chapter 6

Deviance and Control
**WHAT IS DEVIANCE?**

**EXAMPLES OF DEVIANCE**
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**FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVE:**
FUNCTIONS AND DYSFUNCTIONS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>myth</strong></th>
<th><strong>reality</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strangers don’t care about us as much as our relatives, friends, and acquaintances do. So it’s no wonder that most murder victims were killed by strangers.</td>
<td>Most murder victims were related to or knew their killers (p. 149).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Guns don’t kill; people do.” Therefore, it is futile to outlaw the possession of guns.</td>
<td>Of course, guns by themselves cannot kill, nor can their absence reduce people’s motivation to kill. But were guns less available, potential murderers would use less lethal weapons, which would result in fewer deaths (p. 150).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since sexually active men can easily get sex, they are unlikely to rape their dates.</td>
<td>Sexually active men are more likely to rape their dates than men with little or no sexual experience (p. 151).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance is always harmful to society.</td>
<td>Deviance can bring benefits to society if it occurs within limits (p. 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the feminist movement for gender equality, women today are about as likely as men to commit crimes.</td>
<td>Men still greatly outnumber women in committing crimes because the recent increase in female crime has not been great enough to be significant (p. 161).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. criminal justice system is, by any measure, soft on criminals.</td>
<td>The United States appears to be soft on criminals because extremely few criminals are apprehended and punished. But compared with other democracies, the United States is tougher in imprisoning proportionately more criminals and imposing longer prison terms (p. 168).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT IS DEVIANCE?

Deviance is generally defined as any act that violates a social norm. But the phenomenon is more complex than that. How do we know whether an act violates a social norm? Is homosexuality deviant—a violation of a social norm? Some people think so, but others do not. At least three factors are involved in determining what deviance is: time, place, and public consensus or power.

First, what constitutes deviance varies from one historical period to another. Nearly 2,000 years ago, the Roman Empress Messalina won a bet with a friend by publicly having a prolonged session of sexual intercourse with 25 men. At the time, Romans were not particularly scandalized, although they were quite impressed by her stamina (King, 1985). Today, if a person of similar social standing engaged in such behavior, we would consider it extremely scandalous. 

Second, the definition of deviance varies from one place to another. A polygamist (a person with more than one spouse) is a criminal in the United States but not in Saudi Arabia and other Muslim countries. Prostitution is illegal in the United States (except in some counties in Nevada) but legal in Denmark, Germany, France, and many other countries. As a married man, former President Clinton got into hot water for having an affair, but married leaders in China are fully expected to have girlfriends (Janofsky, 2001; Rosenthal, 1998a).

Third, whether a given act is deviant depends on public consensus. Murder is unquestionably deviant because nearly all societies agree that it is. In contrast, drinking alcoholic beverages is generally not considered deviant. Public consensus, however, usually reflects the vested interests of the rich and powerful. As Marx would have said, the ideas of the ruling class tend to become the ruling ideas of society. Like the powerful, the general public tends, for example, to consider bank robbery a serious crime but not fraudulent advertising, which serves the interests of the powerful.

In view of these three determinants of deviant behavior, we may define deviance more precisely as an act considered by public consensus, or by the powerful, at a given time and place, to be a violation of some social rule.

EXAMPLES OF DEVIANCE

Most of the deviant acts studied by sociologists—such as homicide, robbery, and rape—involv...
ing a criminal law; hence, they are criminal deviance. Some sociologists have, however, urged that more attention be focused on noncriminal deviance, such as homophobia, using pornography, and mental disorder (Bader et al., 1996). Here, we discuss both kinds of deviance.

### Homicide

Homicide is mostly a personal crime, far more likely to be committed against acquaintances, friends, or relatives than against strangers, as shown in Figure 6.1. Swayed by common sense, we may find this incredible. But as sociologists Donald Mulvihill and Melvin Tumin (1969) explained, “Everyone is within easy striking distance from intimates for a large part of the time. Although friends, lovers, spouses, and the like are a main source of pleasure in one’s life, they are equally a main source of frustration and hurt. Few others can anger one so much.” As a crime of passion, homicide is usually carried out under the overwhelming pressure of a volcanic emotion, namely, uncontrollable rage.

| myth | Strangers don’t care about us as much as our relatives, friends, and acquaintances do. So it’s no wonder that most murder victims were killed by strangers. |
| reality | Most murder victims were related to or knew their killers. |

Homicide occurs most frequently during weekend evenings, particularly Saturday night. This holds true largely for lower-class murderers but not for middle- and upper-class offenders, who tend more to kill on any day of the week. One apparent reason is that higher-class murders are more likely than lower-class homicides to be premeditated and hence are less likely to result from alcohol-induced quarrels during weekend sprees. Research has also often shown that most U.S. murderers are poor, including semiskilled workers, unskilled laborers, and welfare recipients (Levin and Fox, 2001; Parker, 1989).

