identification with his or her parents. The lack of appropriate socialization may develop into personality disturbances that lead to the internalization or externalization of natural antisocial tendencies. A child who externalizes his or her antisocial impulses becomes a criminal, while the child who directs them inward becomes a neurotic (Friedlander 1947).

Although Freud did not specifically address criminality in his writings, his perspective laid the groundwork for later developments in this field. Aichorn (1935), and later Redl and Wineman (1951), applied Freud's psychoanalytic theory to treatment programs for delinquent youth. However, rather than seeing deviance as resulting from a strong id, they approached deviance from the point of view of underdevelopment of the ego or overdevelopment of the superego. Thus the Freudian perspective views deviance as a neurosis stemming from the improper resolution of childhood traumas.

Other psychological theories look to other sources for problems in the human psyche. A cognitive theory of crime, developed by Walters and White (1989), posits that career criminals are irresponsible and self-indulgent and break rules in most areas of their lives. They act as hedonistic adolescents, engaging in short-term thinking, and they lack self-discipline. Rather than having social causes, this thinking pattern among career criminals perpetuates itself by always making choices that favor the offender's own short-term self-interest (Walters and White 1989; Walters 1990).

Related theories focus on personality traits that reflect abnormal characteristics in criminals and delinquents. Therefore offenders are often found to be more impulsive, hostile, and antisocial than non-offenders. Personality tests such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) have been used in efforts to measure and link abnormal personality characteristics to deviant behaviors. The results have been mixed and most studies have not been able to conclude that personality characteristics are major causes of criminal behavior, because such characteristics appear in many noncriminal subjects as well (Vold and Bernard 1986; Shoemaker 1990; Sutherland, Cressey, and Luckenbill 1992).

Developed from the principles of behavioral psychology, learning theory posits that a person's behavior is learned and maintained through stimulus consequences. Stimulus consequences can be either positive – for example, receiving a reward for exhibiting a given behavior – or negative – for

example, receiving punishment for acting inappropriately. They are further classified as external reinforcement, which occurs as a direct result of an individual's particular behavior; as vicarious reinforcement, which occurs through an individual's observation of others being rewarded or punished for a particular behavior; or as self-regulation, which occurs upon an individual's seeing how others respond to a particular behavior (Slee 2002).

According to learning theory, crime is learned or unlearned through the processes of reinforcement. Learning theory takes a variety of forms. When a criminal act is rewarded, it is more likely to recur. When a criminal act is punished, it is less likely to recur. Thus, deviant behavior can be mitigated by reducing or eliminating the reward value of the behavior and/or by increasing the punishment for the behavior. However, rewards and punishments must be applied swiftly and with certainty.

Beginning in 1978, Edwin Sutherland developed differential association theory over a span of about fifteen years. Sutherland argued that criminal behavior is learned as an individual interacts with others, who have values, beliefs, and behaviors that orient toward criminality. Sutherland believed that, if learning orientations toward crime are stronger than orientations away from crime, then the individual is more likely to engage in criminal behavior. To date, Sutherland's theory has been widely tested only on juveniles. These studies have yielded evidence in favor of many aspects of Sutherland's theory, though they are often criticized for not clearly specifying the causal relationship between peer interaction and delinquency. Similarly, Sutherland's theory has been criticized for its ontological imprecision: that is, differential association theory is unable to explain the origins of the first criminal behavior.

Building on Sutherland's theory, Burgess and Akers (1968) developed differential reinforcement theory. In contrast to Sutherland's assertion that the learning of criminal behavior occurs only in groups, differential reinforcement theory argues that the learning of criminal behavior can occur in nonsocial situations as well, largely through the mechanism of operant conditioning. Criminal behavior can also be learned through comparative reference groups, even if the individual has no direct experience of that reference group. Later, Akers (1985) added the caveat that criminal knowledge can also be gained through reflection over past experiences, which aids in the evaluation of the costs and benefits of future criminal activities.

Another study of the manifestation of learning comes from Sykes and Matza (1957). Neutralization theory contends that conventional social norms exist side by side with unconventional – or deviant – ones. As individuals learn the norms appropriate for their society, they are also exposed to the unconventional norms. These norms may be adopted in certain social contexts, but rejected in others. Thus people are not always criminals. They move from one set of norms to another, as social circumstances warrant.

Psychologist Hans Eysenck (1977) used behavioral theory to hypothesize that, through processes of learning, people develop moral preferences that will make them more or less prone to criminal behavior. For example, when a child is consistently punished for misbehavior, he or she develops a psychological and physiological response whenever he or she considers committing the inappropriate act. The emotional anxiety and guilt that arise from the process of conditioning result in the development of a conscience. However, Eysenck noted that there is tremendous variability among people in their personalities, which will increase or decrease their susceptibility to conditioning practices.

Cognitive developmental theories of crime see crime as occurring when people fail to progress to a proper state of moral reasoning. Developmental psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg (1960) proposed a theory of moral reasoning that posits three levels of moral development, each level consisting of two stages. Successful progression through each stage is essential for the proper internalization of society's prosocial values. Level one, called the preconventional level, spans the growth of the child up until middle childhood. At this stage moral reasoning consists in the simple notion of avoiding punishment. This is usually done through obedience to those who may initiate punishment. Punishment is seen as a natural and integral part of wrongdoing. The second level, called conventional, manifests itself at the end of middle childhood and lasts until young adulthood. At this level moral reasoning is based on perceived expectations that significant others

have for the individual. In other words, what is morally right is what gets a positive reaction from others, and what is morally wrong is what gets a negative reaction from others. Finally, during early adulthood, the individual enters the post-conventional level of moral development. This stage is characterized by a general adherence to social convention, with the added understanding that individuals may act as agents of change, to improve social justice. According to Kohlberg, individuals who fail to proceed through all of the levels and stages are likely to have a retarded moral growth, and thus they are more likely to become delinquents.

Constitutional learning theory, developed by James Q. Wilson and Richard J. Herrnstein (1985), links biological predisposition and learning to explain criminality. The two theorists argue that all behaviors have a cost and a benefit. If the benefits of committing a criminal act outweigh the losses incurred, then the person is likely to engage in that act. Wilson and Herrnstein also stress that equity and time discounting are important factors influencing the likelihood of criminality. Equity judgments are made during interactions in which the individual determines whether or not he or she has been treated justly. Equity judgments tend to be cumulative over time. Time discounting refers either to the speed with which rewards (versus punishment) may result from committing the crime or to the time it would take to earn a similar reward by legitimate means.

People differ in their threshold for gratification delay and in their tolerance for perceived injustice. This makes some people more likely to engage in criminal acts than others. People who are unwilling or unable to delay gratification long enough to receive rewards through legitimate channels are more likely to turn to the immediacy of illegitimate means to achieve their goals. Similarly, individuals may commit crimes to rectify their feelings of being treated unjustly. These differences in threshold are due largely to what Wilson and Herrnstein call constitutional factors (such as intelligence, physiological arousal, and personality characteristics), which influence how a person makes decisions about the costs and benefits of deviance. For example, physiological arousal influences the degree to which people can be conditioned toward specific targets. People with high arousal thresholds are unable to

associate punishments and guilt with committing a crime, and they are therefore less likely to be deterred from deviant acts. Similarly, children with low intelligence and who are poorly socialized are likely to exhibit an impulsivity that is associated with later deviance.

It can be seen that psychological theories of crime are of several different types. In most contemporary theories, psychological factors are combined with social and sometimes with biological factors, in an effort to explain crime more comprehensively.

SEE ALSO: Biological Theories of Crime; Classical Criminology; Criminology; Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime; Positive Criminology; Social Learning Theory; Therapeutic Communities.

References

Aichorn, August (1963) *Wayward Youth: A Psychoanalytic Study of Delinquent Children, Illustrated by Actual Case Histories*. New York: Viking Press.

Akers, Ronald (1985) *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Burgess, Robert L., & Akers, Ronald (1968) A differential association–reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems* 14, 128–147.

Eysenck, Hans (1977) *Crime and Personality*. London: Paladin.

Friedlander, K. (1947) *The Psychoanalytic Approach to Juvenile Delinquency*. London: Kegan Paul.

Kohlberg, L. (1960) The development of children's orientations toward a moral order. *Vita Humana* 6, 11–33.

Redl, Fritz, & Wineman, David (1951) *Children Who Hate: The Disorganization and Breakdown of Behavior Controls*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Shoemaker, D. J. (1990) *Theories of Delinquency: An Examination of Explanations of Delinquenct Behavior*, 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Slee, Phillip T. (2002) *Child, Adolescent and Family Development*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992) *Principles of Criminology*, 11th edn. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.

Sykes, Gresham, & Matza, David (1957) Techniques of neutralization. *American Sociological Review* 22, 664–670.

Vold, G. B., & Bernard, T. J. (1986) *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Walters, G. D. (1990) *The Criminal Lifestyle*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Walters, G. D., & White, T. W. (1989) The thinking criminal: A cognitive model of lifestyle criminality. *Criminal Justice Research Bulletin* 4, 1–10.

Wilson, J. Q., & Herrnstein, R. (1985) *Crime and Human Nature*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Differential Association Theory

DANIELLE R. KLECKNER

The theory of differential association is classified as a prominent criminological theory rooted in the field of sociology. Edwin Sutherland developed his theory of differential association in order to establish the concept that criminal behavior is not thoroughly explained through an individualistic approach, but instead through the makeup of social organizations and how individuals are influenced by them. It is in this sense that sociological factors, such as family, school, peers, environment, etc., are the very key to understanding why crime occurs in society. Arguably, it is with this understanding that Sutherland rejected the earlier works of researchers, such as Lombroso, who described criminal behavior as influenced by an individual's biological makeup and deficiencies (Anderson and Dyson 2002; Lilly, Cullen, and Ball 2007). However, Sutherland was not the first to develop a theory that rejected individualistic explanations as to why crime occurs. Instead, he followed in the footsteps of fellow Chicago school researchers Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay. Shaw and McKay set sociological explanations of crime theory in motion with their theory on social disorganization, but it was Sutherland's theory of differential association that was more applicable to explain the true nature of criminal behavior in many areas of society (Lilly et al. 2007). Sutherland's theory was an attempt to explain crimes that were committed by both the upper and lower classes of society and it is in this regard that Sutherland's theory was the first theory of its time to address white-collar crime (Anderson and Dyson 2002).

Differential association theory was first introduced by Sutherland in his 1939 first edition of *Criminology*, but was modified in the 1947 edition (Sutherland and Cressey 1974). While studying at the University of Chicago, Sutherland's thinking was greatly influenced by the "Chicago brand of sociology," which ultimately shaped how he thought about crime and why crime occurs (Lilly et al. 2007: 41). Through his studies and research in the field of sociology, Sutherland came to reject the previous theorists' individualist explanations of why crime occurs, because he believed that it was not the individual who was to blame for criminal behavior. Instead, structural characteristics, such as the social organizations in which the individual is embedded (the neighborhood, etc.), are the overwhelming influence on criminal behavior (Lilly et al. 2007). In trying to develop a theory that accounted for this concept concerning the social aspect of why crime occurs, Sutherland looked to his colleagues and fellow Chicago school criminologists, Shaw and McKay, and their theory of social disorganization for further enlightenment.

In 1942, Shaw and McKay had developed their theory of social disorganization, which described particular neighborhoods, especially those in the inner city, which had lost their influences of positive prosocial controls and where criminal traditions were well established (Lilly et al. 2007). Sutherland's further theorizing extended Shaw and McKay's theory of social disorganization by first substituting their term of social disorganization with the new concept of differential social organization (Lilly et al. 2007). In this respect, Sutherland agreed that there was a concept of differential social organization in society and as a result, all of the criminal areas in society could be described more accurately. As part of his theory of differential social organization, Sutherland theorized that there are different types of cultures in society that define prosocial and antisocial (i.e., criminal) behavior in distinct and various ways (Sutherland 1973). It is in this respect that it is reasonable to believe that some cultures would be more permissive of criminal behavior than others (Lilly et al. 2007).

Sutherland further built on Shaw and McKay's observation that "delinquent values are transmitted from one generation to the next" (Lilly et al. 2007: 42). This observation was developed through the idea that the desire to commit

criminal behavior is "culturally transmitted," that is to say, criminal behavior is learned through the social organizations in which individuals are rooted and the cultural values they are subjected to (Lilly et al. 2007: 42). It is in this respect that Sutherland's macro-level theory of differential social organization evolved into his micro-level theory of differential association. Whereas differential social organization focused on particular groups that contained values that were more conducive to criminal behavior (macro-level), differential association focused on how the individual learned values that were more conducive to criminal behavior (micro-level) (Cullen and Agnew 2011).

As part of his theory on differential association, Sutherland concluded that, especially in inner-city areas, a culture conflict takes place. As part of this culture conflict, there are two different cultures (one conventional and one criminal) competing for the "allegiance of the residents" (Lilly et al. 2007: 42). Criminal behavior is thus acted upon whenever an individual becomes consumed by the criminal culture. However, the criminal culture does not always emerge victorious. The importance of the culture conflict is to understand how each particular individual chooses which of the two competing cultures to be associated with. This can best be explained through Sutherland's concept of "definitions" and how they influence an individual's likelihood to commit or not to commit criminal behavior (Lilly et al. 2007). Sutherland explains that in life, all individuals will face "definitions favorable to the violation of law" and "definitions unfavorable to the violation of law" (Sutherland 1973). It is how much definitions on one side exceed those on the other that influences whether or not the individual will choose to act upon criminal or noncriminal behaviors. As Sutherland attempted to further develop his theory to more accurately explain criminal behavior, he recognized that his theory could be better explained in greater detail (Sutherland and Cressey 1974).

In 1947, in a modified version of his well-recognized work *Criminology*, Sutherland established a set of nine propositions that he believed accurately described his theory of differential association and why crime occurs in society. The nine propositions are as follows:

1. Criminal behavior is learned.
2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication.
3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within the intimate personal groups.
4. When criminal behavior is learned, the learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which sometimes are very complicated, sometimes are very simple; and (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of legal codes as favorable and unfavorable.
6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law. This is the principle of differential association.
7. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity.
8. The process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all the mechanisms that are involved in any other learning.
9. While criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values (Sutherland and Cressey 1974: 75–76).

A further explanation of Sutherland's nine propositions is as follows: (1) The very essence of the first proposition is the concept in which Sutherland turned from previous theories on biological explanations of crime and insisted that criminal behavior is not inherited. Instead, individuals learn criminal behavior through their social interactions and it is through this learning process that individuals begin the process of taking part in criminal behavior (Anderson and Dyson 2002; Lilly et al. 2007). (2) As for Sutherland's second proposition, the communication aspect of the learning process refers to how people interact with one another and how they are socialized. (3) As for the third proposition, it is important to note that criminal behavior cannot

be learned without the help of others, which commonly occurs within an individual's social groups (Sutherland and Cressey 1974). An individual's "intimate personal groups" would consist of people with whom the individual has the closest of bonds, meaning those whom the individual can trust. These "intimate personal groups" would most likely consist of the individual's family, friends, and peer groups. (4) While an individual's behavior cannot be learned without the help of others, Sutherland's fourth proposition explains the specific learning process, which is two-fold: first, individuals must learn the physical techniques for committing a crime (how to pick a lock, etc.), second, they must learn the mental component of how to rationalize their behavior and change their thinking to suit and accept their behavior. (5) Sutherland's fifth proposition explains that it is through the interactions with an individual's "intimate personal groups" that the individual learns either "definitions of legal codes as favorable," meaning to see law as something to abide by, or "definitions of legal codes as unfavorable," meaning to see law as something to disregard (Sutherland and Cressey 1974). (6) Sutherland's sixth proposition defines his reasoning behind the theory of differential association. As Akers and Sellers (2004: 82) further explain, individuals become criminal only after they have learned "definitions" (rationalizations and attitudes) favorable to violation of law in "excess" of the definitions unfavorable to violation of law. (7) As explained by Sutherland's seventh proposition, an individual has a greater chance to engage in criminal behavior if exposed to "definitions unfavorable to the violation of law" more frequently (frequency), for a longer period of time (duration), at any earlier age in life (priority), and that are more intense (intensity), than "definitions favorable to the violation of law" (Akers and Sellers 2004; Anderson and Dyson 2002). (8) The eighth proposition states Sutherland's observation that learning criminal behavior is comparable to learning any other type of behavioral patterns. (9) In Sutherland's ninth and final proposition, criminal behavior cannot be explained by motives such as "the happiness principle, striving for social status, the money motive, or frustration," because these very same motives can explain noncriminal behavior (Sutherland and Cressey 1974: 76–77).

Therefore, it cannot be assumed that criminal and noncriminal behaviors have the exact same motives.

As Sutherland's theory was introduced, it received substantial attention from researchers and still continues to do so. One of the most persuasive pieces of evidence supporting differential association is explained by Warr (1988: 186) when he states, "no characteristic of individuals known to criminologists is a better predictor of criminal behavior than the number of delinquent friends an individual has." Even though Sutherland's theory is regarded by many researchers as being rationally sound, there is, however, the issue that it cannot be properly tested as originally stated (Paternoster and Bachman 2001). In order for differential association theory to take on new meaning, Matsueda argues that future research needs to examine the theory's abstract principles, such as "definitions favorable to crime, differential social organization, and normative conflict" (1988: 295). Once these abstract principles and concepts are further explored, Sutherland's theory will be able to be properly tested and better explored to its full potential. Even so, Sutherland's theory of differential association can be described as being a major influence of "a wide range of criminological theories" (Cote 2002: 126). However, while Sutherland insisted in his theory that criminal behavior is learned, he did fail to explain or explore how that learning process actually occurs (Akers and Sellers 2004). By distinguishing that there was a limitation to Sutherland's theory in this regard, Ronald Akers looked to extend Sutherland's theory through his own theory of social learning.

SEE ALSO: Biological Theories of Crime; Criminology; Social Disorganization Theory; Social Learning Theory.

References

Akers, R. L., & Sellers, C. S. (2004) *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*, 4th edn. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Anderson, J. F., & Dyson, L. (2002) *Criminological Theories: Understanding Crime in America*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Cote, S. (2002) *Criminological Theories: Bridging the Past to the Future*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2011) *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings*, 4th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2007) *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences*, 4th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Matsueda, R. L. (1988) The current state of differential association theory. *Crime and Delinquency* 34(3), 277–306.

Paternoster, R., & Bachman, R. (2001) *Explaining Criminals and Crime: Essays in Contemporary Criminological Theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Sutherland, E. H. (1973) *On Analyzing Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1974) *Criminology*, 9th edn. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Warr, M. (2001) The social origins of crime: Edwin Sutherland and the theory of differential association. In R. Paternoster & R. Bachman (eds.), *Explaining Criminals and Crime: Essays in Contemporary Criminological Theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury, pp. 182–191.

Routine Activities and Crime

JOONGYEUP LEE

During the rise of social positivism in the early 1900s, criminologists started to attribute criminal motive and characteristics to social structure, and then to social processes in which criminals were largely made through interactions with family, friends, and teachers. The society and others were to blame when a criminal committed crime. Such a viewpoint reached its apex in the 1960s when the civil rights movement and anti-authority movements flourished across the United States. The turbulence in the social paradigm set the ground for the development of labeling theory of crime and deviance. Again, the government and justice system were blamed for social problems.

Routine activities theory emerged in the midst of yet another change in the social paradigm in the 1970s. Some criminologists and society as a whole began to challenge the ideology that society is responsible for crime and criminals. Also, justice policies and public programs for crime reduction that were developed under such ideology appeared ineffective. Missing in an understanding of the causes of crime was a view of criminals as rational and responsible human beings. Consequently, rational choice theory and deterrence theory emerged.

Cohen and Felson (1979) put forth the routine activities theory from the rational choice perspective. They posited that offenders in general are rational human beings who weigh the potential cost and benefit of crime. When they conclude in favor of the crime, crime is most likely to occur (Felson 1986). People are instinctively motivated to commit a crime to the extent they are by nature in pursuit of self-interest and pleasure. This is similar to Hirschi's (1969) ideological basis for social bonding theory in which the issue begins with asking why we refrain from committing crime. Accordingly, we all are tempted to commit crime to varying degrees. However, offenders' criminal motive does not materialize unless they find a target in a crime-favorable situation. Therefore, theorizing criminal motive is deemed unnecessary to routine activities theorists. What matters the most is the situation where a victim and offender momentarily stand together, rather than how an offender has lived in the past. This rationale stands in stark contrast with other criminological theories which attempt to define the causal pathways to criminal motive or propensity.

Unique to routine activities theory is the substantive addressing of opportunity in the situation (Lee, Zhang, and Hoover 2013). Crime requires an opportunity, in addition to a more or less motivated offender. As long as an offender can think rationally, no crime can occur without his or her finding an opportunity which s/he believes can make a perfect crime. For this reason, routine activities theory is sometimes referred to as opportunity theory (Wilcox, Land, and Hunt 2003). The fundamental perspective in routine activities theory posits that crime occurs when a situation within the context of our *routine life patterns* produces an optimal opportunity (Felson 1998; Osgood et al. 1996). And the usual dimensions to identify the situation are temporal and spatial dimensions. If a person's routine patterns include returning home on foot via deserted streets late at night, then s/he would be vulnerable to robbery. Presence on the street without other people nearby and at night may be an optimal spatial and temporal condition for rape. In their theory, Cohen and Felson (1979) articulated that the specific elements of crime as an incident must emerge from a criminally optimal time and place. Along with the motivated offender, they propose two more elements: a suitable target and the absence of capable guardianship. Targets for crime are wide in range; anything or anyone can be attractive to an offender as long as it has the projected *benefit*. Thieves might target jewelry for its light weight and high resale value, and rapists would target females of their physical preference. Capable guardianship also has a wide range that embraces any entity that can bewilder offenders by warning of the potential *cost* in terms of arrest and punishment. Police, private security

systems, CCTVs, and even the nearness of other people can provide guardianship against crime. The theory argues that if routine patterns in life happen to bring about an opportunity through a nexus of the three elements, then a crime is most likely to occur.

Cohen and Felson (1979) explain the increase in crime rate between the 1960s and 1970s in the United States with an abrupt increase in women's participation in the labor force; it exposed more women on the streets for a longer period of time during the day and left more houses unattended during working hours. Similarly, there has been a continuing increase in the types and amount of valuables in the 2000s. Electronic gadgets have become smaller, lighter, and more expensive, and more people own them than before. The more portable and valuable these items are to the owner, the more suitable they become to robbers and thieves. The consequential increase in suitable targets promotes an increase in crime rates. Nevertheless, one may suppose that the advancement in police tactics and investigative technology, inexpensive private security systems, or easier access to police through cell phone use must provide some degree of buffer against the crime rate increase. The interpretation of a decrease in crime rate would then conclude that the relative strength of widespread guardianship offsets the quantitative increase in suitable targets in our society.

Routine activities theory is often referred to as victimization theory because of its emphasis on the profile of a victim and the victim's presence in a particular situation (Cohen, Kluegel, and Land 1981; Fisher et al. 1998). In effect, routine activities theory was developed based on findings from victimization data (see Cohen and Felson 1979). A group of scholars, however, have postulated that the environment in terms of time and place matters not only to a victim but also to an offender. They discuss how the situation relates to the confinement of motivated offenders (Brantingham and Brantingham 1993; Eck and Weisburd 1995; Osgood et al. 1996). Their elaboration on both situational elements and the absence of authority figures rationalizes an offender-centered approach. Situational motivation results from the situational characteristics by which a person can easily gain motive and find targets for a specific crime. Absence of an authority figure implies that a person is free from

cognitive supervision from entities such as police or families (Lee, Jang, and Bouffard 2011).

Routine activities theory, following rational choice perspective, emphasizes the need for a crime-specific approach to the understanding of crime (Cohn 1996; Clarke 1997; Lee et al. 2013). While offenders are usually young and poor males who prefer absence of guardianship, the optimal condition varies in terms of targets across different types of crime. Robbers would favor tourists or affluent people, but rapists would favor young and attractive females, and car thieves are not much interested in either group of people. The variation extends to the temporal and spatial dimensions of the optimal condition across different types of crime (Lee et al. 2013). While most offenders would prefer night time, burglars may prefer daytime hours when family members are at work or school. Pickpockets may prefer weekends when more targets are on the street, while burglars would favor weekdays when most targets are at work, away from home. Concerning spatial conditions, there are crimes that primarily occur outdoors (e.g., aggravated assault), whereas other types occur mainly indoors (e.g., illegal drug use).

Further, the profiles of offenders would generate the resources for better understanding of crime ecology. The rationality assumption in routine activities theory reflects the importance of cognitive human agency. Immediately before making an action, an offender should assess the suitability of the target and evaluate the situation. Offenders are individual human beings with various viewpoints and knowledge. A car thief may consider a brand new Mercedes as a suitable target for its market value and his capability to disable its anti-theft system. By contrast, another car thief might prefer older models simply because she knows a market for those models. The way offenders perceive and assess a crime-resistant guardianship in the situation also differs. One may have correct and full information of a police patrol route and response time in an area, while another has incorrect and partial information. One may consider a few bystanders to be a non-threat to his robbery, while another robber finds them discouraging. This perspective demonstrates the offender-specific approach to rational choice decision. It recognizes that offenders vary in terms of their estimation of cost or benefit pertaining to the same situation.

Empirical research on routine activities theory has not been extensive. The variables such as target suitability and guardianship are not easily measurable because they are relative concepts that depend on the type of crime and criminal. For example, a suitable target of rape for a male offender would be completely different from a suitable target for shop lifting for a female offender. In addition, the dataset for a perfect test would require the information on suspect/victim, temporal and spatial dimensions, and any estimates of guardianship; such a dataset is seldom available. Two data types used most extensively are a police department database for calls for service or arrest files (Johnson 2008; Lee et al. 2013; Rabe-Hemp and Schuck 2007) and victim surveys (Cohen and Cantor 1980; Cohen et al. 1981; Kennedy and Forde 1990). Still, the measures of capable guardianship are limited to community characteristics or presence of bystanders. For these reasons, the extant literature focused primarily on the temporal and spatial dimensions (see Andresen 2006; Cohn 1996; Roncek and Maier 1991). These situational factors are examined to identify the specific profiles of a situation that result in criminal opportunities. Presence at a particular time of day and day of the week and in a particular place may render the victim most suitable and the guardianship least effective.

Johnson (2008) employed the situational approach in analyzing safety threats to responding officers in domestic violence. Using the FBI's *Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted* reports and news articles from 1999 to 2004, Johnson identified 143 fatal and non-fatal assaults in domestic violence across the United States. He examined situational profiles, such as the time of day, day of the week, month of the year, relationship between suspect and complainant, location, and suspect's demographical variables. Findings suggest that a temporal dimension is an important factor influencing domestic violence. For example, fatal assaults to responding officers were more likely to occur on Wednesdays and Saturdays and between 9.00 p.m. and midnight in residential areas.

Rabe-Hemp and Schuck (2007) investigated threats to police officer safety using police arrest and victimization survey data from six jurisdictions across the United States. They considered weapon use by suspects, rather than the injuries to officers, as a threat indicator. Findings revealed that situational factors, such as the presence of bystanders, location, and time of day, contributed to the odds of weapon use by suspects on officers. When bystanders were present, the location was considered dangerous by police officers, or if it was during the night, the suspects were more likely to use a weapon against the responding officers. A similar study was delivered by Lee et al. (2013). They examined both situational and neighborhood characteristics of weapon use in domestic disputes and found empirical evidence corroborating routine activities theory that aggressive human behavior shows patterns in the context of situational elements.

Kennedy and Forde (1990) analyzed data from the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey to test the validity of routine activities theory for both property and interpersonal victimization. The research idea was based on a previous assertion by Miethe, Stafford, and Long (1987) that routine activities theory would not account for interpersonal violence. Kennedy and Forde examined demographic variables, routine activities during the day and night, and community characteristics, such as the rates of single-headed households, unemployment, divorce, and low-income families. After analyzing over 70,000 cases, they found that, counter to the allegation by Miethe et al. (1987), temporal and spatial dimensions of the victim's lifestyle were significantly associated with both property and interpersonal violence.

Cohn's (1996) study was more focused on weather and temporal dimensions of situational characteristics. She examined the temperature, wind speed, humidity, precipitation, month of the year, time of day, day of the week, and presence of light, among others, for their contributions to the amount of calls. Calls for service data from the Minneapolis Police Department in 1985, 1987, and 1988 were analyzed, and findings provided support for routine activities theory. Temporal variables, as well as a few weather variables were significantly associated with the number of calls for service. Specifically, the calls increased during the night, on weekends, and during the spring and summer. In another study, Cohn also considered outdoor temperature and climate as significant factors of crime (Rotton and Cohn 2004).

Due partially to routine activities theory's indifference to criminal motive, integration with other criminological theories is affordable given their substantial contribution to criminal motive and lack of attention to situational approach. For example, the integration with *social bonding theory* would posit that poor parenting and insufficient attachment to family and society would motivate the offender, who then finds a target in the absence of guardianship at a particular time and space. Research has been carried out to integrate *social disorganization theory* and routine activities theory based on their mutual reinforcement and a common emphasis on geographical characteristics of crime at the incident level and neighborhood level (Lee et al. 2013; Smith, Frazee, and Davison 2000). Social disorganization theory can be complementary to routine activities theory to the extent that an increase in criminal motive and decrease in social control under routine activities theory may be attributable to the dilapidated neighborhood under social disorganization theory (Rice and Smith 2002). At the same time, routine activities theory can be complementary to social disorganization theory to the extent that criminal opportunity in terms of the amount of suitable targets is a relatively neglected aspect in social disorganization theory (Miethe and Meier 1994). After all, routine activities theory has served a pivotal role in understanding crime and delinquency particularly for those who believe crime is a product of motive and opportunity.

SEE ALSO: Rational Choice Theory; Victimization, Theories of.

References

Andresen, M. A. (2006) Crime measures and the geographical analysis of criminal activity. *British Journal of Criminology* 46, 258–285.

Boba, R., & Santos, R. (2007) Single-family home construction site theft: A crime prevention case study. *International Journal of Construction Education and Research* 3(3), 217–236.

Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1993) Environment, routine, and situation: Toward a pattern theory of crime. In R. V. Clarke and M. Felson (ed.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice*, vol. 5. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing, pp. 259–294.

Clarke, R. V. (1997) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies* (2nd edn). New York: Harrow and Heston.

Cohen, L. E., & Cantor, D. (1980) Residential burglary in the United States: Life-style and demographic factors associated with the probability of victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 18(1), 588–608.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review* 44(4), 588–608.

Cohen, L. E., Kluegel, J., & Land, K. (1981) Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization: An exposition and test of a formal theory. *American Sociological Review* 46(5), 505–524.

Cohn, E. G. (1996) The effect of weather and temporal variations on calls for police service. *American Journal of Police* 15(1), 23–43.

Cornish, D. (1994) The procedural analysis of offending and its relevance for situational prevention. In R. V. Clarke (ed.), *Crime Prevention Studies*, vol. 3. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 151–196.

Eck, J. E., & Weisburd, D. (1995) Crime places in crime theory. In J. E. Eck and D. Weisburd (eds.), *Crime Places: Crime Prevention Studies*, vol. 4. Monsey, New York: Willow Tree Press, pp. 1–33.

Felson, M. (1986) Linking criminal choices: Routine activities, social control, rational decisions and criminal outcomes. In D. B. Cornish and R. V. Clarke (ed.), *The Reasoning Criminal*. New York: Springer Verlag, pp. 119–128.

Felson, M. (1998) *Crime and Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. J., Cullen, F. T., & Lu, C. (1998) Crime in the ivory tower: The level and sources of student victimization. *Criminology* 36, 671–710.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *The Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Johnson, R. R. (2008) Assessing the true dangerousness of domestic violence calls. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum* 8(5), 19–29.

Kennedy, L. W., & Forde, D. R. (1990) Routine activities and crime: An analysis of victimization in Canada. *Criminology* 28(1), 137–152.

Lee, J., Jang, H., & Bouffard, L. A. (2011) Maternal employment and juvenile delinquency: A longitudinal study of Korean adolescents. *Crime and Delinquency*. doi: 10.1177/0011128711428733

Lee, J., Zhang, Y., & Hoover, L. (2013) Profiling weapon use in domestic violence: Multilevel analysis of situational and neighborhood factors. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice* 8(2), 164–184.

Miethe, T. D., & Meier, R. F. (1994) *Crime and its Social Context: Toward an Integrated Theory of Outsiders, Victims, and Situations*. New York: SUNY.

Miethe, T. D., Stafford, M. C., & Long, S. J. (1987) Social differentiation in criminal victimization: A test of routine activities/lifestyle theories. *American Sociological Review* 52, 184–194.

Osgood, W. D., Wilson, J. K., O'Malley, P. M., et al. (1996) Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review* 61(4), 635–655.

Rabe-Hemp, C. E., & Schuck, A. M. (2007) Violence against police officers: Are female officers at greater risk? *Police Quarterly* 10(4), 411–428.

Rice, K. J., & Smith, W. R. (2002) Socioecological models of automotive theft: Integrating routine activity and social disorganization approaches. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 39(3), 304–336.

Roncek, D. W., & Meier, P. A. (1991) Bars, blocks, and crimes revisited: Linking the theory of routine activities to the empiricism of hot spots. *Criminology* 29, 725–753.

Rotton, J., & Cohn, E. G. (2004) Outdoor temperature, climate control, and criminal assault: The geographical and temporal ecology of violence. *Environment and Behavior* 36(2), 276–306.

Smith, W. R., Frazee, S. G., & Davison, E. L. (2000) Furthering the integration of routine activity and social disorganization theories: Small units of analysis and the study of street robbery as a diffusion process. *Criminology* 38(2), 489–523.

Weisburd, D., Mastrofski, S. D., McNally, A., et al. (2003) Reforming to preserve: Compstat and strategic problem solving in American policing. *Criminology and Public Policy,* 2(3), 421–456.

Wilcox, P., Land, K. C., & Hunt, S. A. (2003) *Criminal Circumstances: A Dynamic Multicontextual Criminal Opportunity Theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Life-Course and Development Theories of Crime

JAMIE NEWSOME

The life-course perspective has emerged as a leading paradigm in criminology. Life-course theories take a developmental approach, and emphasize the importance of examining patterns of behavior in each stage of life to achieve a comprehensive understanding of involvement in crime. Elder (1985) explains that an individual's life comprises interconnected trajectories, or pathways, that extend across different developmental periods. Shifts from one state to another along a trajectory are known as transitions. Additionally, transitions can produce turning points in which the direction of one's trajectory is altered. Human development is considered a continual process, beginning at conception and continuing over the span of one's life. A variety of factors at each developmental stage of life can explain individual differences in behavior.

Life-course criminology is integrative and is informed by empirical research in a number of disciplines. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck (1950) pioneered the longitudinal multifactor approach to examining delinquency. Between 1939 and 1948, the Gluecks collected information from numerous sources on a sample of 500 delinquent and 500 nondelinquent boys. Their data captured social, psychological, and biological aspects of the boys' lives and identified important differences between the two groups. Although their research was largely criticized at the time, the Gluecks' work has had a tremendous impact on the life-course paradigm in recent years.

Another influential study was conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin (1972) in which they observed 9,945 boys born in 1945 and residing in Philadelphia between 1955 and 1963. Using official police records to identify delinquents, Wolfgang and his colleagues found that about one-third of the sample had some police contact. Of those who were involved in delinquency, more than half were repeat offenders. The group of repeat offenders were further divided into nonchronic recidivists and chronic recidivists. These chronic offenders represented only 6% of the entire sample, but accounted for the majority of crimes committed by the cohort. The identification of chronic offenders suggested that these individuals may possess unique characteristics that predispose them toward a criminal lifestyle. Furthermore, this work illustrated the need for criminologists to investigate other aspects of the criminal career.

The criminal career is the sequence of criminal acts one commits over time (Blumstein et al. 1986). Examination of the criminal career includes participation, which distinguishes those who have at any time been involved in crime from individuals who have had no involvement in crime. Furthermore, criminologists can evaluate current participation, or criminal activity, during a particular period of time. The beginning of the criminal career is marked by the first offense, which is considered the onset. The age of onset is an important concept in life-course criminology because early onset is associated with more serious and long-term patterns of offending (Loeber 1982; Loeber and LeBlanc 1990). The final aspect of the criminal career is desistance, or the termination of criminal behavior.

In 1985, Robert Sampson and John Laub discovered the original data files compiled by the Gluecks decades earlier, which had been donated to the Harvard Law School Library. These data were used to develop and test their age-graded theory of informal social control, which has become a dominant theory in the life-course tradition (Sampson and Laub 1993). The central premise of this theory is that informal social ties to society influence individual trajectories of crime and conformity. The institutions responsible for generating informal social control vary across the stages of life. When the bonds to these institutions are weak or broken, crime and deviance are more likely to emerge.

Sampson and Laub (1993) contend that the most salient bonds in childhood and adolescence are the family, school, and peers. Structural factors including the size and socioeconomic status of the family, the criminality of the mother and father, residential mobility, whether the parents are foreign-born, the mother's employment status, and family disruption are predicted to influence parenting practices. In addition to these factors, the characteristics of the individual during childhood can influence parenting practices. Children who have a difficult temperament, persistent tantrums, and early conduct disorder are likely to create difficulties for parents. Both the structural and individual factors can create a lack of supervision of the child, poor disciplinary practices, and a weak bond between the parents and the child, resulting in delinquency (Sampson and Laub 1993). As the individual ages, bonds to school and peers become more important. The structural and individual factors that influence parenting are also predicted to influence school attachment and performance, and attachment to delinquent peers. Children and adolescents who are weakly attached to school and strongly attached to delinquent peers are likely to become involved in delinquency.

Sampson and Laub (1993) explain that stability between misbehavior early in life and during adolescence and adulthood is explained by different types of continuity. Homotypic continuity refers to the observation of similar behaviors or traits over time (Caspi and Bem 1990). For example, an individual may have delinquent peers during each stage of development. However, youth who participate in deviant or delinquent behaviors may engage in different deviant or criminal acts later in life, which is known as heterotypic continuity (Caspi and Bem 1990). While the behaviors are not the same at each stage of life, they reflect the same underlying trait.

These patterns are presumed to be the product of interactional and cumulative continuity (Caspi, Elder, and Bem 1987). *Interactional continuity* refers to a process in which the actions of an individual produce a response from others that sustains their behavior. For example, youngsters with a difficult temperament may evoke negative reactions from parents and teachers, which weaken their attachment to the family and school, resulting in further problem behaviors. Cumulative continuity generates stability in antisocial behaviors through the consequences that accumulate over time. Sampson and Laub (1993) explain that early delinquency may "knife off" future opportunities because arrests, convictions, and periods of incarceration can sever bonds to family, school, and friends. This makes it increasingly difficult for individuals to successfully participate in conventional activities such as pursuing higher education or maintaining meaningful employment.

Although the age-graded theory of informal social control offers an explanation for stability in behavior over time, the theory also offers an explanation for change. Sampson and Laub (1993) posit that some experiences serve as *turning points*, which can change one's trajectory toward a conventional lifestyle. Results from their analyses suggest that marriage, obtaining meaningful employment, and serving the military are key turning points. They hypothesize that adult social bonds to conventional institutions, including attachment to a spouse, commitment to educational or occupational goals, and stable employment can increase informal social control (Sampson and Laub 1993). These bonds can create change regardless of childhood factors because as an individual invests in these institutions he or she can create social capital, making it more costly to participate in crime (Laub and Sampson 1993).

More recently, Laub and Sampson (2003) followed up with 52 of the 70-year-old men who had participated in the Gluecks' original study. The complete data represent a 60-year study of the Glueck men, which is currently the longest longitudinal study in existence in criminological research. Findings from their interviews with the men resulted in the modification of the age-graded theory of informal social control. Laub and Sampson (2003) still maintain that involvement in crime is related to social bonds at each stage of the life-course; however, they recognize the importance of situational contexts, structured routine activities, and human agency in explaining persistent offending or desistance from crime during adulthood.

During adulthood, social bonds may be influenced by individual choice and situational context (Laub and Sampson 2003). As one ages, one may

encounter greater costs for engaging in criminal behaviors. Some behavioral choices may be altered by an individual's routine activities. Those with lives that are highly structured and routine may be more likely to desist as a result of these routines. Laub and Sampson (2003) also hypothesize that human agency, or choice, can create desistance, but the structural context can limit one's choices. While turning points may arise that have the potential to create change, one must exercise human agency in order to experience those changes. Although the interaction between the individual and his or her environment is evident throughout development, some factors are ultimately the result of chance occurrences that cannot be predicted.

The men reported during the interviews that marriage, service in the military, reform school, and work all served as turning points (Laub and Sampson 2003). The characteristics of turning points that are most likely to result in desistance are those situations that separate the past from the present, increase supervision, alter or increase the structure of one's routines, and provide opportunities for transforming one's identity. Turning points with these features are able to create immediate changes in one's day-to-day activities, and also promote long-term change by generating social capital. According to their revised theory, Laub and Sampson (2003) argue that change is not only possible, but is virtually inevitable for all offenders.

Terrie Moffitt's (1993, 1997) developmental taxonomy has emerged as another dominant theory in life-course criminology. She contends that there are two types of offenders, each with a unique pattern of development. Life-course persistent offenders are a small group of offenders characterized as showing considerable continuity in various antisocial behaviors across every stage of development. Their behavioral problems are hypothesized to be the result of neuropsychological deficits and aversive environmental conditions (Moffitt 1993). According to this theory, neuropsychological deficits can be due to genetic factors or influences surrounding prenatal development (e.g., poor prenatal care, exposure to toxins). Even amongst children who would otherwise be born normally, it is possible that complications during labor and delivery could result in neuropsychological deficits. In either case, these problems emerge very early in life, and may have a negative impact on an individual's temperament, behavior, and cognitive abilities. Children with neuropsychological deficits may be born to parents who are unable to effectively manage them. Parents who lack the ability and skills to properly rear these children are more likely to respond negatively to behavioral problems. The continued interaction between these difficult children and their ill-equipped parents generates further problem behaviors.

Life-course persistent offenders engage in negative interactions with others outside their immediate family as well. As a result, they are often rejected by teachers and peers in childhood (Moffit 1993). These youth fail to master prosocial skills early in life and often perform poorly in school. Beginning early in life, the effects of cumulative continuity begin to take hold and opportunities for future change diminish. Delinquency in adolescence further exacerbates the effects of cumulative continuity (Moffitt 1997). They are unable to form meaningful relationships with others and lack the abilities necessary to gain employment.

Adolescence-limited offenders are fundamentally different from life-course persistent offenders. Adolescence-limited offenders are more common, engage in less serious offenses, and do not have a history of early behavior problems (Moffitt 1993). Individuals in this group begin offending during the teenage years and desist upon entering adulthood. At the onset of puberty, youth become sexually mature and more independent of their parents. Additionally, society expects teens to act more like adults and less like children; however, during adolescence, youth are not permitted to assume adult roles and engage in behaviors associated with adult status. This period of time is known as a *maturity gap*, and during this phase teenagers experience ambivalence and confusion regarding their lives. Moffitt (1993, 1997) explains that youth deal with the stress of being in the maturity gap through social mimicry.