### Critical Thinking:

Why can people we care about hurt us much more than total strangers?

*Source: Data from FBI, Uniform Crime Reports, 2003.*
“Guns don’t kill; people do.” Therefore, it is futile to outlaw the possession of guns.

Of course, guns by themselves cannot kill, nor can their absence reduce people’s motivation to kill. But were guns less available, potential murderers would use less lethal weapons, which would result in fewer deaths.

Whatever their class, murderers most often use handguns to kill. Perhaps seeing a gun while embroiled in a heated argument incites a person to murderous action. As Shakespeare wrote, “How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds, makes ill deeds done.” Of course, firearms by themselves cannot cause homicide, nor can their absence reduce the motivation to kill. It is true that “Guns don’t kill; people do.” Still, were guns less available, less dangerous weapons such as fists or knives might be used instead. Thus, many heated arguments might result in aggravated assaults rather than murders, thereby reducing the number of fatalities. But given the enormous number of guns in private hands, it is not surprising that far more deaths result from gun attacks in the United States than in Canada, Britain, and other industrialized countries, where there are considerably fewer guns per person (Kim, 1999; Kristof, 1996a).

The easy availability of guns has contributed to a stunning upsurge in killings by teenagers and young adults before the early 1990s. But since then, the homicide rate among young people has declined, largely as the result of increased economic prosperity, tougher law enforcement, and greater protection of domestic violence victims (Rosenfeld, 2002).

## Rape

Rape involves the use of force to get a woman to do something sexual against her will. It is a common problem in the United States but exactly how common? And why is it common?

### Incidence and Characteristics

Every year, about 110,000 cases of rape in the United States are reported to the police, but the actual number of rapes is considerably higher, running into the millions. According to the most conservative estimate, at least 10 percent of women have been raped (Russell and Bolen, 2000; Berthelsen, 1999). Most of these rapes are not even legally defined as such, let alone reported to the police. A key reason is that the overwhelming majority of cases involve intimates such as lovers and close friends, whereas the popular perception of rape is associated with strangers or mere acquaintances.

In one survey, while 22 percent of the women said they had been forced to have sex, only about 3 percent of the men admitted to having committed forced sex. Why do the overwhelming majority of men fail to acknowledge what some women see as forced sex? The apparent reason, again, has much to do with the fact that most cases of forced sex involve
intimates. Consider the following two scenarios given by Michael and his colleagues (1994).

One involves a married man coming home late after drinking a lot of beer with the guys. He wants sex, but his wife cringes when he approaches. She obviously does not want sex. He does and has his way. He does not think it was forced, but she does. Another illustration involves two young people on a date. She touches his hand, his arm, and then even his thigh while they are talking at dinner. She thinks she is only trying to get to know him, but he thinks she wants sex. Later, when he makes his move, she says no. But he thinks she means yes. He believes the sex was consensual. To her, it was forced.

But why do the males in such scenarios fail to see that they have committed forced sex? The reason seems to lie in the traditional patriarchal belief that a man should be aggressive to win a woman’s heart. Resulting from such aggression gone out of control, forced sex is an extension of the traditional pattern of male sexual behavior. The belief about the importance of male aggressiveness is embedded in the culture that encourages rape.

### The Culture of Rape

The culture of rape reveals itself through at least three prevailing attitudes toward women.

First, women traditionally have been treated like men’s property. If a woman is married, she is, in effect, her husband’s property. Thus, in most countries and some states in the United States, a man cannot be prosecuted for raping his wife. The reasoning seems to be: How can any man steal what already belongs to him? The property logic may also explain the difficulty of getting a man convicted for raping a woman who is raped, we often say that she has been “ravaged,” “ravished,” “despoiled,” or “ruined,” as if she were a piece of property that has been damaged.

Second, women are treated as if they are objects of masculinity contests among men. To prove his manhood, a man is culturally pressured to have sex with the largest number of women possible. The pressure to play this masculinity game often comes from friends, who ask questions such as “Did you score?” “Had any lately?” If the answer is no, the friends may ask, “What’s the matter? Are you gay or something?” Such social pressure tends to make young men want to show off their masculine qualities, such as aggressiveness, forcefulness, and violence.