During adolescence, the behaviors of the life-course persistent offenders seem to their peers to be reflective of adult status. They are frequently found to engage in smoking, drinking alcohol, risky sexual behaviors, and to resist adult control (Moffitt 1993). To adolescents seeking a way

to cope with the maturity gap, life-course persistent offenders appear to have a solution to their dilemma and their behavior is mimicked. For adolescence-limited offenders, their minor delinquent acts are viewed as a symbol of their independence, making these acts rewarding and likely to be repeated.

Unlike life-course persistent offenders, the criminal behavior of adolescence-limited offenders does not persist into adulthood. According to Moffitt (1993, 1997), as youth continue to develop and enter adulthood, they are able to achieve adult status through conventional means. Individuals are able to secure employment or begin preparing for a career. They are permitted more freedom to make decisions regarding their lives and have more resources to achieve adult status. During early adulthood, involvement in criminal acts becomes less rewarding and more costly. Continued criminal behavior is likely to produce consequences that may limit future opportunities. As a result, adolescence-limited offenders desist.

The shift from a deviant lifestyle to one that is conforming is easier to achieve for adolescence-limited offenders than for life-course persistent offenders. Adolescence-limited offenders do not suffer from neuropsychological deficits and are able to master prosocial skills (Moffitt 1993). Members of this group have little difficulty meeting the demands of college or employers, and are able to form relationships with the opposite sex. The duration of their criminal career is also significantly shorter than that of life-course persistent offenders, so the effects of cumulative continuity are less salient. Upon entering adulthood, adolescence-limited offenders are able to conform and create conventional lives, while life-course persistent offenders are ensnared in an antisocial lifestyle.

SEE ALSO: Age; Alcohol Use and Crime; Drug Use; Education and Crime; Families.

References

Blumstein, A., Cohen, J., Roth, J. A., et al. (1986) *Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals,"* vol. 1. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Caspi, A., & Bem, D. (1990) Personality continuity and change across the life course. In L. A. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 549–575.

Caspi, A., Elder, G. H., & Bem, D. J. (1987) Moving against the world: Life-course patterns of explosive children. *Developmental Psychology* 23, 308–313.

Elder, G. H. (1985) Perspectives on the life course. In G. H. Elder, Jr. (ed.), *Life Course Dynamics: Trajectories and Transitions, 1968–1980*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 23–49.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950) *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.

Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (1993) Turning points in the life-course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology* 31, 301–325.

Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003) *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys at Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Loeber, R. (1982) The stability of antisocial and delinquent child behavior: A review. *Child Development* 53, 1431–1446.

Loeber, R., & LeBlanc, M. (1990) Toward a developmental criminology. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, vol. 12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 375–473.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993) Adolescence-limited and life-course persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* 100, 674–701.

Moffitt, T. E. (1997) Adolescence-limited and life-course persistent offending: A complementary pair of developmental theories. In T. P. Thornberry (ed.), *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 11–54.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Sellin, T. (1972) *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Further Readings

Benson, M. L. (2002) *Crime and the Life Course*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Elder, G. H. (1996) Human lives in changing societies: Life course and developmental insights. In R. Cairns, G. H. Elder, Jr., & E. J. Costello (eds.), *Developmental Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 31–62.

Elder, G. H. (1998) The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development* 69(1), 1–12.

Laub, J. H., Sampson, R. J., & Sweeten, G. A. (2006) Assessing Sampson and Laub's life-course theory of crime. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory – Advances in Criminological Theory*, vol. 15. New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions Books, pp. 313–333.

Moffitt, T. E. (2006) A review of the research on the taxonomy of life-course persistent versus adolescence-limited antisocial behavior. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory – Advances in Criminological Theory*, vol. 15. New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions Books, pp. 277–312.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990) Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review* 55, 609–627.

Wolfgang, M. E., Thornberry, T. P., & Figlio, R. M. (1987) *From Boy to Man, From Delinquency to Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wright, J. P., Tibbetts, S. T., & Daigle, L. E. (2008) *Criminals in the Making: Criminality Across the Life Course*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marxist Criminology

CHRISTOPHER SHARP

Marxist criminology emerged as a form of New Criminology (an evolution of critical criminology) in the 1970s and 1980s. This particular sub-theory of social structure theory came about as a result of disillusion amongst some academics with mainstream criminological theory, and in many ways mirrored the sociopolitical responses to the turmoil of the 1960s (Sparks 1980). Although Karl Marx never specifically made any comment on a theory of crime and why people commit crimes *per se*, his perspectives on society and struggle led future criminologists to explore criminal behaviors from a Marxist viewpoint. The study of criminology from a Marxist perspective has largely fallen out of favor in recent times (Russell 2002), causing some to question the overall relevance of a critical criminology perspective in new research (Hil 2002). Nevertheless, this particular branch of critical criminology has raised several important questions regarding the interaction of social structure, the economy, and how certain behaviors become either criminalized or decriminalized.

Quinney (1978) cites the observations of Marx regarding individuals and their ability to succeed or fail within a particular culture. Marx noted that people do not necessarily have control over their current situation because they have little control over their history and how it is remembered and applied to their current state of affairs. Instead, history is often translated through both a subjective and objective retelling of the past. From an objective viewpoint, the conditions that cause people to desire and possess material objects provide the ideal environment for the creation and transformation of economic markets, and even for societal revolution. Such changes, however, can be counteracted through redirection of the social conscience toward newer, better material goods, or toward forces that may threaten the continued possession of already acquired goods by individuals in the populace.

As such, conditions in a society, good or bad, will not change within the established social order until the forces of production (those that produce goods but do not necessarily possess them, i.e., the working class) contradict the established societal mores (established by those that possess the goods). This contradiction, or protest, can then grow to a point where the proletariat becomes an obstacle to further growth; in essence, the proletariat becomes revolutionary. The ability of those that produce the goods to subjectively look at the inconsistencies between their history, the established desired state of existence, and their current state of being is the basis for revolution. Therefore, the interpretation of history as it relates to the current state of affairs is a review of both class struggle and the development of the modes of production. Conflict arises as individuals attempt to reconcile their subjective perceptions of reality with objective definitions of success.

Critical criminological authors, such as Chambliss and Seidman (1971), note that through the lens of Marxist criminology, the parameters of the legal system in developed societies can be best understood through an analysis of the structure of society and the subsequent conflict that arises as individuals are relegated to a particular class. More specifically, the focus of Marxist criminological research into the influence of class stratification and the conflict attributed to political and economic disparities may identify and explain relationships that cause individuals to commit criminal behaviors.

Marx further believed that written law was the mechanism by which the privileged or ruling class of a society (those that possess the means of production) overpowers the other classes within that society. Keeping subjugated classes controlled was therefore simply an exercise in identifying behaviors that were counter to the accepted, prevailing societal order and addressing those behaviors through the application of law. The process of convincing mainstream society that the newly identified behaviors were in fact antisocial and criminal in order to further marginalize those engaging in that behavior is paramount to solidifying the position of the ruling class. In

societies with largely homogeneous populations, the codification of law only becomes necessary to preserve the largely homogeneous nature of the culture (Sellin 1938). An example of this are Amish communities where the populace is largely homogeneous in attitudes and behaviors, and justice for actions that violate social norms is usually decided within the community.

Conversely, as societies become a mixed bag of cultures and people, the coming together of divergent behaviors and ideologies necessitates an increase in codified laws in order to solidify the historically established social mores. These codified laws become the ideological mainstream by which all members of a particular society are expected to adhere, and the measuring rod through which they are held accountable (also known as the middle-class measuring rod). Although the established codes of behavior may not necessarily reflect the ideological foundations of the majority population (long believed to be the middle class, which some think acts as the balancing force between the upper and lower classes), these codified laws are advocated as vital in order to maintain order in society. Political and economic pressures are then utilized to focus on increasing the fear of becoming a victim of crime, and the acceptance of the written law, in order to further refine the objective telling of history. For example, until the emergence of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), drinking and driving was not only not criminal, it was not even demonized as it is today. However, through the application of financial and political power, society's understanding of proper and acceptable behavior evolved to a point where drinking and driving is not only criminal, but is socially unacceptable. Another contemporary example is the controversy associated with the disparity in sentencing for crack versus powdered cocaine. Powdered cocaine, largely associated with the middle and upper classes, has been historically sentenced at a much lesser degree of harshness than crack cocaine. The harshness of punishment for crack cocaine, some believe, is due to the association of crack cocaine with marginalized populations such as minorities and the lower class.

Since law is often a function of protecting the interests of the state, Marxist criminology has often focused on crimes that are in violation of established political and state definitions of behavior. However, more recently, the influence of corporate interests on the political system and on states has led the established government (the mode of social control) and some researchers to expand this purview to include state-corporate crime. As an example, activities that emerged as a result of the use of technology ("hacking" for instance) and which were once viewed as methods for writing technical computer codes to make systems more efficient, have been systematically redefined as antisocial and criminal due to the damage they can inflict on corporations (e.g., espionage and degradation of service).

The study of Marxism allows for a theoretical foundation from which to question the arrangements of power and class in society, and provides several research questions, such as: why are the elements of power and political discourse often limited for the majority of the population? In a society where economic liquidity is correlated strongly with political power (i.e., increased financial assets equates to an increased political voice), it is interesting that the codification of accepted behaviors does not necessarily represent the subjective realities of the majority of the population (made up largely of the lower and middle classes). From a Marxist perspective, such conflict leads ultimately to a revolution and redefinition of the status quo, thereby changing how history is portrayed. An historical example of this is the American Revolution. At the time, those who were fighting the established status quo were viewed as traitors, guerrillas, and dishonorable. However, through the retelling of history, these same individuals are viewed as the founding fathers of the greatest nation in the world. This retelling of history through an objective lens is how power is established and continues to flourish.

Marxist research, grounded in the structure and development of society and the social order, has not only had criminological ramifications, but has also persuaded researchers in several other disciplines to explore the relationships of power, societal position, knowledge, and privilege within society. Societal alienation, often a derivative of the social power play, is believed to be the precursor to antisocial or criminalistic behaviors. As one class is marginalized, the behavior associated with that class is identified and labeled as antisocial, deviant, or criminal due to its non-adherence to

the accepted norms. This marginalization leads to decreased opportunities for success through the provision of menial labor opportunities and little or no recognition of the contributions of the marginalized class. The discrepancy between this actual and acceptable state of being generates frustration in the marginalized class, and leads to conflict. That conflict is viewed as a response to social oppression and as a justified means for overcoming it. In essence, crimes are committed in order to achieve the status that one feels one deserves. However, from the perspective of society, the actions of the controlled class are labeled as deviant, at first, in order to reassert the power and influence of the ruling class. The practice of labeling becomes the mechanism by which these behaviors begin to be criminalized and begins to explain why the focus of "mainstream" society changes from one crime to another.

This social class view of crime and behavior provides a comprehensive explanation of criminality, since Marx focused on societal forces. But it fails to explain why individuals within the oppressed class engage in socially accepted behaviors as opposed to those associated with the oppressed group. It is this key flaw that is believed to be one of the reasons why the Marxist view of criminology fell out of favor. The fact that individual members of a "criminal" group could in fact overcome the behaviors associated with that group and act in accordance with mainstream, socially accepted ideals means that, as with most theories, Marxist theorists could not explain the majority of crime in society. In fact, situations where individuals overcome their environment to enjoy conventional measures of success have been romanticized in movies such as "Boys N the Hood." (Opposite stories, where individuals cannot overcome their environment, are similarly told in movies like "Menace II Society.")

The reason why Marxist criminologists fail to explain individuals' (or groups') criminal behavior may be that they focus on the controlled rather than the controlling class. Randall Shelden (2006) analyzes in detail the history of the American criminal justice system and the methods used to control those groups seen as dangerous to the status quo. He cites Marx's observations that in a capitalist society there is a surplus population that is viewed as "societal scum" when labor within the population is scarce. This surplus population

can be called on when labor is needed, and just as easily thrown away when no longer needed. Shelden gives several examples, most notably the criminalization of opium (used heavily by Chinese immigrants) after the American railroad system was built; the criminalization of LSD and other hallucinogens as a response to the hippie and anti-war movements of the 1960s; and marijuana legislation that targeted mainly Hispanic and African American populations. Interestingly, at roughly the same time that the marijuana legislation was being enacted and advocated as necessary to control a new immigrant class, synthetic textiles such as nylon were starting to be produced as competitors to natural hemp (hemp being the fibers from the marijuana plant and noted for their strength and resilience). A final example is Prohibition laws as well as vagrancy laws and the idea of *parens patriae* (or the state as parent), which were mainly responses to the influx of Irish immigrants (deemed threatening to the predominantly English heritage of the United States).

Marxist thought can be applied to other areas of societal structure in addition to the criminal justice system and its perceived use not only to control but also to warehouse the classes deemed dangerous. The practice of urban gentrification creates a situation where individuals may be politically and economically marginalized, not because of their behaviors but because of their class standing. Gentrification occurs when wealthier individuals (i.e., the gentry) acquire property and businesses in what was once a low-income community. The result is often a displacement of the poorer, native residents, who cannot compete with the increased property costs, the associated taxes, and who are often shunned by the influx of businesses now catering to the more affluent migrants to the area. Although this may be problematic in and of itself, it is made even more so when the programs for urban gentrification are backed by the government. This can be done through programs such as first-time buyers programs and other financial incentives used to improve decayed housing, or by declaring particular houses as historical sites. Although the idea and practice of gentrification often results in reduced property crime and in increases in property value and the associated taxes (which benefit the local government), what is often not

considered is the impact on the displaced population in terms of access to housing, proximity to employment, and transportation (public or otherwise). While gentrification can occur as part of a planned revitalization project for downtown areas, it may also occur as an indirect result of responses to natural disasters. For instance, in the wake of "Hurricane Andrew" in Miami, Florida, low-income individuals displaced by the storm were moved to government-funded housing, sometimes at a great distance from their place of employment and with no access to public transportation. This was the result of them being forced out of the real-estate market due to increased housing costs, changes to building codes as a result of the storm, and rezoning as a means of hazard mitigation. Even though authors such as Hartman and Squires (2006) cite the lessons learned from "Hurricane Andrew" in order to build environmentally friendly, revitalization projects that include government-funded housing, what is not necessarily considered is that the victims of natural disasters are still being placed at the will of the government, which may or may not consider their need for meaningful employment opportunities.

In conclusion, Marx offered a great deal of insight, from a conflict perspective, into the way that the structure of society can lead to the marginalization of specific groups based on their perceived importance or worth to society as a whole. Marxist criminologists have used Marx to provide critical analyses of the American criminal justice system and the way the law is applied to control those individuals that are deemed dangerous. Authors such as Randall Shelden have noted that through the applications of laws pertaining to drugs, alcohol, and even parenting, immigrant populations have been targeted by the government for control throughout the history of the United States. Furthermore, Marxist criminologists have questioned the purpose of law and the correctional system in the United States, often accusing the system of being merely a method to warehouse the surplus labor population that is created by the ebb and flow of economic forces. However, Marxist criminology, which enjoyed a period of growth in the 1970s and 1980s, has fallen out of favor for two reasons. First, Marxist criminologists could not offer explanations as to why individuals within an oppressed class of people engaged in conventional behaviors as opposed to those deemed deviant or criminal. This situation caused many to question the worth of a Marxist perspective as an explanation for behavior. Secondly, Marxist criminologists were viewed as spending too much time positing Marxist criminology as a valid perspective instead of focusing on an in-depth analysis of Marxist theory and its applicability to the structure of society. This situation is changing, however, as a new generation of critical criminologists expand the analysis of social structure from the criminal justice system to an interdisciplinary analysis of society and the way groups can be marginalized and held under government control. Examples such as the response to "Hurricane Andrew" were used to illustrate how lower-class individuals can be displaced and have modes for gaining success through access to meaningful employment removed as a collateral effect of rebuilding. Furthermore, the move of communities toward revitalizing downtown areas, which were formerly low income, through increasing property values, increased property taxes, rezoning, and the designation of historical sites, often forces poorer residents away from those areas. Governments can exacerbate this problem through the provision of programs that encourage gentrification, often without regard to the secondary effects on those that are removed. In view of all this, future Marxist critical criminology may well provide an in-depth, holistic analysis of the structure of society.

SEE ALSO: Chambliss, William; Conflict Theories of Crime; Critical Criminology; Quinney, Richard.

References

Chambliss, W., & Seidman, R. (1971) *Law, Order, and Power*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hartman, C., & Squires, G. (2006) *There is No Such Thing as a Natural Disaster: Race, Class and Hurricane Katrina*. New York: Routledge.

Hil, R. (2002) Facing change: New directions for critical criminology in the early new millennium? *Western Criminology Review* 3(2), 1–21.

Quinney, R. (1978) The production of a Marxist criminology. *Contemporary Crises* 2, 277–292.

Russell, S. (2002) The continuing relevance of Marxism to critical criminology. *Critical Criminology* 11, 113–135.

Sellin, T. (1938) *Culture Conflict and Crime*. New York: Societal Science Research Council.

Shelden, R. (2006) Controlling the dangerous classes: The case of immigrants and the criminal justice system in the United States. Paper presented at Merging Immigration and Crime Control: An Interdisciplinary Workshop, University at Buffalo School of Law, April 27–29, 2006.

Sparks, R. (1980) A critique of Marxist criminology. *Crime and Justice* 2, 159–210.

Further Readings

Adams, G., & Balfour, D. (2009) *Unmasking Administrative Evil*. Thousand Oaks, CA: M.E. Sharpe, Sage.

Arrigo, B. A., & Williams, C. R. (eds.) (2006) *Philosophy, Crime, and Criminology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (2011) *Contemporary Critical Criminology*. London: Routledge.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Dragiewicz, M. (eds.) (2012) *Routledge Handbook of Critical Criminology*. London: Routledge.

Greenberg, D. F. (1993) *Crime and Capitalism: Readings in Marxist Criminology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hogg, R., & Carrington, K. (eds.) (2002) *Critical Criminology*. Portland, OR: Willan.

Lynch, M. J., & Michalowski, R. (2006) *Primer in Radical Criminology: Critical Perspectives on Crime, Power and Identity*, 4th edn. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Lynch, M. J., & Stretesky, P. B. (2011) *Radical and Marxist Theories of Crime*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Milovanovic, D. (1997) *Postmodern Criminology*. London: Routledge.

Shelden, R. (2000) *Controlling the Dangerous Classes: A Critical Introduction to the History of Criminal Justice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Critical Criminology

MARTIN D. SCHWARTZ and
WALTER S. DEKESEREDY

Critical criminology is an umbrella term that covers a wide range of theories and perspectives on crime, the definition of crime, and crime causation (Friedrichs 2009). One source of confusion, however, is that mainstream criminologists usually refer to the field by one of its older, now rarely used names. Most commonly it was called *conflict theory*, an older position that was occasionally rooted in an economic analysis, but could just as easily fit into a conservative noncritical approach, describing crime as the outgrowth of clashes between different groups in society. Less commonly, it was referred to as *radical criminology*, a term used by a few left-oriented criminologists in the 1960s and 1970s. With the rise in the 1970s of feminist criminology (itself split into several subfields), and the splintering of other perspectives, the one place all of these groups were able to come together was under the wide term "critical theory," which describes all of the perspectives that opposed mainstream criminology from the left (Schwartz 1991). Although most mainstream criminologists either ignore crime causation or else implicitly or explicitly find the causes of crime in the individual offender or social groups, "critical criminologists regard major structural and cultural changes within society as essential steps to reduce crime and promote social justice" (DeKeseredy 2011: 7). The problem, to critical theorists, is that mainstream criminologies tend to focus on punishing or changing individuals, preferring to leave the overall crime-facilitating social structure and capitalist economic structure intact.

Changes proposed by critical theorists do not all have to be complete reformulations of society, of course. There are substantial calls for incremental changes in law and practice. Still, these recommended changes can be easily differentiated from reform-minded mainstream criminology in that critical theorists strongly oppose the trend over the past 30 years in Western countries toward harsher sentences, more prisons, the use of therapeutic and civil commitment processes as punishments, and the explosion of profit-making private prisons. Critical theorists want to reduce the victimization of crime, but broadly speaking the mechanism that many prefer is to make peace on crime, claiming that making aggressive, punitive war on crime is counterproductive.

Implicit in these calls for change are a rejection of the stand-off, so-called objective stance of empirical scientists. Critical theorists are indeed political. Of course, mainstream theorists are also political and take sides. The difference is that most mainstream theorists tend to believe that supporting the status quo, supporting the current economic system, and supporting or at least not speaking out against society's political, racial, and gender inequalities makes them neutral, or objective. Critical thinkers are more likely to reject this "objective" stance, and take positions that advance gender, racial, and social justice. While there is no reason why critical thinkers cannot use statistical or empirical analyses, and of course some do, traditionally most analyses within the tradition have been from a qualitative or interpretive tradition. Of course, this typically leads to attacks from mainstream criminologists who privilege the scientific method, rejecting alternative approaches. For example, Kubrin, Stucky, and Krohn (2009: 239) claim that critical theory "is characterized by too many ideas and not enough systematic research," making the unusual claim that the empirical studies that have been done by critical theorists "are illustrative of, but do not actually *test* the theory." In other words, they reject critical theory because they reject critical theory's scientific method as flawed because it is different to their own scientific method.

Critical theory has its origins in a variety of perspectives influenced broadly by more or less Marxist influenced positions. Starting in the early twentieth century, theorists argued that the criminal law was not designed to serve all members of society, but rather the interests of the ruling class. Unlike many Classical theorists, these criminologists argued that people are not born with

natural greed and "me-first" egos, but rather that the system of competitive capitalism has bred these values in people, teaching competition over cooperation, and greed over sharing.