Even without peer pressure, the popular belief in sexual conquest as a badge of masculinity encourages men to be aggressive toward women. If women say no, men are expected to ignore this response or even translate it into really meaning yes. Such lessons in sexual conquest often come from the stereotype of the movie or television hero who forcefully, persistently embraces and kisses the heroine despite her strong resistance, and who is rewarded when she finally melts in his arms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Since sexually active men can easily get sex, they are unlikely to rape their dates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>Sexually active men are more likely to rape their dates than men with little or no sexual experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In real life, such sexual aggression can easily lead to rape. This is why many sociologists regard rape as an extension of the socially approved conventional pattern of male sexual behavior. It is also not surprising that members of the Spur Posse, a group of high school boys in California who compete with one another by scoring points for sexual conquests, were once jailed only for a few days on charges of molesting and raping girls as young as 10. It is also no wonder that other winners of the masculinity game, such as college men with considerable sexual experience, are more likely to rape their dates than are the so-called losers, who have little or no sexual experience (Nash, 1996; Schur, 1984; Kanin, 1983).

Third, there is a popular myth that, deep down, women want to be raped. This myth is often expressed in various ways: “She asked for it”; “She actually wanted it”; and “She lied about it (or consented to sex but later decided to cry rape).” In essence, the victim is held responsible for the rape. The victim is assumed to have done something that provoked the man to rape her. That something involves being in the wrong place (walking alone at night); wearing the wrong clothes (short shorts, miniskirts, or some other sexy dress); turning the man on (letting him kiss or pet her); or having an attitude (behaving assertively or independently) (Brinson, 1992).

Because of this blame-the-victim assumption, defense attorneys for alleged rapists tend to portray the victim as a willing partner. In one case, the victim was accused of having a “kinky and aggressive” sex
life. In another case, the victim was said to be “sexually voracious” and to have “preyed on men” (Lacayo, 1987). The willing-victim myth is a major motivating force behind many rapes. In a study of convicted rapists, 59 percent denied their guilt and blamed their victims instead. They insisted that their victims seduced them, meant yes while saying no to the sexual assault, and eventually relaxed and enjoyed the rape. Not surprisingly, men who believe this dangerous myth about women are more likely to rape them (Smith, 2002; Scully and Marolla, 1984).

**Binge Drinking**

In recent years there have been many cases of college students dying from binge drinking, which involves having at least five drinks in a row for men or four drinks in a row for women. According to Dr. David Anderson, of George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, at least 50 college students throughout the United States drink themselves to death every year. While endangering their own lives, binge drinkers also tend to disturb or hurt their fellow students, such as causing them to lose sleep, interrupting their studies, and assaulting them physically or sexually (Thompson, 1998; Winerip, 1998).

Although binge drinking is a serious problem, it has long been a tradition on many U.S. college campuses. And despite the raising of the legal drinking age to 21 in all states since the late 1980s, binge drinking continues to be about as prevalent today as it was 20 years ago. According to a nationwide survey, some 44 percent of college students (50 percent of the men and 39 percent of the women) have binged at least

---

**FIGURE 6.2**

**Rape in War Zones**

When a conquering army takes over the conquered population’s property, they also tend to rape the women, as if they are part of that property. History is replete with instances in which women were raped by enemy soldiers, and this abhorrent practice continues to occur in today’s armed conflicts worldwide.

**Critical Thinking:** Could rape in war be stopped? If so, how? If not, why not?

once during the past two weeks. There is also a relentless quality to the pursuit of intoxication among many students who drink: About 40 percent of students intend to binge or get drunk every time they drink (Wechsler, 1998; Wechsler et al., 1995).

Compared with their moderate or nondrinking peers, binge-drinking students are more likely to miss class, fall behind in schoolwork, have poor grades, engage in unprotected sex, get injured, damage property, fight, or get into trouble with the police. Binge drinkers are also more likely to be male, white, involved in athletics, or living in fraternity or sorority houses (Nelson and Wechsler, 2003; Thompson, 1998; Wechsler, 1998).

Why, then, do they binge drink? The stress from having to work hard for good grades is one contributing factor. A more important factor is the social pressure to get drunk so as to fit in and not be seen as uptight or antisocial. This may explain why a large majority (81 percent) of fraternity brothers and sorority sisters are binge drinkers. The social pressure to fit in can also explain the unusually high incidence of binge drinking among those who regard parties as a very important part of their college life (Wechsler, 1998; Wechsler et al., 1995).

### Corporate Crime

Corporate crimes are committed by company officials without the overt use of force, and their effect on the victims is not readily traceable to the offender. If a miner dies from a lung disease, it is difficult to prove beyond reasonable doubt that he died because the employer violated mine safety regulations. Corporate crimes may be perpetrated not only against employees but also against customers and the general public. Examples include disregard for safety in the workplace, consumer fraud, price fixing, production of unsafe products, and violation of environmental regulations. Compared with traditional street crime, corporate crime is more rationally executed, more profitable, and less detectable by law enforcers. In addition, crime in the executive suite is distinguished from crime in the street by three characteristics that help explain the prevalence of corporate crime.