However, the most important influence on most early critical theorists was the popularity in the 1960s within criminology of labeling theory. This particularly American theory explained how agents of social control took some individuals, who might or might not be different to many others, and forced upon them a label such as "deviant" or "criminal." The severe stigmatizing and debilitating effects of such labels was a revelation for many criminologists. Ultimately, however, critical criminologists came to a belief that this theory ignored the context of such labeling decisions: the powerful economic system in place that gave one group the power to stigmatize unruly and weaker members of society. These labels were not done in isolation, critical theorists claimed, but partially to serve the economic interests of the powerful.

What is often confusing to many mainstream writers is that this era of major societal conflict (splits over the Vietnam War, civil rights battles, the rise of feminism) led to the development of several very famous theorists who proposed that the system could best be understood as a conflict between groups over power. Not all of these theorists were tied to a political agenda. Some who were, including William Chambliss and Richard Quinney, later moved beyond conflict theories as critical theory evolved. Others, such as the earlier generation of Thorsten Sellin and George Vold, fell out of favor. In other words, while conflict theory was an important stage in the development of critical theory, it has been mostly abandoned by theorists within the school. This has not kept mainstream theorists from typically referring to the school as conflict theory.

If they are not conflict theorists, what then? Actually, there are a wide variety of critical theories under the umbrella (Schwartz 1991). We can only sample some of them here. One of the most popular is *feminist theory*, and particularly those versions of feminist theory that overlap with other traditions on the political left. One impetus to the rise of feminist criminology was the recognition that much of both mainstream and critical criminology either ignores women and girls in conflict with the law, or else simply treats sex as a variable

to be included in statistical analyses. Much more than just bringing females into analyses, feminist scholars of many stripes are united by a gendered lens through which to view social phenomena. They all believe that modern society is characterized by a patriarchal hierarchy that provides benefits for men.

For example, Meda Chesney-Lind (1989) has argued that delinquency theory on all sides has generally not only systematically ignored girls as offenders, but also their victimization and the central role played by the juvenile justice system in sexualizing girls' delinquency and criminalizing girls' survival strategies. But this interrogation of mainstream (or malestream) criminology is not the perspective's only use. Feminist criminologists have pioneered the integration of investigations of race, class, and gender throughout criminology, recognizing, as Jody Miller (2003: 16) puts it, "that gender is as relevant for understanding men's and boys' lives as women's and girls'." In other words, as Schwartz and Hatty (2003) point out, after all of the generations of study into which factors are most related to criminality, the one factor most associated with crime, but least discussed, remains being male. Thus, Miller reports that one key question is not the androcentric one of why women are so different to men, but rather why it is that men commit such a disproportionate amount of crime.

Most feminist theorists believe that the answer can only be found in the nature of social relations in a particular society. In modern capitalist society, critical feminists would argue, the system itself is patriarchal, hierarchical, and stratified, which not only raises boys and men to believe that systems of male superiority are acceptable, but that they are part of nature itself.

Feminist theorists have also made a number of other discoveries that have begun to infiltrate all of criminology, such as the enormous overlap between women's victimization and women's offending. No doubt as a corrective to the ignoring of women's victimization by not only the criminal justice system but also by criminologists, many of the early contributions of feminist criminology were in descriptive studies of women and their victimization. However, the field has moved sharply beyond this, to important and nuanced studies of female criminality, the pathways to it, the directions it takes, and the factors that are

associated with it. One such instant classic, one of the most important criminology books published in the past decade, is Jody Miller's (2008) study of urban inequality and gendered violence, which actually ties these threads together. Adding the context of public place to studies of race, class, gender, and victimization, Miller found through extensive interviews that society's victim-blaming of girls for their own sexual victimization not only affected the girls' behavior, but also became an important part of the gender stereotypes and inequality that is a reason why males tend to control public places.

One of the English-speaking world's most important critical criminologies has not, interestingly, been particularly influential in the United States. *Left realism* began as a European, and particularly British, phenomenon, mostly as a response to British Marxists who generally excused inner-city crime. Sometimes called left idealists, such theorists called concerns about rape, violence, murder, and burglary in the inner city a media panic, designed to stir up racial hatred and to divert attention away from corporate crime. Left realists such as Jock Young, Roger Matthews, and John Lea argued that ignoring inner-city crime just handed that issue over to the right wing. Attacked for seeming to support the criminal justice system, left realists responded that they were supporting the working-class poor who were the predominant victims of street crime as well as corporate crime. Not only was it not racist to point to minority criminals, they argued, but it was racist to completely ignore the minorities who were disproportionately being raped, robbed, and murdered. Leftists who were realistic about crime could offer positive suggestions for system change in aid of these people (Young and Matthews 1992).

Left realism also differs from the idealists by adopting a subculture theory not completely unusual in studies of inner-city youth. They argued that a key problem was relative poverty, as extreme poverty did not seem to cause crime worldwide. Rather, it was the poverty embedded in a perceived system of economic inequality that is bred in the competitive individualism of modern capitalism that causes dissatisfaction. Discontented individuals tend to band together to form a subcultural search for

solutions that are often branded by society as criminal.

Perhaps one of the faster growing critical theories is *cultural criminology*. The concern is not totally new, of course. Critical theorists have been interested in the influence of culture, popular culture, and the mass media at least since the 1920s. What is new is that a group of theorists have begun to train a specific media lens on how representations in culture and the media shape and influence public understandings of human behavior. The importance of this investigation is that these public understandings in turn tend to shape our public policy toward drug use, criminal behavior, and a constant supply of "folk devils" that we invent to justify more stringent laws. Simply put, media generated images are taken by many people as empirical reality (Ferrell, Hayward, and Young 2008). This newer emphasis on culture was spearheaded by Jeff Ferrell, but has become broadly popular in many countries, with a particular prominence these days at the University of Kent in the United Kingdom.

Partially related to the above is *postmodern criminology*, which shares certain insights, but is also unlikely to develop a theory of why people commit crimes. Actually, postmodernism is made up of a variety of different threads of thought, or types of postmodern analysis, but there are certain central beliefs. All are concerned with how we come to think of certain things as criminal, and certain people as criminals. All are concerned with language and the role it plays in developing our understanding of the world around us. This is the reverse, or properly, the inverse, of a common linguistic argument that language reflects our understanding and beliefs (Schwartz and Friedrichs 1994). Thus, since the prevailing structures in our society have the most influence over our language, truth itself is not absolute but rather partial and reflective of the power arrangements in society (Arrigo and Milovanovic 2010).

Two closely related fields are *peacemaking criminology* and *restorative justice*, which again are very powerful paradigms that are widely successful, but much less influential in a crime control and retributionist oriented North America than in some other parts of the world. With roots in Harold Pepinsky and Richard Quinney's work (1991), the peacemaking perspective takes the

position that it is time to stop wars on crime, and begin to make peace on crime. It calls upon the system to practice nonviolence, inclusion, and social justice, and calls upon offenders to take responsibility and to stop harming others. Restorative justice speaks directly to mechanisms for bringing people together to try to repair the relationships that crime destroys. Based on the input of some faith groups, and the writings of John Braithwaite in Australia (Braithwaite 1999), it is leading to experiments across the world in group conferences that try to convince offenders to take responsibility, and to negotiate some means to reconcile with the victim. As Pepinsky (2008) notes, the art involved is trying to walk the fine line between offering empathy to an abused offender, and resisting that offender's abuse and violence.

Critical criminologists have also been leaders in the fields of crimes of the privileged, and crimes of the state, arguing that the main focus of mainstream criminology has been on the behavior of the poorest and weakest members of any society. David Friedrichs has led the way for the study of crimes of the elites with his comprehensive and powerful *Trusted Criminals* (2010), dealing not only with crime by people in positions of trust, but also by corporations themselves in the furtherance of corporate goals. A number of important critical criminologists have been active in this area, with many tracing their roots as colleagues or students of Ronald Kramer or Ray Michaelowski, such as Dawn Rothe, Rick Matthews, and David Kauzlarich.

Finally, convict criminology is the latest strain of critical theory to develop, primarily in the United States (but now with contributors from around the world). Criminologists with advanced degrees but also with experience as convicted prisoners argued that the literature in corrections did not truly represent the lived experience of the men and women who had been the objects of penal incarceration. They have become an important presence within critical criminology in recent years as they struggle to move from ethnographic stories of prison life into solid theoretical positions.

SEE ALSO: Conflict Theories of Crime; Feminist Theories of Criminal Behavior; Left Realism Theory; Marxist Criminology; Peacemaking Criminology; Theoretical Integration; Theory and Public Policy.

References

Arrigo, B. A., & Milovanovic, D. (eds.) (2010) *Postmodernist and Post-Structuralist Theories of Crime*. London: Ashgate Publishing Group.

Braithwaite, J. (1999) Restorative justice. In M. Tonry (ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, vol. 25. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–127.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1989) Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency* 35, 5–29.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (2011) *Contemporary Critical Criminology*. London: Routledge.

Ferrell, J., Hayward, K., & Young, J. (2008) *Cultural Criminology: An Invitation*. London: Sage.

Friedrichs, D. O. (2009) Critical criminology. In J. M. Miller (ed.), *21st Century Criminology*, vol. 1. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 210–218.

Friedrichs, D. O. (2010). *Trusted Criminals*, 4th edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Kubrin, C., Stucky, T. D., & Krohn, M. D. (2009) *Researching Theories of Crime and Deviance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. (2008) *Getting Played: African-American Girls, Urban Inequality and Gendered Violence*. New York: New York University Press.

Pepinsky, H. E. (2008) Empathy and restoration. In D. Sullivan & L. Tifft (eds.), *Handbook of Restorative Justice*. London: Routledge.

Pepinsky, H. E., & Quinney, R. (eds.) (1991) *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Schwartz, M. D. (1991) The future of critical criminology. In B. MacLean & D. Milovanovic (eds.), *New Directions in Critical Criminology*. Vancouver, BC: Collective Press, pp. 116–125.

Schwartz, M. D., & Friedrichs, D. O. (1994) Postmodern thought and criminological discontent. *Criminology* 32, 221–246.

Schwartz, M., & Hatty, S. (eds.) (2003) *Controversies in Critical Criminology*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Young, J., & Matthews, R. (1992) *Rethinking Criminology: The Realist Debate*. London: Sage.

Further Readings

Chambliss, W. J., & Seidman, R. T. (1971) *Law, Order and Power*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Perry, B. (2006) *Advancing Critical Criminology: Theory and Applications*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Lea, J., & Young, J. (1984) *What is to be Done about Law and Order*. New York: Penguin.

Quinney, R. (1974) *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Ross, J., & Richards, S. (2002) *Convict Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rothe, D. L. (2009) *State Criminality: The Crime of All Crimes*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Schwartz, M. D. (1989) The undercutting edge in critical criminology. *The Critical Criminologist* 1(2), 1–5.

Labeling and Symbolic Interaction Theories of Crime

KATHERINE BENNETT and
TAYLOR BRICKLEY

Labeling theory in criminology is in part a derivative of the earlier-formulated social theory of symbolic interactionism, as well as works by Charles Cooley and Frank Tannenbaum. The term "symbolic interaction" was coined in 1936 by Herbert Blumer, a sociologist at the University of Chicago, to represent the unique qualities of interactions that take place between individuals. This school of thought was originally developed by George Herbert Mead, an early social psychologist and philosopher who taught at the University of Chicago for over 40 years. Central to symbolic interaction is the view of the self as presented by Mead's collection of writings and lectures published in 1934. An individual's self develops through the social process of interactions which include one's behavior, others' reactions, internalization of others' reactions, and subsequent interactions. This internalization of others' attitudes toward the individual was termed "the generalized other" by Mead (1934). Symbolic interactionists de-emphasize the effect that social structure and societal institutions have on an individual's behavior, seeing that effect as occurring only "through the common meanings expressed in the symbols of the group and the ways in which these are interpreted in exchanges between individuals" (Campbell 1981: 215). In other words, social reality is an interpretation according to each individual based on the process of continuing interactions, thus allowing for multiple realities. Mead, and symbolic interactionism, present human beings as "self-determining agents who create their behavior with varying degrees of freedom and success" (Paternoster and Iovanni 1989: 379).

Mead's concept of the "generalized other" is similar to the idea of the reflected or looking-glass self developed by Charles Horton Cooley (1902, 1964; Mutchnick, Austin, and Martin 2009). Cooley described this concept as having three components: how we imagine we appear to others, how we imagine others judge us, and the feelings we derive from that imagined judgment: "[t]he thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves, but . . . the imagined effect of this reflection upon another's mind" (1964: 184). Mead (1930) noted that Cooley directed attention to the "forming influence" of the group, and indeed Cooley states that individuals have no separate existence from the group: "a man is bound into the whole of which he is a member, and to consider him apart from it is quite as artificial as to consider society apart from individuals" (1964: 38).

Another sociologist who significantly influenced the development of symbolic interaction was Erving Goffman, who received his PhD in 1953 from the University of Chicago. Goffman's 1959 work is a continuation of Mead's concept of the self "as an object of conscious reflection and a source of spontaneous activity" (Campbell 1981: 216). Goffman highlighted how individuals take on roles in daily interactions with others. It is Goffman's work on stigma, though, that is seen as providing a "direct link" between symbolic interaction and labeling theory (Mutchnick et al. 2009: 236). Goffman described several types of stigma whose characteristics are determined by society. One type of stigma defined by race, ethnicity, and religion is directly connected to labeling theory. Stereotyping individuals according to these characteristics determines others' expectations of those so stereotyped and those *perceived* expectations, if internalized by stereotyped individuals, then influence how people behave in later interactions.

This process is also known as a "self-fulfilling prophecy," a term created by Robert Merton (1949, 1968). This concept is part of the foundation of labeling theory. While Merton is primarily regarded in criminology for anomie theory, he also contributed to the development of reference

group theory, another perspective central to labeling theory. Reference group theory includes the premise that individuals' actions are a consequence of those groups to which they belong. Merton described conditions under which out-groups (or stigmatized groups) might become the significant reference group for some individuals. Mead's *Mind, Self, and Society* as well as Cooley's looking-glass self provide the foundation for reference group theory (Mutchnick et al. 2009).

Symbolic interaction also provides the foundation for differential association theory (Vold and Bernard 1986) and is identified with the pragmatist philosophical tradition, emphasizing linking theory and practice, contrary to the structuralist-functionalist school of thought represented by Emile Durkheim. Unlike the Durkheim tradition, symbolic interaction emphasizes the individual's activity in "using and manipulating the symbols of the group to participate in the creation of orderly social life" (Campbell 1981: 215). However, it was Durkheim's structuralism and sociological positivism that dominated sociological thinking and explanations of criminal behavior at the University of Chicago in the early 1900s (Cavender 1995).

Symbolic interaction as a school of thought, Mead's "generalized other," and Cooley's concept of the looking-glass self relate to understandings of human society in general, and how individuals within that society develop. These perspectives were not specifically applied to explaining criminal or delinquent behavior. However, in 1938, Frank Tannenbaum's *Crime and the Community* was published, exploring the process of how delinquency develops and directly influencing labeling theory that was to come a couple of decades later. Tannenbaum stated that if a child is caught in a delinquent act, a label or "tag" is given to the child, singling that child out. "The first dramatization of the 'evil' which separates the child out of his group for specialized treatment plays a greater role in making the criminal than perhaps any other experience" (1938: 19–20).

This interactive process of "making the criminal" was fully explored by Edwin Lemert in 1951. In this work, Lemert, a sociologist and anthropologist, developed the concepts of primary and secondary deviance and became known as one of the founders of labeling theory. According to Lemert, the first criminal acts or primary deviations that a person commits do not cause the

individual to define himself or herself as a criminal or delinquent. These are acts that may be due to various psychological, sociological, or biological factors (Vold and Bernard 1986).

However, as others react to the behavior by assigning the criminal label and stereotyping and stigmatizing the person, over time the individual may redefine his or her self-image, adopting a criminal self-image and becoming, in Lemert's terms, a "secondary deviant" (1951: 75–76). The secondary deviant is now fully involved in criminal behavior. Lemert applied a consensus-based approach by accepting primary deviations as behaviors that violate rules or norms held by most people in society to be deviant. Other labeling theorists were to define deviance in more symbolic interactionist terms, focusing entirely on the role of reactions of people toward the behavior and how deviance is created. Vold and Bernard, in fact, do not use the term "labeling theory" but "social reaction theory" to describe the perspective (1986: 249–268).

While Lemert's primary and secondary deviance concepts are central to this theory, he credits Howard Becker with creating labeling theory (Mutchnick et al. 2009), and it was Becker's (1963) work that made the labeling perspective in criminology a major theory. In *Outsiders*, Becker approached the defining of deviance from a symbolic interactionist perspective.

Becker wrote that "deviance is *not* a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender.' The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label" (1963: 9). Becker (1963: 9) noted that "the most important earlier statements of this view can be found in Frank Tannenbaum, *Crime and the Community* ... and E. M. Lemert, *Social Pathology*." Becker differed from Lemert somewhat, however, by not accepting a consensus- or norm-based definition of deviance, and asked why certain acts come to be defined as deviant. To explain this process, he emphasized the role of moral entrepreneurs. There are two types of moral entrepreneurs important to labeling theory: rule creators and rule enforcers. Rule creators are those moral crusaders or reformers in society who define new rules for society. Such crusaders

may call for criminalizing gambling or marijuana use, for example. The rule enforcers, on the other hand, are those agents such as police officers and societal institutions that must enforce the new rules (laws) set in place by the crusaders. Further, the rules are not enforced against everyone; only certain groups of people tend to be held accountable to these rules. Becker noted the peculiar situation faced by the enforcers: they must demonstrate that they are effective and successful at enforcing the rules while at the same time they cannot be too successful because they must justify the need for their continued existence.

The idea that deviance is created by the moral entrepreneurs of society and the observation that the rules may be selectively enforced based on extralegal characteristics (e.g., race, socioeconomic status, age, gender) "became the central focus of criminology in the 1960s and 1970s" (Mutchnick et al. 2009: 253). The appeal of labeling and support for its tenets had much to do with the political climate of the 1960s, the civil rights movement, controversies surrounding the Vietnam War, the attitude of "anti-Establishment," and the rise of social activism in other areas. Protests against police officers were rooted in part in an increased sensitivity and critical awareness of the role of government in "demonizing" the poor and powerless.

Another area of thought emphasized by Becker and important to labeling theory is distinguishing between master statuses and subordinate statuses and the concept of the deviant master status. Becker noted that the label of "criminal" overrides all other labels. Once it has been applied by authorities as a general controlling label, it can create a self-fulfilling prophecy. Individuals assigned this master status may find themselves cut off from conventional society, finding that they are denied "the ordinary means of carrying on the routines of everyday life open to most people" (Becker 1963: 35). When the person accepts that identity as "criminal" or "delinquent" as his or her prominent self-image and moves into associating only with others similarly labeled, then the process of making the criminal or delinquent is complete (Becker 1963; Mutchnick et al. 2009).

In *Outsiders*, Becker developed a four-part typology of deviant behavior, consisting of individuals perceived as deviant but behaving obediently (the falsely accused); individuals not

perceived as deviant and also behaving obediently (the conformist); individuals not perceived as deviant but violating the rules just the same (the secret deviant), and those individuals who violate the rules and are perceived as deviant (the pure deviant) (Becker 1963: 19–21). This typology is used to explore the development of deviant careers. Becker noted that most people probably experience "deviant impulses" quite regularly and the question to be answered is why conventional people do not give in to these impulses (1963: 26–27).

Another sociologist contributing to the development of labeling theory was Edwin Schur. Schur noted in 1965 that the attention being given to the emphasis on deviance as a process learned through social interactions was not a new perspective and referred back to Tannenbaum's *Crime and the Community* (1938) as delivering a classic statement about labeling:

> No more self-defeating device could be discovered than the one society has developed in dealing with the criminal. It proclaims his career in such loud and dramatic forms that both he and the community accept the judgment as a fixed description. He becomes conscious of himself as a criminal, and the community expects him to live up to his reputation, and will not credit him if he does not live up to it. (1938: 477; Schur 1965: 3)

Schur was to echo Tannenbaum in criticizing the criminogenic effect that officially labeling someone delinquent or criminal may have. In fact, in 1973 Schur promoted radical non-intervention and reforming societal conditions as a policy toward delinquency. Schur's concept of radical non-intervention (or "judicious non-intervention") involves legalizing many acts considered delinquent and abolishing juvenile correctional institutions in order to avoid official labeling and stigmatization (Schur 1973; Curran and Renzetti 2001). Like Tannenbaum, Schur's preferred way of addressing the delinquent was to *not* "dramatize the evil."

In addition to Tannenbaum, Becker, Lemert, and Schur, other sociologists who contributed significantly to the development of labeling theory included Harold Garfinkel (1956), Kai Erikson (1966), and John Kitsuse (1962). However, by the early 1970s, some of those associated

with labeling began to distance themselves. Becker expressed his dissatisfaction with the conventional title of "labeling theory" (1973: 178), preferring to call it an "interactionist theory of deviance." He emphasized that "[l]abelling theory is neither a theory" nor an exclusive focus on the act of labeling but is instead a "way of looking at a general area of human activity" (1973: 181). In 1971, Schur defended the theory as having been misrepresented by its critics and described it as firmly grounded in well-established sociological concepts and premises. By 1974, Lemert had moved away from the perspective, maintaining that it had become too psychological (Mutchnick et al. 2009).

The tendency of social scientists to distance themselves from labeling theory in the early 1970s was exacerbated by research during that time which found little or no evidence to support the theory (Hirschi 1975). Critics of labeling theory added that labeling did not account for other personal and social variables that may influence delinquent behavior. With these criticisms in mind, other social scientists began to modify the theory or to integrate the labeling concept with other theories. Richard Quinney's 1970 work is an example of the integration of labeling theory and the conflict or critical perspective. In *The Social Reality of Crime*, Quinney suggested that labeling criminal behavior is a political action that helps preserve an existing social hierarchy. Grimes and Turk (1978) claimed the impact of labeling on deviance is also context-dependent. Specifically, the scale and formality of a particular situation determine the level of impact on deviance.

Through the 1980s tests of labeling theory, in its original form, continued to find little support for the theory (Wellford 1987). However, social scientists did not reject the value of labeling altogether and instead chose to reform the labeling concept. Rather than specifying the particular contexts in which labeling occurred, labeling was considered one part of a larger social process. John Braithwaite's reintegrative shaming theory is one of the more recognizable examples of how the process can work. Braithwaite (1989: 192) described the source of crime control as "reactions to deviance that simultaneously evoke remorse [shaming] from offenders for the rules they have violated and reinforce the individual's membership in the community of law-abiding citizens." Reintegrative shaming theory identifies the underlying conditions that lead to either labeling a person after they have engaged in deviant behavior or accepting them back into the community. If a person is labeled a deviant, reintegrative shaming theory suggests that stigmatization will lead to future deviance by increasing the likelihood of associating with other deviants, and reducing the effectiveness of shaming in the future. In other words, reintegrative shaming theory considers labeling an indirect cause of delinquency. Ross Matsueda (1992) used a reflective appraisal approach to explain how labeling can influence subsequent deviance. Instead of labeling having social implications, Matsueda suggested that labeling alters a person's self-concept and affects the dynamics of symbolic interaction. In this conceptualization deviant behavior is a person's attempt to conform to the expectations of others, which are clarified through the labeling process.

Perhaps the most contemporary development in labeling theory can be found in Robert Sampson and John Laub's theory of age-graded informal social control. Referencing the work of Loeber and Le Blanc (1990), Sampson and Laub (1997: 6) noted that "labeling theory is the only criminological theory that is truly developmental in nature because of its explicit emphasis on process over time." In 1993, Sampson and Laub introduced their age-graded theory, which integrates social control and labeling theories. Social control theory explains why individuals *do not* commit deviant behavior through attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief in prosocial persons and/or institutions. These social controls, according to Sampson and Laub, vary over a person's life-course, resulting in a person being more or less likely to commit deviant behavior over a given time. Central to this idea is the concept of *cumulative disadvantage* or the idea that weak social controls and subsequent deviant behavior aggregate over time, resulting in further weakening of controls and an increased rate of delinquency. Integrating labeling theory with this process helped Sampson and Laub (1997: 10) to explain how people in similar situations can have different life-courses or "trajectories" based on the reaction to their behavior by the state.

To date, age-graded theory remains relevant in criminological research and related findings

appear to support the theory (see Bernburg and Krohn 2003 for an example that focuses specifically on the role of labeling in this process). As opposed to the substantial body of research from the 1970s and 1980s, results from the most current research on labeling theory appear to be trending toward support for the theory. For example, Chiricos et al. (2007) found that withholding the label "felony" associated with convicted offenders in Florida was associated with lower rates of recidivism in that population; McGrath (2010) found that gender may affect how juveniles experience stigmatization by the juvenile justice system (females felt more stigmatized); and Cullen, Jonson, and Nagin (2011) argued that incarceration can lead to labeling, which in turn affects recidivism.

SEE ALSO: Braithwaite, John; Merton, Robert; Quinney, Richard; Tannenbaum, Frank.

References

Becker, H. (1963, rev. edn. 1973) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Bernburg, J., & Krohn, M. (2003) Labeling, life chances, and adult crime: The direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. *Criminology* 41(4), 1287–1318.

Blumer, H. (1936) Social attitudes and nonsymbolic interaction. *Journal of Educational Sociology* 9, 515–523.

Braithwaite, J. (1989) *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, T. (1981) *Seven Theories of Human Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cavender, G. (1995) Alternative approaches: Labeling and critical perspectives. In J. F. Sheley (ed.), *Criminology: A Contemporary Handbook*, 2nd edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, pp. 83–113.

Chiricos, T., Barrick, K., Bales, W., et al. (2007) The labeling of convicted felons and its consequences for recidivism. *Criminology* 45, 547–581.

Cooley, C. H. (1902, 1964) *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Schocken Books.

Cullen, F., Jonson, C., & Nagin, D. (2011) Prisons do not reduce recidivism: The high cost of ignoring science. *The Prison Journal* 91(3), 48s–65s.

Curran, D. J., & Renzetti, C. M. (2001) *Theories of Crime*, 2nd edn. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Erikson, K. T. (1966) *Wayward Puritans*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Garfinkel, H. (1956) Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies. *American Journal of Sociology* 61(5), 420–424.

Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday.

Grimes, R., & Turk, A. (1978) Labeling in context: Conflict, power, and self-definition. In M. D. Krohn & R. L. Akers (eds.), *Crime, Law, and Sanctions: Theoretical Perspectives*. Berkeley, CA: Sage, pp. 39–58.

Hirschi, T. (1975) Labeling theory and juvenile delinquency: An assessment of the evidence. In W. R. Grove (ed.), *The Labeling of Deviance*, 2nd edn. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 181–203.

Kitsuse, J. I. (1962) Societal reaction to deviant behavior: Problems of theory and method. *Social Problems* 9, 247–256.

Lemert, E. (1951) *Social Pathology: A Systematic Approach to the Theory of Sociopathic Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Loeber, R., & Le Blanc, M. (1990) Toward a developmental criminology. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice*, vol. 12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 375–437.

Matsueda, R. L. (1992) Reflected appraisal, parental labeling, and delinquency: Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 97, 1577–1611.

McGrath, A. J. (2010) The subjective impact of contact with the criminal justice system: The role of gender and stigmatization. *Crime and Delinquency* 57(5). DOI: 10.117 7/0011128710389589. http://cad.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/11/26/0011128710389589.full.pdf+html, accessed January 31, 2013.

Mead, G. H. (1930) Cooley's contribution to American social thought. *American Journal of Sociology* XXXV(5), 693–706.

Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R. (1949, rev. edn. 1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.

Mutchnick, R. J., Austin, W. T., & Martin, R. (2009) *Criminological Thought: Pioneers Past and Present*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Paternoster, R., & Iovanni, L. (1989) The labeling perspective and delinquency: An elaboration of the theory and an assessment of the evidence. *Justice Quarterly* 6(3), 359–394.

Quinney, R. (1970) *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1997) A life-course theory of cumulative disadvantage and the stability of delinquency. In T. P. Thornberry (ed.), *Developmental*

Theories of Crime and Delinquency. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, pp. 133–161.

Schur, E. M. (1965) *Crime without Victims*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schur, E. M. (1971) *Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications*. New York: Harper & Row.

Schur, E. M. (1973) *Radical Non-Intervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tannenbaum, F. (1938) *Crime and the Community*. New York: Ginn Publishers.

Vold, G. B., & Bernard, T. J. (1986) *Theoretical Criminology,* 3rd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wellford, C. (1987) Delinquency prevention and labeling. In J. Q. Wilson & G. C. Loury (eds.), *From Children to Citizens*, vol. 3. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 257–267.

Feminist Theories of Criminal Behavior

KATHRYN M. WHITELEY

Feminism has traversed 150 years in American history and has evolved dramatically across three major waves. Feminist criminology has its roots in the second wave feminism of the 1960s and 1970s, which is primarily defined in terms of women's rights and women's liberation. Feminism has three main schools of thought, namely Marxist, radical, and liberal. Despite the lengthy history and the three distinct camps of thought, no single theory of feminism prevails. Feminism has, however, influenced criminological thought. Therefore, before engaging feminist theories of criminality, a brief working definition of feminism is necessary. According to Delmar, "a feminist holds that women suffer discrimination because of their sex, that they have needs which are negated and unsatisfied, and that the satisfaction of these needs require a radical change" (1986: 8). Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988) agree with Delmar that beyond this call to recognize discrimination and evoke radical change, things become much more complicated. In consideration of liberal feminist thought and female offending, Daly and Chesney-Lind state that "the task of describing and changing a spectrum of women's experiences, which have been formed by particular and often competing allegiances to class, race, and other social groups, is not a straight forward, but a blurred and contingent enterprise" (1988: 6).

The impact of feminist theory upon criminology is best seen in the birth of feminist criminology. There is no agreed-upon date for its origin, but Heidensohn (1968) has often been credited with the first call for a feminist voice within mainstream criminology. Heidensohn (1968) contended that criminology was dominated by male researchers who studied male subjects. Within a few years, major works by feminist criminologists appeared that served to establish a feminist presence and perspective. The first work often

associated with feminist criminology is Klein (1973); Adler (1975) was the first book written by a feminist criminologist that theorized female criminality. Furthermore, it was Smart (1976) that provided the first critique of the absence of women's offending within mainstream criminology and was the first to emphasize the newly recognized phenomenon of women as victims.

The influence of these early feminist criminology works has been realized on several fronts. The American Society of Criminology established a division of Women and Crime and this division has to its credit the *Journal of Feminist Criminology*. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, articles by female criminologists and research that focused upon female offending were absent within the major journals. A study by Hannon and Dufour (1998) analyzed articles in four major criminology journals in the 1970s, and found that female criminologists were dramatically underrepresented and that the research samples were exclusively male. The influence of feminist criminology reversed this practice. Criminological journals and textbooks today as a rule contain feminist criminological research wherein female offenders are incorporated into the samples and theories of offending. Feminist criminology's contributions over the past 30 years have insured that female offending is no longer an afterthought, but a major focus of criminological research.

Beyond the historical underpinnings and the impact of feminist theory upon feminist criminology, a brief definition of feminist criminology will be helpful. According to Miller and Mullins, "feminist criminology refers to that body of criminological research and theory that situates the study of crime and criminal justice within a complex understanding that the social world is systematically shaped by the relations of sex and gender" (2009: 218). Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988: 218) offer five facets of feminist thought that serve to separate feminist criminology from traditional criminological inquiry:

1. Gender is not a natural fact simply derived from biological and sex differences, but

a complex social, historical, and cultural phenomenon.

2. Gender and gender relations in critical ways regulate social life and social institutions.

3. Gender relations and constructs of masculinity and femininity are not symmetrical, but are based on an organizing principle of men's superiority and social, political and economic dominance over women.

4. Systems of knowledge reflect men's views of the natural and social world and the production of knowledge is gendered.

5. Women should be at the center of intellectual inquiry, not peripheral, invisible, or appendages to men.

It is this last point that served as the foundation for feminist criminology. Women should be the focus of the inquiry and female offending cannot be understood through the theories of male criminality.

Heidensohn (1968) and other feminist criminologists in the 1970s initially collided with an immutable fact, namely that males dominate criminality (the *gender ratio*). So strong is the evidence that, according to Naffine (1996), it is one of the very few facts within criminology that is universally embraced. Naffine (1996) further maintains that that the male domination of crime is so dramatic that maleness and criminality seem a natural phenomenon. A good example of male preeminence in a specific area of offending is homicide. A remarkable statistic finds that, consistently over the past decade, males have been responsible for 90% of homicides across Australia, Canada, England, and the United States (Brookman 2005). Why, then, do males criminally offend so much and why don't females offend more often? Existing criminological theories, such as strain theory, struggle with this question.

The inherent practice of generalizing male criminal behavior theory to female offending was a major impetus for the feminist criminological endeavor. Chesney-Lind (1988) termed the practice as "add women and stir." Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, there were challenges to this practice, which failed to demonstrate the relevance of boys' and men's theories of criminality for offending by girls and women. If existing theories for males were not relevant for females,

perhaps retooling some theories such as conflict theory and labeling theory might yield relevance. However, Smith and Paternoster (1987) analyzed the two efforts and declared that the findings were varied and unconvincing. Theories derived from male samples simply could not explain female offending.

The gender ratio and the practice of a one-size-fits-all theory for males and females led to the notion of gender blindness. Writing over 50 years ago, criminologist Wootten stated that "the relative rarity of women offenders has for the most part been tactfully ignored by students of criminology, any clues suggested by this sex difference being generally neglected" (1959: 32). Thirty years later, Cain wrote that "the criminological gaze cannot see gender and the criminological discourse cannot speak men and women" (1989: 4). And 20 years after her initial call for a feminist criminology, Heidensohn contended that "criminology is poorer in all its forms because it has not yet fully accepted and integrated the importance of gender" (1987: 27).

Walker (1979) is a seminal work, which served to shed light upon domestic violence – an issue that had largely escaped public scrutiny in the West. Although Walker herself is a feminist psychologist, her depiction of the battered woman as understood through domestic violence, and her subsequent theory of the battered woman syndrome, drew the attention of feminist criminologists on two major fronts. It was recognized that many young girls who criminally offend have been subject to domestic violence and that many women who offend, particularly violent offending, have been subject to intimate partner violence. The charge to feminist criminology was to discern the relationship between young girls and women who offend and their victimizations.

Among the first feminist criminological works to address the issue among young girls was Chesney-Lind and Rodriguez (1983), who drew the association between violent offending by girls and histories of abuse. Later works, including Acoa (1999) and Rivera and Widom (1990), reinforced the view that young girls who violently offend have high rates of victimizations. Rivera and Widom (1990) reported rates of various child abuses ranging from 40 to 73% among girls who violently offended.

One year prior to Walkers's (1979) revelations regarding battered women, feminist criminologist Totman (1978) observed that the primary victim of women who kill is their violent male partner. Feminist criminology has extensively examined female homicide offending. One of the most consistent crime statistics reported throughout the West (including Australia, Canada, England, and the United States) is the rate of female homicide offending. The rate has held at approximately 10% of total homicides (Brookman 2005). Totman's (1978) observation has remained a consistent finding through the 1990s and into the 2000s. Feminist criminology has therefore established a relationship between a young girl's or woman's physical victimizations and subsequent violent offending.

Another aspect of victimization has been associated with young girls and women who violently offend. Just as physical victimization is prominent in the histories of girls and women who violently offend, so is mental illness. Chesler (1972) asserted that it was commonplace to regard a woman who committed murder as possessing a deep-seated disease of mind or body. There is no denying that women who violently offend or perpetrate homicide have higher rates of pathology than their non-offending peers. However, as Worrall (1990) argued, by pathologizing a woman who violently offends, we victimize her further. Worrall contends that, according to societal discourse, men kill because they are bad, but a woman with a pathology or mental illness who kills does so because she is victimized by the disease. This further victimization was shown by Browne (1987)'s analysis of court, which shows that courts pay more attention to the mental health of women who kill than to the mental health of men who do so.

A theory that spun off of the victimization of women who violently offend is that of blurred boundaries or a victim–offender dichotomy. Can a woman who violently offends be both a victim and an offender? Chesney-Lind (1989) asserts that many young girls who flee violent homes are labeled as offenders. Many of these same young girls live on the streets and resort to crime for survival. With adult women, Browne (1987) noted that many who violently offend or perpetrate homicide within an intimate partner violence scenario do so as it may be their only means

of escape or it may be in self-defense. However, Browne indicates that some women kill a former intimate weeks or months following a violent episode. In recent years, feminist criminologists have argued that the victim offender–dichotomy is shortsighted. This dichotomy does not allow for an examination of the larger social context of offending.

Intersectionality is a theory that emerged alongside the third wave feminism of the 1980s and 1990s. Naffine (1996) argued that systems of power, race, class, and gender do not operate independently, but intersect to create our experiences. In the words of Daly and Stephens, "the approach examines crime in demonstrating how class, gender, and race, construct the normal and deviant and how these inequalities place some societal members at risk to engage in law breaking" (1995: 193). Naffine herself avers that "only with a commitment to theoretically and analytically engage intersectionality, will we arrive at an understanding of gender and crime" (1996: 143).

Another theory promulgated by feminist criminology is that of "doing gender," a term which has been credited to West and Zimmerman (1987). By the late 1980s, gender was recognized as a social construct and not a biological category. West and Zimmerman saw gender as an emergent feature of social interactions, implying that in these interactions one is "doing gender" (1987: 126). The first attempts at theorizing gender and crime essentially argued that when a male's means of meeting normative scripts for masculinity are blocked, the male may engage in lawbreaking. There were many skeptics of this theory, according to whom if crime were a resource for doing gender, crime would then be the work of men. More compelling was the question: if man needs to produce masculinity through criminality, why don't far more men engage in criminality?

Miller (2002) examined young girl's criminality. One of her key findings was that young girls in gangs demonstrated a gender crossing. Miller argued that some girls in gangs "do masculinity" and subsequent crime. It was Miller's contention that many of the gang girls were not intent upon accomplishing normative femininity as realized through an extensive range of social actions. This finding prompted Miller to argue that gender

dualisms are problematic in light of gender crossing. Her argument was grounded in the assertion that gender does not transpire in a systematic fashion in girls, boys, men, and women.

A much-less heralded accomplishment of feminist criminology is the impact it has had upon feminist methodology. Criminology has relied largely upon crime statistics to theorize offending. Feminist criminology has advocated providing a voice to the female offender. Accordingly, feminist criminological inquiry has increasingly engaged qualitative methodology. It has been argued that the best means to improve the status of the female offender is to give her a voice. The media, the court, and the societal discourse of normative femininity have all spoken for the female offender; what is seldom heard is her own voice. The qualitative methodological approach reveals more of the social dynamics and how meaning occurs within interactions.

There have been many detractors that maintain qualitative methodologies are understood as unsystematic, biased, and politically motivated. However, a collaborative partnership with the woman offender will give voice to her life and everyday experiences; it removes the traditional imbalanced power relationship between the researcher and the researched (Reinharz 1992). In the view of Renzetti, "what sets this type of research apart is that it is also good social science; that is, it seeks to give voice to and to improve the life conditions of the marginalized, and it transforms social scientific inquiry from an academic exercise into an instrument of meaningful social change" (1997: 143).

Looking back over the last 30 years of feminist criminology, it can be argued that the single overarching accomplishment of the endeavor has been to reverse the paradigm of mainstream criminology where men studying boys and men produced theories from which female criminality was completely absent. More specifically, gender has been recognized as a crucial aspect of crime. Key was the insight that the issue of gender relates not only to women, but also to men. Among the major theories introduced have been notions of victimization, pathways to crime, "doing gender," and intersectionality. Intersectionality brings out the complexity of female lives and subsequent offending, and as such has helped move the inquiry beyond the quantitative analysis of crime statistics and into the qualitative analysis of women's lives and offending.

Feminist criminological theory and advocacy has had an impact on legislation and the criminal justice system. It has spurred changes in the practice of assessment and classification of female offenders; it has led to increased availability of mental health and substance abuse services to female offenders; it has called attention to the plight of the children of incarcerated women; it has exposed women's victimization in relation to domestic violence and other forms of oppression, including rape, sex trafficking, drug trafficking, and prostitution.

As for the criminal justice system, feminist criminology has helped dismantle several barriers that limited women from working in law, policing, and corrections. An example of this is revealed in statistics from the American Corrections Association (1984), wherein between 1983 and 1995 the number of female staff employed within corrections quadrupled. Additionally, in the past women were largely absent within criminological academic programs, while today they chair criminology and criminal justice programs. Any comprehensive analysis of the accomplishments of feminist criminology in the past 30 years shows that the endeavor has stayed true to its feminist principles, in keeping women at the focal point of their inquiry. The efforts have been fueled by the contention that any diminishing or misunderstanding of women's criminality renders our understanding of crime incomplete.

SEE ALSO: Battered Woman Syndrome; Gender; Victim–Offender Relationship.

References

Acoa, L. (1999) Investing in girls: A 21st century challenge. *Juvenile Justice* 6, (1), 3–13.

Adler, F. (1975) *Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal*. New York: McGraw–Hill.

Allen, H. (1987) Rendering them harmless: The professional portrayal of women charged with serious violent crimes. In P. Carlen & A. Worrall (eds.), *Gender, Crime and Justice*. Philadelphia: Open Press University, pp. 81–94.

American Corrections Association (1984) *Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies*

and Paroling Authorities, United States and Canada. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association.

Brookman, F. (2005) *Understanding Homicide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Browne, A. (1987) *When Battered Women Kill*. New York: Free Press.

Cain, M. (ed.) (1989) *Growing Up Good: Policing the Behavior of Girls in Europe*. London: Sage.

Carlen, P., & Worrall, A. (eds.) (1987) *Gender, Crime, and Justice*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Chesler, P. (1972) *Women and Madness*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1988) Girls and deinstitutionalization. *Criminal Justice Abstracts* 20, 144–165.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1989) Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency* 35(1), 5–29.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Rodriguez, N. (1983) Women under lock and key. *The Prison Journal* 63(2), 47–65.

Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988) Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly* 5(4), 497–538.

Daly, K., & Stephens, D. J. (1995) The dark figure of criminology: Towards a black and multi-ethnic feminist agenda for theory and research. In N. Hahn Rafter & F. Heidensohn (eds.), *International Feminist Perspectives in Criminology: Engendering a Discipline*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, pp. 189–215.

Delmar, R. (1986) What is feminism? In J. Mitchell & A. Oakley (eds.), *What is Feminism?* New York: Pantheon, pp. 8–33.

Hannon, L., & Dufour, L. R. (1998) Still just the study of men and crime? A content analysis. *Sex Roles* 38(1–2), 63–71.

Heidensohn, F. (1968) The deviance of women: A critique and an enquiry. *British Journal of Sociology* 19(2), 160–175.

Heidensohn, F. (1987) Women and crime: Questions for criminology. In P. Carlen & A. Worrall (eds.), *Gender, Crime, and Justice*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, pp. 16–27.

Klein, D. (1973) The etiology of female crime: A review of literature. *Issues in Criminology* 8(2), 3–30.

Miller, J. (2002) The strengths and limits of "doing gender" for understanding street crime. *Theoretical Criminology* 6(4), 433–460.

Miller J., & Mullins, C. W. (2009) Feminist theories on girls' delinquency. In M. A. Zahn (ed.), *The Delinquent Girl*. Philadelphia, PA. Temple University Press, pp. 30–49.

Naffine, N. (1996) *Feminism and Criminology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Reinharz, S. (1992) *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Renzetti, C. M. (1997) Confessions of a reformed Positivist: Feminist participatory research as good social science. In M. D. Schwartz (ed.), *Researching Sexual Violence Against Women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 131–143.

Rivera, B., & Widom, C. S. (1990) Childhood victimization and violent offending. *Violence and Victims* 5(1), 19–35.

Smart, C. (1976) *Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Smith, D. A., & Paternoster, R. (1987) The gender gap in theories of deviance: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 24, 140–172.

Totman, J. (1978) *The Murderess: A Psychological Study of Criminal Homicide*. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates.

Walker, L. E. (1979) *The Battered Woman*. London: Harper and Row.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987) Doing gender. *Gender and Society* 1(2), 125–151.

Wootten, B. (1959) *Social Science and Social Pathology*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Worrall, A. (1990) *Offending Women*. New York: Routledge.

Power Control Theory

KATHRYN M. WHITELEY

The gender gap in crime refers to the fact that women commit far fewer crimes than men. The 1950s and 1960s produced significant theories of delinquency such as the work of Cohen (1955) and Hirschi (1969), which focused solely on males. Despite this convincing phenomenon, criminology largely failed to recognize gender in the development of theories of crime. This gap in offending was highlighted by the research of Meda Chesney-Lind (1989, 1993) with young female offenders. She argued that the findings of male delinquents were typically generalized to young girls' delinquency, arguing that girls needed to be added to the equation of delinquency (Chesney-Lind 1989). Feminist criminologists, including Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988) and Heimer (2000), concurred with general feminist perspectives that patriarchy is the source of gender differences across behaviors and especially with criminal behaviors. Power control theory as introduced by Hagan, Gillis, and Simpson (1985) was among the first criminological theories that emphasized the influence of patriarchy as understood through power relationships. Just as important, it was the first major theory that theorized delinquency with consideration of gender.

In order to fully comprehend power control theory, it is necessary to consider Hagan et al.'s (1985) thoughts regarding power and control that underlie the theory. According to these criminologists, power theories have largely focused on relations within the employment context. Typically, control theory is relegated to the family system. In their extension of power control theory, Hagan et al. (1987: 812) suggest "positions of power in the workplace are translated into power relations in the household."

A definition of patriarchy is essential to understand power control theory. Much is written regarding patriarchy and Hagan (1988) attributes the family system as the birthplace and institution that perpetuates patriarchy in society. Patriarchy can be seen as a social discourse in which males and male attributes are more highly regarded than the attributes of females and femininity. As such, a society that embraces patriarchy yields to gender inequities that tyrannize women. A broader definition is provided by Walby (1990), who contends patriarchy is a system of structures and practices whereby males control, oppress, and exploit females.

In addressing patriarchy, Hagan (1988) starts by establishing that hierarchical situations occur not only within the employment setting, but they are also established within the household between spouses and children. Within a classic patriarchal family system, Hagan (1988) argues that males are predominately employed outside the home whereas the mother is typically a homemaker and delegated the role of controlling the children. Highly patriarchal homes are sometimes referred to as unbalanced homes where child socialization is relegated to the mother.

The power relations between the mother and father, according to Hagan et al. (1985, 1987), are largely determined by employment status and the amount of authority the mother or father possesses. In highly patriarchal families, the father's employment authority significantly overshadows the mother's, particularly when she does not work outside the home. In this scenario, the father focuses on his outward duties and the mother is relegated instrumental control of the children, in particular the daughters (Hagan et al. 1985). Simply stated, daughters are subjected to much more supervision and control than sons. In highly patriarchal families, the daughters are socialized into what has been referred to as a cult of domesticity. Sons within patriarchal families, according to power control theory (see Hagan et al. 1985, 1987), are less supervised and are generally encouraged to take more risks.

Understanding risk-taking behavior is vital in understanding power control theory. In its most basic formulation, Hagan et al. (1985, 1987) suggest that power relations within the family determine the levels of social control over sons and daughters. Sons who have less maternal control are persuaded to take more risks. According to

Hagan et al. (1987), this scenario also serves to lessen the perceived consequences of the risk-taking behavior by males. With more risk-taking behavior and less fear of reprisal, the larger gender gap in delinquency can be understood.

From its formal conception, power control theory has undergone modifications (see Hagan 1988). This has largely been a result of the shifting labor force and more women in positions of authority. In consideration of this phenomenon, Hagan (1988) presents his notions of the concepts of consumption and production spheres. Historically, the consumption sphere was related to the home and the production sphere to work outside the home. With the increasing number of women becoming involved in the production sphere, the long-established sharp delineation between the two spheres was dissolving. Hagan (1988: 155) writes that with the increasing overlap of the two spheres arose the egalitarian family, and this witnessed girls now being groomed for production nearly on par with boys.

Cited was power control theory in regard to patriarchy that assumes that mothers are the chief agents of socialization. With increased employment and subsequent job authority, it became necessary to reconceptualize the power dynamic within the home. Becoming associated with power control theory were notions of the egalitarian or balanced household. It is assumed by Bates, Bader, and Mencken (2003) that in such households, mothers will exercise less control over their daughters. In this setting, daughters and sons will experience comparable levels of control. Where little difference exists between the mother's and father's employment and authority, childrearing is shared.

Accordingly, as families become more egalitarian, patriarchy as reflected in power control theory was further reconceptualized. Simply stated, Hagan (1988) argues that as women gain more power in relation to their husbands, their daughters will be treated more on par with their sons. It is anticipated that among highly patriarchal family systems, high disparity across delinquency will continue, but among egalitarian families, smaller gender differences will be realized (Hagan 1988: 158). Finally, Hagan (1988: 270) asserts if the revised power control theory is correct, "it implies that middle class youth of both sexes will have higher crime rates than their lower class peers."

Research seeking to validate power control theory has had mixed results. Hagan and his colleagues have expanded upon the theory and sought to validate it through their own research (Hagan et al. 1987; Hagan and Wheaten 1993). However, numerous studies, to include Hill and Atkinson (1988); Singer and Levine (1988); Jensen and Thompson (1990); Morash and Chesney-Lind (1991); and Blackwell et al. (2002), have all attempted to replicate Hagan's findings and have recognized minimal support for the theory.

A challenge met early on was realized through the research of Morash and Chesney-Lind (1991) who suggested that power control theory seemed to be an extension of the liberation or emancipation hypothesis. It was postulated that as women were increasingly emancipated and moved into positions of authority, we would see women engaging in more crime and that the gender gap in crime would even out. In their earliest assertions Morash and Chesney-Lind (1991) submitted that a better explanation for the gender gap in offending among delinquents could rest in the character of the nurturing relationships present. Young girls who are socialized in nurturing relationships are directed toward more prosocial behaviors and subsequently less criminality (Morash and Chesney-Lind 1991).

It was noted by Coser (1985) that in Hagan et al.'s (1985) original conceptualization of power control theory, the theory failed to address gender relations in the workplace and at home. There existed an inherent assumption that gender power disparity was in relation to the class position of the male as head of the household. In recognition of this limitation to the theory, Hagan et al. (1987) expanded upon the theory to account for the difference of authority in the employment setting between the wife and husband. This expansion of thought countered the absolute authority of the male head of the household, allowing a platform for gender power relations existing within the family system to be examined.

A persistent pattern of criticism is found among feminist criminologists. In a study seeking to confirm power control theory, Chesney-Lind and Shelden (1992) report they were unable to substantiate key elements of the theory. Specifically problematic was the theory's consistent adherence to ascribing far greater importance to

mothers than fathers in the social control aspects within patriarchal homes. A finding of Morash and Chesney-Lind (1991) cast doubt upon the near-exclusivity of the mother's control over the daughters within patriarchal family systems. Their analysis relegated more prominence within the father's role in causal terms. A sharp critic of the theory is Naffine (1988: 68) who argues that Hagan and associates portray girls and women as "a manipulated thing that is passive, compliant, and dependent." Naffine further argues that the criminal label is applied in the public sphere to males as females are deemed conformists who are manipulated by familial control. Last, Naffine asserts that the basic tenets of all control theories strip females of the capacity to act as rational agents who chose to perpetrate violence.

Hagan and others who have attempted to expand upon power control theory encountered a major challenge in the operationalizing of patriarchy. A criticism has been the tendency to rely on the conventional notions of household production and paid employment, or what is referred to as private patriarchy. Private patriarchy served to classify a family as highly or less patriarchal (Walby 1990). More specifically, Walby (1990) contends there exists a public patriarchy wherein institutions continue the oppression of women. It can be argued that public patriarchy has expanded dramatically in the past few decades and private patriarchy is now relatively rare in Western cultures. Public patriarchy translates into gender roles exercised upon adolescents within the home setting. Patriarchy, according to Walby (1990), both private and public, has posed challenges to operationalization for researchers.

Researchers, including Singer and Levine (1988), Blackwell (2000), and Blackwell et al. (2002), when attempting to replicate power control theory, demonstrated weak findings. The failure to acknowledge public patriarchy and its influences on childrearing may have contributed to the results. Given that patriarchy is fundamentally the basis for the theory, Walby (1990) contends that public patriarchy must be assimilated into the conceptualization of patriarchy.

Power control theory has been extended to apply to adult samples (see Blackwell 2000) to incorporate the influence of peer relations (Singer and Levine 1988). Power control theory has also been used to calculate a likelihood of victimization (Hagan and Wheaten 1993). In their extension of power control theory Bates et al. (2003) sought to extend power control theory in light of other types of family structures. It was suggested by Bates et al. (2003) that numerous applications of power control theory had been applied to intact two-parent families and to a lesser degree single mother families. Their research sought to incorporate single mother, single father, and step-families. The findings of Bates et al. (2003) suggest that power control theory does not allow for a full exploration of alternate family forms. For the theory to hold relevance, it needs to expand the definition of family and patriarchy (Bates et al. 2003).

In a study seeking to validate power control theory conducted by Hadjar and colleagues (2007), there were findings that support power control theory. The study engaged both the original power control theory (Hagan et al. 1985) and the revised version (Hagan et al. 1987). This study compared gender differences in aggressive behavior with youth in two very different geographic locales. One sample was from East and West Berlin in Germany and the other from Toronto, Canada. In this study (Hadjar et al. 2007) samples consisted of two-parent households with a mother and father and two opposite sex adolescents. Their study demonstrated findings consistent with power control theory whereby it supports that gendered differences in the workplace appear related to gender differences in aggressive behavior.

Additionally, the largest differences between boys' and girls' aggressive behaviors were manifest in the Toronto group. It is possible that since Toronto has far more immigrants than the two Berlin sites many of the immigrant families hold more traditional or patriarchal socialization practices. Another finding of significance to power control theory is that across all three sites, stronger control of daughters was associated with larger gender differences in aggressive behaviors (Hadjar et al. 2007). In their limitations to the findings Hadjar et al. (2007) caution that a sample of two parents – mother and father and two opposite sex offspring – are rare and not easily generalized to many existing studies attempting to validate power control theory.

In another article that seeks to expand upon power control theory (Grasmick et al. 1996), the

case is made for moving beyond risk taking and delinquency in adolescents to an application among risk taking by adult women in noncriminal behaviors. This is evidenced in the finding that women who were raised in less patriarchal homes were more likely to engage in risky occupations. Another expanded application for power control theory is the finding that women raised in less patriarchal homes are more likely to take risk and leave relationships, placing them at peril of abuse, such as domestic violence. Finally, Grasmik et al. (1996) point out that power control theory has relevance for future research that takes into consideration the disconnect between one's family of origin and one's family of procreation. Many adults who were raised in highly patriarchal families find within their own family system they are enmeshed in a structure that is more egalitarian. The significance of this shift is not well known as it relates to risk-taking behavior.

Power control theory by Hagan et al. (1985) and the revised version of power control theory (Hagan et al. 1987) remains one of the most influential and enduring theories attempting to account for gender differences in delinquency. Basically, the theory asserts the presence of power and absence of control differentially merge to generate situations that contribute to the presence and absence of the gender gap in delinquency (Hagan et al. 1985). In recognition of the shifting societal dynamics, Hagan et al. (1987) revised the theory to reflect both parents in the workplace as compared to the original focus upon the father's position. It was initially heralded as a bold step to introduce gender and to recognize patriarchal and power relationships by feminist criminologists Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988).

Criticisms of the theory share some consistent themes. Cited was the difficulty in operationalizing patriarchy or the power element of the theory. Noted was the failure to incorporate other household structures. Household types have evolved significantly and power control theory has not engaged father-only households or households where both parents are present, but only the mother is employed. A further gap is that Hagan et al. (1985, 1987) reference crimes such as vandalism, theft, and aggression, while no consideration of serious crimes of violence are incorporated. A further criticism is found in Morash and Chesney-Lind's (1991) observation that the bulk of Hagan et al.'s (1985, 1987) research was limited to work with youth in Toronto, Canada. Other scholars, to include Hill and Atkinson (1988), argue that some parenting styles are not adequately accounted for, such as aspects of instrumental control with males and expressive or relational control across females.

However, support continues for power control theory. Hagan and colleagues have continued to expand upon the theory, and tests of the theory have yielded support for some of its basic fundamentals. As noted, power control theory has been applied to several areas of criminological inquiry to include adult risk-taking behavior. Another application for power control theory was advocated by Sacco (1990) for the study of gender, fear, and victimization. Lastly, Hagan et al.'s (1985, 1987) analysis of risk-taking has been applied to the study of threat of risk-taking (see Grasmick, Blackwell, and Bursik 1993) in adult women, with some degree of reliability.

All major theories are placed under the microscope of scrutiny by research peers. Power control theory has been both challenged and embraced. It has continued to evolve, taking into account the changing societal structure. Critical elements of the theory have been replicated and the theory itself has become more inclusive of variables initially not considered. Power control theory has withstood 25 years of cross-examination and has established itself among the major contributions to criminological research.

SEE ALSO: Gender.

References

Bates, K. A., Bader, C. D., & Mencken, F. C. (2003) Family structure, power-control theory, and deviance: Extending power-control theory to include alternate family forms. *Western Criminology Review* 4(1), 170–190.

Blackwell, B. S. (2000) Perceived sanction threats, sex, and crime: A test and elaboration of power-control theory. *Criminology* 38(2), 439–488.

Blackwell, B. S., Sellers, C. S., & Schlaupitz, S. M. (2002) A power-control theory of vulnerability to crime and adolescent role exits – revisited. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 39(2), 199–218.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1989) Girls' crime and women's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency* 35(10), 5–29.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1993) *Girls, Delinquency and Juvenile Justice*, 3rd edn. CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R. G. (1992) *Girls, Delinquency and Juvenile Justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Cohen, A. K. (1955) *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free Press.

Coser, R. (1985) Power Lost and Status Gained: The American Middle-Class Husband. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.

Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988) Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly* 5(4), 497–538.

Grasmick, H. G., Blackwell, B. S., & Bursik, R. J. (1993) Changes in sex patterning of perceived sanctions. *Law and Society Review* 27(4), 679–705.

Grasmick, H.G., Hagan, J., Blackwell, B. S., & Arneklev, B. J. (1996) Risk preferences and patriarchy: Extending power-control theory. *Social Forces* 75(1), 177–199.

Hadjar, A., Baier, D., Boehnke, K., & Hagan, J. (2007) Juvenile delinquency and gender revisited. *European Journal of Criminology* 4(1), 33–58.

Hagan, J. (1988) *Structural Criminology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hagan, J., Gillis, A. R., & Simpson, J. (1985) The class structure of gender and delinquency: Towards a power-control theory of common delinquent behavior. *American Journal of Sociology* 90(6), 1151–1178.

Hagan, J., Gillis, A. R., and Simpson, J. (1987) Class in the household: A power-control theory of gender and delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology* 92(4), 788–816.

Hagan, J., & Wheaten, B. (1993) The search for adolescent role exits and the transition to adulthood. *Social Forces* 71(4), 955–980.

Heimer, K. (2000) The nature of crime: Continuity and change. Changes in the gender gap in crime and women's economic marginalization. *Criminal Justice* 1, 427–483.

Hill, G., & Atkinson, M. (1988) Gender, familial control and delinquency. *Criminology* 26(1), 127–147.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jensen, G.G., & Thompson, K. (1990) What's class got to do with it? A further examination of power-control theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 95(4), 1009–1023.

Morash, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1991) A reformulation and partial test of power-control theory of delinquency. *Justice Quarterly* 8(3), 347–378.

Naffine, N. (1988) *Female Crime: The Construction of Women in Criminology*. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.

Sacco, V. (1990) Gender, fear and victimization: A preliminary application of power-control theory. *Sociological Spectrum* 10(4), 485–506.

Singer, S., & Levine, M. (1988) Power-control theory, gender, and delinquency: A partial replication with additional evidence on the effects of peers. *Criminology* 26(4), 627–647.

Walby, S. (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Left Realism Theory

RANDOLPH R. MYERS

Left realists argue that "street" crime – the every-day violence in homes and on the street – needs to be taken seriously by criminologists and politicians. In theorizing crime, left realists focus much of their attention on the relationship between economic inequality, especially relative deprivation, and violence. While incorporating insights from mainstream sociological theories of crime, especially work in the strain tradition of Robert Merton, left realists are more critical of capitalism. Unlike the dominant positivist theories of crime, left realists contend that to fully explain the social phenomenon of crime, societal reactions need to be understood as well. While acknowledging that crime is in part socially constructed – that is, social reactions are necessary ingredients for crime – left realists maintain that street crime is *real enough*, especially for the economically disadvantaged individuals and communities that experience most violence. The scholarship that criminologists produce, therefore, ought to be practical and address the *real* problem that is street crime (Matthews 2009; Currie 2010; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 2010). So, while the massive amount of economic inequality generated by capitalism is theorized to breed much serious violence (and mass incarceration), there is no need, in the view of left realists, to wait for capitalism's demise to begin constructing a more just, less harm-filled society.

The left realist call to treat "street" crime as a "real" phenomenon was a reaction to much of the critical criminology of the 1970s. This work, according to left realists, gave little attention to – and sometimes excused – everyday "street" crimes and criminals. In the early 1980s, left realists, working predominantly in the United Kingdom, argued that to not acknowledge the harm caused by crimes such as robbery, domestic abuse, serious substance abuse, rape, and murder was an idealistic view of the world. Such a "left-idealist" position might be fine for privileged leftist academics, but it was an untenable one for everyday people, especially those living in violent communities and explosive homes. Left realists argued that street crime and the fear it generates is "real enough" for these populations and, therefore, it ought to be taken seriously. Taking crime "seriously" does not mean that acts currently defined as criminal ought to be – many should not. What it does mean, however, is that the "crimes" that receive social attention should be based on the lived realities of citizens, and that societal responses to crime ought to be democratically determined as well (Mooney 2000).

Left realists stress that crime is a social phenomenon, and that it needs to be understood in equal parts as action and reaction. This has clear implications for how scholars theorize crime because "a full-blown criminology must problematize why people commit crimes and why certain actions are criminalized" (Young and Matthews 1995: 2). It is not sufficient, therefore, to explain crime as behavior resulting from causes, even those that are structural in nature. Nor is it enough to say that crime is the product of shifting norms, or simply that it is behavior so labeled. Instead, one must understand the roots and consequences of the action *and* reaction. Crime, for a left realist, "is not reducible to an act nor is it simply the product of social reaction" (Matthews 2009: 346). Jock Young's (1999) square of crime most famously captures the social nature of crime from a left realist perspective. Young asserts that crime should be understood as resulting from the relationship between the four corners of the square of crime: the state (formal social control), the victim, the offender, and the community (informal social control). Crime results from the interplay between these four factors, and a change to any of the four may affect the crime rate.

Much of left realist criminology theorizes about how massive economic inequalities generated by certain capitalist economic arrangements explain the high levels of violence, especially homicide, seen in certain societies (Hall and McLean 2009). Left realists argue that despite the

fact that significant fluctuations in violence can and do occur *within* societies, levels of violence *across* societies, especially rates of homicide, remain higher in nations with the most economic inequality – countries where there is a wide and sustained gap between the economically included and excluded (Young 1999). For example, while it is true that the United States – a country with a tremendous and worsening amount of economic inequality – has experienced a meaningful drop in violent crime over the last 15 years or so, rates of homicide in the United States still tower over those seen in other countries such as Canada and Australia, and states in Western Europe. So, although San Diego, New York, and Chicago may be safer places than they were two decades ago, a left realist would point out that citizens in these cities – especially young men on the lower rungs of the economic ladder – remain much more likely to die from violence than their counterparts in Paris, Melbourne, or Toronto.

Departing from earlier critical criminologists, who focused much of their analytic attention on the inequities and injustices generated by capitalism generally, left realists recognize that certain versions of capitalism are especially criminogenic, while others are less so. Elliott Currie (1997) uses the term *market society* in reference to the violence-prone socioeconomic order of certain capitalist countries, including the United States. Market societies are organized around the accumulation of personal economic gain. In such societies, market logic overwhelms other values and social institutions, including those that make for healthy families and safe communities. In such countries, market principles "suffuse the whole social fabric," thereby undercutting and overwhelming "other principles that have historically sustained individuals, families and communities" (Currie 1997: 151–152).

Market societies are unequal societies – and this inequality is linked to crime in a number of ways. Not only do great disparities in wages and wealth exist between citizens, but social safety nets are weak or nonexistent in market societies. That is, there is little in the way of state provisions and supports to "buffer" individuals unable to provide for themselves and their families. Moreover, while the United States has historically possessed lower rates of unemployment than European countries, market societies are not good at creating *livelihoods* that can sustain healthy families and productive communities. Instead, they produce many *bad* jobs characterized by unlivable wages, erratic hours, stingy benefits, and associated problems of underwork and overwork (see Ehrenreich 2011). Scholars in the left realist tradition connect such strain-inducing social arrangements to violence and self-destructive drug use (see Dorn and South 1987; Currie 1993). Such "sink or swim" employment and social policies also shape the social reactions to crime and deviance, as they help to foster a punitive and individualized culture that atomizes citizens and hardens the feelings they hold toward each other. Such a culture is fertile ground not only for violence and self-destruction, but for punitive policies like mass incarceration and the criminalization of young people (Goddard and Myers 2011).

This especially unforgiving version of capitalism contrasts with the more compassionate capitalist models seen in Scandinavia, Japan, and, to varying extents, Western Europe. In these countries, market logic and values are more effectively contained, meaning that they are not allowed to run roughshod over core social institutions that sustain individuals and communities. In such countries, while inequalities in wages and wealth still exist, they are less severe, and stronger social safety nets are in place to catch citizens for whom the market cannot provide a livelihood (Currie 1997).

In theorizing about how certain capitalist economic arrangements breed crime, left realists point to relative deprivation as a key mechanism. Resembling the classic thesis of Robert Merton's strain theory, left realists suggest that modern post-industrial capitalist societies, like the United States and the United Kingdom, are "bulimic" in nature. By this they mean that while dominant consumer culture socializes all citizens to go after glittering goods and lifestyles, large segments of the population are excluded (or expelled) from meaningful participation in the labor market (Young 1999). Qualitative accounts of how inner-city youth of color are simultaneously sucked in and then expelled from dominant American culture bring to life this bulimic process (see Nightingale 1993; Anderson 1999). As an important addendum to Merton's strain thesis, left realists argue that strain occurs not only

from excluded citizens *gazing up* at material possessions they cannot legitimately attain, but also from the *downward glances* cast by the well off citizens at the excluded. That is, often, well-off citizens flaunt the material goods so revered in late modern capitalist countries, while also holding vindictive attitudes toward working-class citizens who "make too easy a living even if it is not as good as one's own" (Young 1999: 9).

According to left realists, hyper-capitalist societies breed crime in ways that resonate with numerous mainstream criminological theories: they help to disorganize communities by not providing stable, high-quality employment for most citizens; they create subcultures of young men who come to value violence as a way to construct meaning and generate income when legitimate avenues to success are blocked (DeKeseredy and Schwartz 2010); and they stress and strain families in ways that will lead to child abuse and disrupt the careful parenting needed to instill self-control in youth. Left realists acknowledge that crime might very well be caused by each of the specific mechanisms outlined by dominant criminological theories, such as learning, strain, social disorganization, and control; however, left realists argue that, very often, activating each of these simultaneously-occurring mechanisms is a virulent brand of turbo-charged capitalism.

Though reforming the criminal justice system – especially shrinking the prison system and putting the police under democratic control – remains a worthy goal for left realists, given that the main generator of violence is inequality and relative deprivation, the key to lowering rates of violence is to institute progressive economic policies that lead to more material equality. Because meaningful reductions in violence can be attained by reining in capitalism, left realists offer "mid-level" policy suggestions aimed at making capitalism's criminogenic effects less so. Often using the social policies of low-violence societies as a guide, left realists suggest that a more progressive tax policy ought to pay for supportive governmental programs such as early childhood education, universal healthcare, low-cost housing, and subsidized employment for disadvantaged young people.

For left realists, these progressive social policies, rather than a bloated, costly, and ineffective prison system, ought to be the cornerstone of a more humane, more effective crime policy.

SEE ALSO: Merton, Robert.

References

Anderson, E. (1999) *Code of the Street*. New York: Norton.

Currie, E. (1993) *Reckoning: Drugs, the Cities, and the American Future*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Currie, E. (1997) Market, crime and community: Toward a mid-range theory of post-industrial violence. *Theoretical Criminology* 1(2), 141–172.

Currie, E. (2010) Plain left realism: An appreciation, and some thoughts for the future. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 54(2), 111–124.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2010) Friedman economic policies, social exclusion, and crime: Toward a gendered left realist subcultural theory. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 54(2), 159–170.

Dorn, N., & South, N. (1987) *A Land Fit for Heroin? Drug Policies, Prevention and Practice*. London: Macmillan.

Ehrenreich, B. (2011) *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Picador.

Goddard, T., & Myers, R. (2011) Democracy and demonstration in the grey area of neo-liberalism: A case study of Free LA High School. *British Journal of Criminology* 51(4), 652–670.

Hall, S., & McLean, C. (2009) A tale of two capitalisms: Preliminary spatial and historical comparisons of homicide rates in Western Europe and the USA. *Theoretical Criminology* 13(3), 313–339.

Matthews, R. (2009) Beyond "so what?" criminology: Rediscovering realism. *Theoretical Criminology* 13(3), 341–362.

Mooney, J. (2000) *Gender, Violence and the Social Order*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Nightingale, C. H. (1993) *On the Edge: A History of Poor Black Children and their American Dreams*. New York: Basic Books.

Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (2010) The current health of left realist theory. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 54(2), 107–110.

Young, J. (1999) *The Exclusive Society*. London: Sage.

Young, J., & Matthews, R. (1995) Questioning left realism. In R. Matthews & J. Young (eds.), *Issues in Realist Criminology*. London: Sage, p. 1.

Peacemaking Criminology

FRANK M. AFFLITTO

Peacemaking criminology has developed, over the last two decades, into an alternative and comprehensive criminological perspective. Such a consciously dual theoretical and applied orientation was originally proposed by both Richard Quinney and Harold Pepinsky. It can best be viewed as a criminological perspective approach, because of its essential, fundamental bridging of basic theoretical underpinnings with its broad and extensive policy recommendations, objectives, and implications. Coupled with this perspective approach, peacemaking criminology routinely proposes valuative paradigms in the policy objectives and program proposals that are central to its very nature (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991; Scimecca 1991; Tifft and Markham 1991; Braswell, Fuller, and Lozoff 2001; Wozniak 2008a; Wozniak 2008b; Klenowski 2009).

Peacemaking criminology can be broadly defined as a set of principles which constitute a theoretical and analytical lens towards conceptually approaching the broad field of criminology (Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991; Scimecca 1991), with its varied and interwoven components. This is accomplished through a three-pronged paradigm, which includes: social justice generation (Tosh 1977; Elias 1991; Quinney 1991; Tifft and Markham 1991), nonviolence (Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991; Quinney 1991; Hanser 2009; Klenowski 2009), and *positive* peace creation (Elias 1991; Quinney 1991; Taraschi 1998; Klenowski 2009; Wheeldon 2009).

The origins and foundations of peacemaking criminology stem from belief systems in both East and West, largely centered on values derived from spiritual traditions (Quinney 1991). These include, but are not limited to, Buddhism (Quinney 1991), Christianity (Taraschi 1998; Klenowski 2009), basic humanism (Wozniak 2008a), First Nations' healing and justice practices (Taraschi 1998; Government of Rwanda 2007; Belknap and MacDonald 2010; Al Jazeera 2011; Beah 2012), and Islam (Gaskew 2009). The foci of the foundational elements in the above-mentioned belief systems are:

1. inner, individual, or inward transformation (Quinney 1991; Taraschi 1998; Hanser 2009);
2. outward, or structural, transformation (Braswell et al. 2001; Hanser 2009; Wheeldon 2009);
3. nonviolent justice building (Quinney 1991; Tifft and Markham 1991; Klenowski 2009; Belknap and MacDonald 2010);
4. nonviolent alternatives to social harm and suffering (Quinney 1991; Tarashi 1998; Braswell et al. 2001; Wozniak 2008a; Wozniak 2009) and human, especially structurally-based, suffering (Tosh 1977; Tifft and Markham 1991; Wozniak 2008a);
5. inclusivity of everyone and everything in both inward and outward transformations, oriented towards healing and non-oppressive conflict resolution (Wozniak 2008a; Hanser 2009);
6. interconnectedness of all living things (Quinney 1991; Taraschi 1998);
7. mindfulness (Klenowski 2009).

Mindfulness, perhaps initially the least understood of the above concepts, refers to the embracing of the realization that we, as human beings, operate on intentions in our agency. Mindfulness, in this sense, also refers to perfecting a deep and growing awareness of ourselves and others, and of our mutual interdependence and interconnectedness. This concept refers to the fact that, not withstanding the factors that "push" or "pull" us, we are ultimately guided by choice.

It is important to note, before presenting the three main tenets of peacemaking criminology, that it is essential to conceptualize these tenets as interrelated and interdependent. They cannot exist apart from each other. First, "positive peace creation" (social activity, not just a

conceptual "orientation") entails the conscious construction, in ourselves and within social institutions, of peace-building transformations. The progressive elimination of social harm, social suffering, and injustice and the implementation of more just, and less violent, social policies in a framework of respect for the human rights of all, is at the heart of peacemaking criminology (Elias 1991; Quinney 1991; Hanser 2009; Wheeldon 2009). Positive peace creation is the conceptual and practical antithesis of "negative peace." When the late Jamaican reggae singer and justice advocate Peter Tosh (1977) sang "I don't want no peace, I want equal rights and justice," he was not implicitly stating that he did *not* long for a peaceful world. He was, instead, implying that no creation of real social peace would occur without the end of oppression and the establishment of just social systems in communities, nations, and internationally. A negative peace (Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991; Wozniak 2009), or the militarized and aggressive policies which seek to quash all social conflict and visible street crime (Tifft and Markham 1991; Braswell et al. 2001) in some geographical areas (Hanser 1989; Wozniak 2008a), also condones criminal activity in others (Tifft and Markham 1991; Wozniak 2008a), so as to construct a thin veneer of calm which is socially acceptable to the elites (Wozniak 2008a; Wheeldon 2009). In this light, traditional criminological theories and criminal justice policies are viewed as supporting what can be called "negative peace" solutions to human suffering and social/communal harm (Wozniak 2000; Wozniak 2008b). Such theoretical and policy approaches prolong and foster deeper injustices (Scimecca 1991; Braswell et al. 2001), and are inherently violent in nature (Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991), upholding oppressive social systems. The construction and creation of a positive peace entails much more than the *seeming* pacification of behavior officially labeled as socially undesirable (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Caulfield 1991; Braswell et al. 2001). The concept of positive peace creation is based on the premise that peaceful and peace-sustaining relationships do not exist in societies because of unjust and eventually unsustainable social structures which generate violence, mutual oppression(s), and widespread

insecurities, especially for those without private security guards or a non-predatory police presence in their geographical communities.

The second tenet of peacemaking criminology is nonviolence (Quinney 1991; Hanser 2009; Klenowski 2009; Belknap and MacDonald 2010). Nonviolence refers not only to individual behavior and personal transformation, but also to the profound transformation of economic and criminal justice structures in a given society, and internationally (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Tifft and Markham 1991), so that social oppressions which cause violence will be terminated and ultimately transformed into life-generating and peace-building institutional policies and social relations (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Elias 1991). Nonviolence can never be institutionalized, nor even generated under structural policies which seek to impose a negative peace (Elias 1991; Scimecca 1991). Profound and lasting interpersonal and society-wide practices of nonviolence can only be brought forth and propagated within a movement of positive peace-building (Taraschi 1998).

The third tenet of peacemaking criminology is the generation of social justice (Tosh 1977; Quinney 1991; Taraschi 1998; Klenowski 2009; Wheeldon 2009), which entails addressing the causation of injustice (Tosh 1977; Quinney 1991; Wozniak 2000; Braswell et al. 2001; Wheeldon 2008; Klenowski 2009; Wozniak 2009), acting upon the resulting knowledge, and creating a just society (Caulfield 1991; Wozniak 2000; Wheeldon 2009). Specifically, the generation of social justice requires addressing the etiology of injustice in a given social order (Hanser 2009; Wozniak 2009). This is where traditional criminology arguably presents its most profound weakness(es) (Caulfield 1991; Taraschi 1988). Neither justice, nor a positive peace, nor a nonviolent social order/atmosphere can ever be constructed without methodological and policy recognition, research, and delineation of the causes and consequences of structural injustice. The generation of social justice also requires the *active* creation of a just society, especially through community organizing (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991) and widespread empowerment (Wozniak 2008a).

Peacemaking criminology's principal policy proposals revolve around "destined" suffering (Tifft and Markham 1991), the (self-) perpetuation of oppressive, violent structures, and effective and harm-reducing criminal justice policies. Policy proposals in peacemaking criminology center on the fundamental premise that human suffering is largely socially-constructed and therefore needs to be socially addressed and eliminated. Traditional criminology has largely been part of the current prolonged "war" paradigm in US society (Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991; Klenowski 2009), and peacemaking criminology presents itself as a clear and profound alternative at both the the conceptual/theoretical and applied policy levels. Human suffering is largely "destined" (Tifft and Markham 1991) and hence, such a destiny can be erased and replaced through the implementation of nonviolent social policies which guarantee human rights (Elias 1991), create positive peace, and generate social justice for all (Wheeldon 2009).

Peacemaking criminology also recognizes that oppressive, violent social structures are self-perpetuating (Caulfield 1991; Braswell et al. 2001). Such structures also contribute foundational or causative factors in violent, oppressive interpersonal relations (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Caulfield 1991; Quinney 1991; Tifft and Markham 1991). The criminal justice system in the United States is most accurately characterized by and manifested through its seeking to establish social control, through the propagation and institutionalization of violent social relations (Caulfield 1991; Braswell et al. 2001). Peacemaking criminological policy proposals originate in a belief that current criminal justice policies, at least as manifested in the United States, are not only violent and unjust, but are, in fact, wholly ineffective (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Caulfield 1991; Elias 1991; Scimecca 1991; Braswell et al. 2001; Wozniak 2008b; Klenowski 2009).

Peacemaking criminology proposes four principal research and policy implications in the area of criminal justice. These are implications regarding penological considerations, especially incarceration; statutory reforms and their effects and limitations; the structural etiology of mutual oppressions, which are based upon power relations in society, such as those made manifest in interpersonal violence; and the theoretical and conceptual value-laden (Wozniak 2008a) bankruptcy of traditional criminological and criminal justice research trajectories and policy recommendations.

In terms of penology, particularly incarceration, peacemaking criminology points to the well-documented assertion that imprisonment simply and thoroughly "ruins lives" (Braswell et al. 2001). Incarceration policies perpetuate the so-called prison-industrial complex, and are an attempt to "punish . . . into conformity" (Braswell et al. 2001) those imprisoned, subsequently yielding predictable, and negative, results, such as high recidivism rates, inability to vote, find employment, or otherwise sustainably reenter free society (Caulfield 1991). Incarceration is a manifestation of the creation of a negative peace. It simply fails to change criminal behavior, and is insufficient to achieve healing (Wozniak 2008b).

Doubts hover over the positive and lasting effects of simple statutory reforms and their potential impact on social sufferings and criminal behaviors. Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries (1991), in their study on sexual assault in a Michigan college town, concluded that program evaluations of legislated policies – the work of focused taskforces or even of focused social activism – must be placed in the appropriate social context in order to understand their results. In their study, they did not in fact find that "hierarchical power arrangements" (Tifft and Markham 1991) were challenged by the legislated policies nor by the majority of those who worked for their local implementation. Without social activism actually questioning a greater social context of violence against women, and the origins, targets, and effects of sexual violence, the legal reforms were wholly insufficient to effect change in women's safety in the local milieu in which they worked, and which they subsequently investigated. Starkly perceiving that neither general nor specific deterrence were successful at changing convicted perpetrators' danger nor threat levels towards society, this conceptual model can and should be applied to new peacemaking recommendations for recent legalistic statutory

forms; for instance, in the area of human trafficking. Peacemaking criminology rightfully queries whether or not a law (and projected punishment for convicted offenders) is enough to change society and to lower thresholds of social harm.

When interpersonal and social violence are addressed in the more traditional literature, the structural origins and manifestations of such violence are systematically ignored, and sometimes even denied (Caringella-MacDonald and Humphries 1991; Caulfield 1991; Tifft and Markham 1991; Klenowski 2009). Battering, for example, is a social phenomenon, inasmuch as the widespread violence perpetrated by elites on populations is structural (particularly on the poor, who simply wish to see their children eat and to live till at least the age of five) (Tifft and Markham 1991; Wozniak 2000). Tifft and Markham (1991) claim that much of human suffering is, in fact, manufactured,'' "self-perpetuating," and designed to foster "cruel" realities on those who are victimized by such subordination to the hierarchical prioritization of "use-values" and corporate profits. The recognition of the structural nature of violence clearly shows that empowerment cannot occur when dependency and subordination are the order of the day.

The final and perhaps most overarching implication for research and policy proposals in peacemaking criminology involve the extensive critiques of traditional criminology. Traditional criminology is seen as:

1. value-laden (Taraschi 1998; Wozniak 2008a);
2. neglectful of the fact that all criminologists play a "political role" (Caulfield 1991; Taraschi 1998);
3. contributing to "predictably ineffective crime policies" (Elias 1991);
4. focusing on theoretical orientations (e.g. subcultural theory), which foster misunderstanding, unjust labeling of marginalized populations, and perpetuate violence (Caulfield 1991).

Through these, and other analytical lenses, traditional criminological approaches are dismissed as the embodied antithesis to peacemaking, and hence as immersed in the "professional failure" of the discipline in general (Elias 1991). Traditional criminology does not support "social stability" (Scimecca 1991), nor an end to injustice and the reversal of "thwarted human needs" (Scimecca 1991). Rather, it fosters injustice (Wozniak 2008b) and social *instability*.

SEE ALSO: Balanced and Restorative Justice; Conflict Theories of Crime.

References

Al Jazeera (2011) Bitter Root. Two former Lord's Resistance Army commanders seek traditional tribal justice in order to come to terms with their past. http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/witness/2011/10/20111012152024670219.html, accessed February 5, 2013.

Beah, I. (2012) Children and conflict in a changing world. Presentation at the M. B. Lykes Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Boston College Center for Human Rights and International Justice and the BC Arts & Social Responsibility Project, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

Belknap, J., & McDonald, C. (2010) Judges' attitudes about and experiences with sentencing circles in intimate-partner abuse cases. *Revue canadienne de criminology et de justice pénale* 52, 369–395.

Braswell, M., Fuller, J., & Lozoff, D. (2001) *Corrections, Peacemaking, and Restorative Justice: Transforming Individuals*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Caringella-MacDonald, S., & Humphries, D. (1991) Sexual assault, women and the community organizing to prevent sexual violence. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 98–113.

Caulfield, S. L. (1991) The perpetration of violence through criminological theory: The ideological role of subcultural theory. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 228–238.

Elias, R. (1991) Crime control as human rights enforcement. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 251–262.

Gaskew, T. (2009) Peacemaking criminology and counterterrorism: Muslim Americans and the war on terror. *Contemporary Justice Review* 12, 345–366.

Government of Rwanda (ca. 2007) Untitled [Gacaca]. http://www.inkiko-gacaca.gov.rw/pdf/introduction%20english.pdf, accessed February 5, 2013.

Hanser, R. D. (2009) Conflicts and geographical flash-points around the world: The effective application of restorative justice and peacemaking criminological perspectives. *Contemporary Justice Review* 12, 191–205.

Klenowski, P. M. (2009) Peacemaking criminology: Etiology of crime or philosophy of life? *Contemporary Justice Review* 12, 207–222.

Quinney, R. (1991) The way of peace: On crime, suffering, and service. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 3–13.

Scimecca, J. A. (1991) Conflict resolution and a critique of "Alternate Dispute Resolution." In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp 172–180.

Taraschi, S. G. (1998) Peacemaking criminology and aboriginal justice initiatives as a revitalization of justice. *Contemporary Justice Review* 1, 103–121.

Tifft, L. L., & Markham, L. (1991) Battering women and battering Central Americans: A peacemaking synthesis. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 114–153.

Tosh, P. (1977) Equal Rights. http://www.lyricstime.com/peter-tosh-equal-rights-lyrics.html, accessed February 5, 2013.

Wheeldon, J. (2009) Finding common ground: Restorative justice and its theoretical construction(s). *Contemporary Justice Review* 12, 91–100.

Wozniak, J. F. (2000) The voices of peacemaking criminology: Insights into a perspective with an eye toward teaching. *Contemporary Justice Review* 3, 267–289.

Wozniak, J. F. (2008a) Poverty and peacemaking criminology: Beyond mainstream criminology. *Critical Criminology* 16, 209–223.

Wozniak, J. F. (2008b) Teaching to shift people's thinking toward peace: The relevance of Colman McCarthy's work for peacemaking criminology. *Contemporary Justice Review* 11, 229–244.

Wozniak, J. F. (2009) C. Wright Mills and higher immorality: Implications for corporate crime, ethics, and peacemaking criminology. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 51, 189–203.

Environmental Criminology

RYAN RANDA

Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) present environmental criminology as a perspective which "argues that criminal events must be understood as confluences of offenders, victims or criminal targets, and laws in specific settings at particular times and places." Environmental criminology is not a single theory but a commonly understood approach to criminology under which many theories of crime and behavior share common themes. Environmental criminology is a home for those theories and perspectives which focus on the criminal opportunity or the criminal event more than on the individual offender.

Wortley and Mazerolle (2008) suggest that the environmental perspective and the theories that are housed within this perspective share three basic premises. First, criminal behavior is significantly influenced by the nature of the immediate environment in which it occurs. The environmental perspective depends upon the principle that all behavior results from a person-situation interaction. The environment is not just a passive backdrop for criminal behavior; rather, it plays a fundamental role in initiating the crime and shaping its course. Thus, crime events result not only from criminogenic individuals; they are equally caused by criminogenic elements of the crime scene. Environmental criminology explains how immediate environments affect behavior and why some environments are criminogenic. Second, the distribution of crime in time and space is non-random. Because criminal behavior is dependent upon situational factors, crime is patterned according to the location of criminogenic environments. Crime will be concentrated around crime opportunities and other environmental features that facilitate criminal activity. Crime rates vary from suburb to suburb and from street to street, and may peak at different times of day, different days of the week, and different weeks of the

year. The purpose of crime analysis is to identify and describe these crime patterns. Third, understanding the role of criminogenic environments and being aware of the way that crime is patterned are powerful weapons in the investigation, control, and prevention of crime. This knowledge allows police, crime prevention practitioners, and other interested groups to concentrate resources on particular crime problems in particular locations. Changing the criminogenic aspects of the targeted environment can reduce the incidence of crime in that location. Environmental criminology and crime analysis combine to provide practical solutions to crime problems (Wortley and Mazerolle 2008).

Given these three premises, one can see that environmental criminology lives both in the abstract and the practical. It is both theoretical and applied, and has a place for a wide and ranging collection of participants. Environmental criminology is a perspective on crime events that draws from a number of disciplines, including sociology, psychology, economics, human ecology, architecture, and product designers, to name a few. And, over the course of its maturation, environmental criminology has included perspectives on crime with roots that vary in scope. Several of these theories are articulated and exist independently as explanations of crime with some commonalities. In fact it is just a few theories that in many respects form the foundations of what we consider environmental criminology today.

One of the core components of environmental criminology today is rational choice theory. This theory is a means for understanding how individuals make their choices, choices to break the law, and choices about how, when, and where to commit crime (Clarke and Cornish 1985; Cornish and Clarke 1987). In simple terms, rational choice is based on the idea that we all make decisions in a relatively simple and similar way, centering on calculating the costs and benefits of the actions and behaviors we are about to engage in. The theoretical work around rational choice has come a long way, and from within rational choice there are many critical elements of crime prevention,

such as blocking opportunities and interrupting scripts, that stem from rational choice theory.

Routine activities theory is another major component of the theoretical background to crime prevention and one of the core theories associated with environmental criminology. This theory is the fundamental foundation of what we think of as the opportunity structure. Specifically, the criminal opportunity structure, at the most basic level, is a combination of three different elements: A target, the offender, and a lack of guardianship. We say that a criminal opportunity exists when these three elements converge. Interestingly, routine activities theory was originally designed to understand why crime was on the upswing in times when many other social institutions were strong. Cohen and Felson (1979) were asking questions about crime in America as a whole. However, over time we have taken this "opportunity structure" and applied it at all levels (city, neighborhood, and bookstore).

Crime pattern theory moved toward a better understanding of how crime patterns were formed. In an attempt to understand how crime clustered throughout cities, this theory developed by Brantingham and Brantingham (1984; 1991) further elaborated on the impact of the physical environment on crime and crime opportunities. Specifically, these authors discussed the nature of how conceptual places like "pathways" and "nodes" influence how crime might develop and emerge in communities; how some places act to attract or generate crime; and finally how the environmental "backcloth" could provide a context in which we could understand the process.

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) is a step toward the micro level application of environmental criminology mentioned above. Early theorists in the area, like Jane Jacobs (1961), and C. Ray Jeffrey (1971), who coined the term crime prevention through environmental design, worked at CPTED from larger scale perspective on cities and communities. However, others such as Oscar Newman (1972) worked over the years to develop and explore the concepts and theory underlying crime prevention through environmental design, and eventually developed additional CPTED components, most notably "defensible space." Newman and other CPTED practitioners and theorists worked to apply their principles to neighborhoods as well as singular structures or buildings. CPTED focuses on elements of structure and design that increase "natural surveillance" and "natural access control", and "natural territorial reinforcement."

Finally, situational crime prevention narrows the focus of environmental criminology further by dealing with very specific forms of crime, often so specific that they are completely individual and unique. Those practicing situational crime prevention use a variety of techniques that involve the management, design, or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic and permanent way as possible and will make crime more difficult and risky, or less rewarding and excusable as judged by a wide range of offenders (Clarke 1997). Ultimately, one will find that there are 25 specifically articulated techniques of crime prevention from the situational crime prevention point of view.

These core theories collectively form the foundation of environmental criminology. Each of them exist on their own to explain some component of crime and crime events; however, their common themes and underlying assumptions result in a unified perspective on crime. Over the years the most salient critique to be leveled against the environmental perspective on crime has been the counterpoint of displacement. Displacement is, most simply, the moving of crime from one place to another, or one time to another, in order to avoid being blocked from their criminal pursuit (Eck 1993). Those making this argument may suggest that crime exists in communities as a result of factors that influence criminality rather than crime or criminal events, and as such the blocking or preventing of crime is not possible without long-term social solutions. Thus, crime in a given area is a symptom of other criminogenic problems. And, the blocking of crimes and opportunity for crime in certain places is in essence treating the symptoms rather than the disease. From this philosophical position, crime cannot be eradicated without resolving issues of criminality and thus, if blocked in one location will only emerge in another.

The evidence surrounding the existence of displacement as a problem with crime prevention has yielded mixed results, with most recent explorations of the displacement problem suggesting that displacement is very unlikely to

be 100%. Rather there is evidence to suggest that concentrated crime prevention efforts may actually produce a diffusion of benefits to the surrounding area. That is, the benefits of a crime prevention effort on one block may actually reduce crime on neighboring blocks without the additional effort by police or other agencies (see Weisburd et al. 2006).

Despite the growing body of evidence that suggests displacement is not the concern that some have suggested it would be, there are still criminologists and policy makers that are hesitant about the overall effectiveness of crime prevention strategies based on elements of environmental criminology. While many of the principal elements and core theories of environmental criminology have been published for more than 30 years, the area of study is still considered young by many scholars. And, if environmental criminology is a young field it is also one with a bright future. New and exciting work is being conducted all the time with fresh developing models that include geographic information systems, innovative product design, and intelligence-driven policing techniques.

SEE ALSO: Rational Choice Theory; Routine Activities and Crime.

References

Brantingham P. J., & Brantingham P. L. (1984) *Patterns in Crime*. New York: Macmillan.

Brantingham P. J., & Brantingham P. L. (1991) Introduction to the 1991 reissue: Notes on environmental criminology. In P. Brantingham & P. Brantingham (eds.), *Environmental Criminology*, 2nd edn. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, pp. 7–26.

Clarke, R. (ed.) (1997) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, 2nd edn. New York: Harrow and Heston.

Clarke, R., & Cornish, D. (1985) Modeling offenders' decisions: A framework for research and policy. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, Vol. 6. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, L., & Felson, M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44(4), 588–608.

Cornish, D., & Clarke, R. (1987) Understanding crime displacement: An application of rational choice theory. *Criminology* 25(4), 933–947.

Eck, J. E. (1993) The threat of crime displacement. *Criminal Justice Abstracts* 25(3), 527–546.

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

Jeffery, C. R. (1971) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Weisburd, D., Wyckoff, L. A., Ready, J., et al. (2006) Does crime just move around the corner? A controlled study of spatial displacement and diffusion of crime control benefits. *Criminology* 44(3), 549–591.

Wortley R., & Mazerolle L. (2008) Environmental criminology and crime analysis: Situating the theory, analytic approach and application. In R. Wortley & L. Mazerolle (eds.), *Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis*. Cullompton, Devon UK: Willan Publishing, pp. 1–15.

Further Reading

Sherman, L., Gartin, P. R., & Buerger, M. E. (1989) Hotspots of predatory crime: Routine activities in the criminology of place. *Criminology* 27(1), 27–56.

Theoretical Integration

RODGER BENEFIEL

The process of developing criminological theory, as with any social science, begins with the formation of a hypothesis that attempts to answer a question. For criminologists, the question can be: Why do some people engage in criminal behavior and others do not? Why does not everyone engage in crime? What environmental factors contribute to or exacerbate the possibility of crime occurring? Some will attempt to answer these questions based on societal explanations ranging from parental influences to economic conditions and cultural expectations, while others may believe the answer lies within the individual, whether on a genetic level or through an interaction between genetic predisposition and the environment. Regardless of the hypothesis, the process of developing it into a theory is the same – scientists use data to think critically about the idea and reject errors in the thought process (Popper 1958). This method is constituted by four principles (Descartes 1637: 67):

1. Never accept anything as true that is not clearly known to be so; in other words, avoid precipitancy and prejudice.
2. Divide each of the difficulties under examination into as many parts as possible.
3. Conduct thoughts such that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, it is possible to ascend step by step to the knowledge of the more complex.
4. In every case, make enumerations so complete and reviews so general so as to be assured nothing has been omitted.

In a similar vein, Hyman (1955) said that if one asserts that factor A causes result B, then the following must be the case (quoted in Hirschi 2002: 4):

1. A and B must be statistically associated.
2. A is causally prior to B.

3. The association between A and B does not disappear when the effects of other variables causally prior to both of the original variables are removed.

Additionally, Hyman advocates that "one or more of the intervening variables link the independent and dependent variables" (1955: 4).

Because theories are proved (or more correctly, not disproved) based on the knowledge available to the scientist at the time, new theories and adjustments to existing theories can be proposed as new data become available, depending on what questions are being asked and how they are answered. It would follow, then, that as new information becomes available and theories are subjected to additional testing, some would be falsified in favor of newer ones. Falsification (also called the oppositional tradition) is based on the idea that theories make contradictory predictions and competitive testing will show which ones are supported by the data and which are not. However, as the number of viable theories purporting to provide a new explanation for criminal behavior increases, some criminologists have come to believe that falsification is failing because the theories are making predictions that are not necessarily contradictory (Bernard and Snipes 1996). The reason why these new theories can make noncontradictory assumptions is that crime is relative – its definition is subject to change and the different theories are simply explaining different portions of the variance in crime (Elliot 1985; Tittle 1989). Unfortunately, having so many theories impedes scientific progress because criminologists are unable to agree on even the most basic facts about crime, such as its relation to age, class, and race (Bernard 1990).

If falsification is doomed to failure, then the alternative is theoretical integration (Bernard and Snipes 1996). Generally speaking, there are two types of integration: propositional and conceptual. Propositional integration involves linking theories by a similar principle, while conceptual integration combines the concept of one theory with that of another. Conceptual integration is not viewed as being particularly useful, primarily

because it is mostly semantic (Liska, Krohn, and Messner 1989), which leaves theorists with the propositional method. However, criminologists differ on whether or not integration will result in scientific progress.

Perhaps the most well-known exchange in this debate occurred in the January 1979 issue of the *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. In that issue, Elliot, Ageton, and Canter (1979) began the discussion by arguing for an integration of strain, labeling, social learning, and social control theories in order to provide a better explanation of criminal behavior. Their paradigm was based on control theory, but placed a different emphasis on participation and commitment to delinquent groups while identifying a set of experiences that either strengthen or weaken social ties over time. The key here was to reconcile the differences between control and strain theories. In control theory delinquency is related to the strength of bonds, while in strain theory the bond is the same but motivation varies. Elliot et al. (1979) reconciled this problem by allowing for variation in both motivation and bonding. Hirschi (1979: 34) countered by saying that Elliot et al. (1979) had changed key portions of the theories in order to mold them into a unified concept. With regard to their use of control theory, Hirschi said that they were "using the terms and ignoring the claims." Hirschi believed that most theories have contradictory assumptions and are incompatible, and thought successful integration would "destroy the healthy competition among ideas" (1979: 37). Short (1979) also weighed in on the debate, claiming that integration needs to incorporate three levels of analysis, namely individual, micro-situational, and macro.

Hirschi (1979) framed his argument against integration by explaining that there are three methods to propositionally achieve integration: end to end, side by side, and up and down:

1. End-to-end integration posits a causal order between the theories – the dependent variable of one theory becomes the independent variable in the subsequent theory.
2. Side-by-side integration involves placing the theories next to each other and seeing how they overlap. Hirschi believed this to be the most appropriate method of integration since it leaves each theory to define criminal behavior "in its own terms" (1979: 35). Bernard and Snipes (1996) give the example of theory A explaining violent crime and theory B explaining crimes committed by indigent persons – the integrated theory would then explain violent crime committed by indigent persons.
3. Up-and-down integration involves increasing the level of abstraction such that partial theories can become specific sections of a larger, more general theory of crime.

In Elliot et al.'s (1979) paradigm, elements of the end-to-end and side-by-side methods were used. According to Hirschi, however, Elliott et al.'s efforts were unsuccessful because they changed the core of the theories they used. Elliot (1985) continued to argue for integration, explaining that different theories explain different portions of the variance in crime and the actual variance explained by individual theories is embarrassingly low; Hirschi (1989) countered that integration misrepresents individual theories.

As the debate continued, Thornberry (1989) proposed theory elaboration as an alternative to both integration and falsification. Thornberry's idea was to logically extend a particular theory. Under elaboration, the theory may undergo some changes, its assumptions can be reevaluated and possibly altered, the temporal ordering of key concepts may change, but the end result would be the blending of different and competing models into a more general explanatory format.

Underlying the discussion over the best method to reconcile new ideas as they are introduced into the literature is the fact that new theories are not created in a vacuum and will almost always contain portions of existing theories. Even the established theories are based on the work of earlier authors. Social learning, for example, grew out of a reevaluation by Burgess and Akers (1966) of differential association theory. According to Krohn: "Essentially Burgess and Akers combined Sutherland's concepts of differential association and definitions with the concepts from behavioral theory of differential reinforcement and imitation" (1999: 464). Akers and Jennings (2009) explained that the behavioral learning aspect of social learning theory draws on the work

of Skinner (1953) and Bandura (1977). Skinner (1953) is used to explain that learning is primarily a process of operant conditioning, or a system of rewards and punishments, while Bandura (1977) is used to explain cognitive learning processes.

Social learning is often combined with other theories by integrationists. Krohn (1999) believes that social learning can be easily integrated with insights from other theories and extended to include social structural variables. According to Krohn, Akers has already provided the ground-work for this, demonstrating that "links between a number of social structural variables and deviant behavior are mediated by the learning mechanisms specified in his theory" (1999: 474). Some further examples:

1. Braithwaite's (1989) re-integrative shaming theory draws on labeling, opportunity, control, and learning theories.
2. Chan, Heide, and Beauregard (2011) have proposed blending social learning and routine activities to explain sexual murderers.
3. DeLisi (2009) has proposed using psychopathy as the unifying construct for all explanations of antisocial behavior.

Even control theory, so vigorously defended by Hirschi (1979, 1989) while resisting integration efforts, is in reality the end result of a developmental process. Control theory began with Freud's (1920) idea that psychological activity is ruled by the principle of pleasure but is eventually ruled by the principle of fact. The idea was further developed by Glueck and Glueck (1950), who identified inner and outer sources of control. The inner source is a person's individual level of self-control (also called the conscience or the superego), which Glueck and Glueck believed was attenuated by poor parental practices and modeling along with a temperament predisposed toward aggression and self-interest (Andrews and Bonta 1998). Hirschi's (2002) contribution to the theory was to further emphasize the bonding aspect of control and identify the four elements of bonding: attachment to the opinions of family, teachers, and peers; commitment to conventional pursuits; involvement in conventional pursuits; and belief in the validity of the law.

Although social learning and social control are often thought to be incompatible (Hirschi 1979,

1989), Conger (1976) proposed integrating the two, believing that both theories were social-psychological in nature. Drawing on Herrnstein's (1970) formulation of the "matching law" of behavior (subjects tend to spend time and effort in environments in proportion to the reward value of those environments), Conger believed that since control theory assumes that a lack of attachment to conventional others will result in an increase in delinquency, social learning theory would add to the predictive ability of control theory by showing that an attachment to delinquent others will further increase the likelihood of delinquency. Conger's example, as well as the work of other authors, highlights the point that theories are by their nature based at least in part on the work of earlier scientists and are created through the identification of new questions and the scientific process of testing additional hypotheses with new data.

Even the argument for completely individual-level explanations for crime cannot escape the frailties of isolationism. Technology has enabled researchers to again raise the possibility of genetic explanations for crime, which have been increasingly explained from a sociological point of view since the early part of the twentieth century. A study by Caspi et al. (2002) for example, points out that although parental mistreatment is strongly correlated with later antisocial behaviors, the relationship is not entirely environmental because the effect is greater for those who have deficiencies in monoamine oxidase A (MAOA). Similarly, Unnever, Cullen, and Pratt (2003) found that attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) was a source of low self-control, although the effect was "substantively and statistically marginal" (2003: 490). Another example is the research of DeLisi et al. (2008), who studied the effect of dopamine D2 and D4 (DRD2 and DRD4) receptors on delinquent behavior, as indicated by age of first criminal arrest. The research showed that DRD2 and DRD4 did not have a strong direct effect, but genetic effects were observed for those with the DRD2 polymorphism and having a low-risk family environment.

What these studies have in common is the identification of different biological markers that at least partially explain criminality. What the studies do not do is definitively separate genetics from environmental factors – there is an assertion

that genetics provide an etiological explanation, but in truth the only proven conclusion is that amongst those who had demonstrated some sort of anomaly, be it low self-control or delinquency in general, both environmental and genetic factors were present at varying levels. Etiology is merely assumed because a person's biological makeup is determined before any environmental interactions occur, although Moffit's (1993) assertion about neural function causing anomalies is in part based on maternal behaviors, such as alcohol or drug usage, which would condition the biological makeup of the individual.

Criminologists will continue to try to answer the myriad questions posed by criminal behavior and will continue to form new hypotheses to explain the phenomena being observed. Because scientific progress is the result of critical thinking, new proposals should be subject to rigorous review in order to fully reject any errors in the theory. As Popper states, "Whenever we try to propose a solution to a problem, we ought to try as hard as we can to overthrow our solution, rather than defend it" (1958: 16). Whether those efforts come through falsification or integration is not nearly as important as the process itself. Criminologists should not reject any viable method that can increase our overall understanding of criminal and antisocial behavior.

SEE ALSO: Criminology; Historical Research Methods; Theory and Public Policy.

References

Akers, R. L., & Jennings, W. G. (2009) Social learning theory. In J. Miller (ed.), *21st Century Criminology: A Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 323–332.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1998) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 2nd edn. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Bandura, A. (1977) *Social Learning Theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Bernard, T. J. (1990) Twenty years of testing theories: What have we learned and why? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27, 325–347.

Bernard, T. J., & Snipes, J. B. (1996) Theoretical integration in criminology. *Crime and Justice* 20, 301–348.

Braithwaite, J. (1989) *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, R. L., & Akers, R. L. (1966) A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Journal of Social Problems* 14, 128–147.

Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J. et al. (2002) Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science* 297(5582), 851–854.

Chan, H. C, Heide, K. M., & Beauregard, E. (2011) What propels sexual murderers: A proposed theory of social learning and routine activities theories. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 55, 228–250.

Conger, R. D. (1976) Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior: A synthesis. *Criminology* 14(1), 17–40.

DeLisi, M. (2009) Psychopathy is the unified theory of crime. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 7, 256–273.

DeLisi, M., Beaver, K. M., Wright, J. P., & Vaughn, M. G. (2008) The etiology of criminal onset: The enduring salience of nature and nurture. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 36, 217–223.

Descartes, R. (1637) Principle rules of the method, from *Discourse on the Method*. In D. Devine (ed.), *Western Vision and American Values*. Bellevue, NE: Bellevue University Press, 2003, pp. 65–69.

Elliot, D. (1985) The assumption that theories can be combined with increased explanatory power. In R. F. Meier (ed.), *Theoretical Methods in Criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 191–204.

Elliot, D. S., Ageton, E. W., & Canter, R. J. (1979) An integrated theoretical perspective on delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 16, 3–27.

Freud, S. (1920) *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950) *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Commonwealth Fund.

Herrnstein, R. J. (1970) On the law of effect. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior* 13, 243–266.

Hirschi, T. (1979) Separate and unequal is better. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 16, 34–38.

Hirschi, T. (1989) Exploring alternatives to integrated theory. In S. F. Messner, M. D. Krohn, & A. E. Liska (eds.), *Theoretical Integration in the Study of Deviance and Crime*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 37–49.

Hirschi, T. (2002) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Originally published 1969.)

Hyman, H. H. (1955) *Survey Design and Analysis: Principles, Cases and Procedures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Krohn, M. D. (1999) Social learning theory: The continuing development of a perspective. *Theoretical Criminology* 3, 462–475.

Liska, A. E., Krohn, M. D., & Messner, S. F. (1989) Strategies and requisites for theoretical integration in the study of crime and deviance. In S. F. Messner, M. D. Krohn, & A. E. Liska (eds.), *Theoretical Integration in the Study of Deviance and Crime*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 1–19.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993) Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* 100(4), 674–701.

Popper, K. R. (1958) Preface to *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. In D. Devine (ed.), *Western Vision and American Values*. Bellevue, NE: Bellevue University Press, 2003, pp. 114–118.

Short, J. F. (1979) On the etiology of delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 16, 34–38.

Skinner, B. F. (1953) *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Thornberry, T. P. (1989) Reflections on the advantages and disadvantages of theoretical integration. In S. F. Messner, M. D. Krohn, & A. E. Liska (eds.), *Theoretical Integration in the Study of Deviance and Crime*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 31–45.

Tittle, C. R. (1989) Prospects for synthetic theory. In S. F. Messner, M. D. Krohn, & A. E. Liska (eds.), *Theoretical Integration in the Study of Deviance and Crime*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 161–178.

Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Pratt, T. C. (2003) Parental management, ADHD, and delinquent involvement: Reassessing Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory. *Justice Quarterly* 20(3), 471–500.