#### The Criminal’s Noncriminal Self-Image

Corporate criminals often see themselves as respectable people rather than common criminals. They maintain their noncriminal self-image through rationalization. Violators of price-fixing laws, for example, may insist that they are helping the nation’s economy by “stabilizing prices” and serving their companies by “recovering costs.” In their book, there is no such crime as price fixing.

The noncriminal self-image is also maintained through seeing oneself as a victim rather than an offender. Corporate criminals argue that they were just unlucky enough to get caught for doing something that practically everyone else does. As a convicted tax offender said, “Everybody cheats on their income tax, 95 percent of the people. Even if it’s for $10 it’s the same principle” (Benson, 1985).

The noncriminal self-image is further maintained through denial of criminal intent. Corporate criminals may admit that they committed the acts that landed them in prison, but they regard their acts only as mis-
takes, not as something motivated by a guilty criminal mind. As a convicted tax offender said, “I’m not a criminal. That is, I’m not a criminal from the standpoint of taking a gun and doing this and that. I’m a criminal from the standpoint of making a mistake, a serious mistake” (Benson, 1985).

The Victim’s Unwitting Cooperation Primarily due to lack of caution or knowledge, many victims unwittingly cooperate with the corporate criminal. In a home improvement scheme, victims do not bother to check the work history of the fraudulent company that solicits them, or they sign a contract without examining its content for such matters as the true price and the credit terms. Some victims purchase goods through the mail without checking the reputation of the firm. Doctors prescribe untested drugs, relying only on the pharmaceutical company’s salespeople and advertising. It may be difficult for victims to know they have been victimized, even if they want to find out the true nature of their victimization. Average grocery shoppers, for example, are hard put to detect such unlawful substances as residues of hormones, antibiotics, pesticides, and nitrites in the meat they buy.

Society’s Relative Indifference Generally, little effort is made to catch corporate criminals. On the rare occasions when they are caught, they seldom go to jail or they receive a light sentence, if they are incarcerated. Their pleas for mercy are heard after they promise to repay their victims or to cooperate in prosecutions against others. They insist that a long prison term will do no good because their lives are already in ruins. Even when convicted of crimes that caused the death of many workers or customers, corporate offenders have never been sentenced to death, let alone executed, though numerous lower-class criminals have been executed for killing only one person.

Mental Problems Mental problems are far more common than popularly believed. Every year, about 22 percent of U.S. adults suffer from a mental problem serious enough
to require psychiatric help or hospitalization, and the figure for adolescents is 10 percent (NIMH, 2003). The most common problems are anxiety and phobia followed by depression and alcoholism (Regier et al., 1993). In fact, all of us have been or will be mentally ill in one way or another. Of course, most of our mental problems are not serious. We occasionally suffer from brief bouts of anxiety or depression, “the common cold of mental ailments.”

This can be illustrated by what happened for a few days following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. After repeatedly seeing the horrifying images of death and destruction on television, Americans throughout the country suffered from anxiety, depression, and other stress-related symptoms such as fatigue and insomnia. These psychological complaints, in turn, led some to develop physical ailments including ulcers, hypertension, and irritable bowel syndrome (Spake and Szegedy-Maszak, 2001). For most people, though, these problems soon disappeared, thanks, in part, to the surge of social support from relatives, friends, and even strangers.

However, the types of mental problems that sociologists and psychiatrists usually study are more serious and durable. They include *psychosis*, typified by loss of touch with reality, and *neurosis*, characterized by a persistent fear, anxiety, or worry about trivial matters. A psychotic can be likened to a person who thinks incorrectly that 2 plus 2 equals 10 but strongly believes it to be correct. A neurotic can be compared to a person who thinks correctly that 2 plus 2 equals 4 but constantly worries that it may not be so (Thio, 2004).

Sociologists have long suspected that certain social forces are involved in the development of mental problems. The one most consistently demonstrated by research to be a key factor in mental problems is social class: the lower the social class, the higher the rate of mental problems. The poor are more prone to mental disorder because their lives are more stressful: more family problems and unemployment, more psychic frailty and neurological impairments, and less social and emotional support.

Other social factors, such as gender, ethnicity, and culture, give rise to certain types of mental problems. Thus, women are more likely to experience depression and anxiety attacks while men tend more to have antisocial personality, paranoia, and drug and alcohol abuse disorders. Jewish and Asian Americans have a higher incidence of depressive disorders, usually in the form of anger turned against oneself. Puerto Ricans and African Americans tend more to show paranoid and sociopathic propensities in the form of distrust and resentment against others. Finally, certain mental disorders take place in some cultures but never or rarely in others. In Latin America, for example, people experience *susto*, the pathological fear that their souls have left their bodies. In the United States, women get anorexia nervosa, an extreme fear of weight gain that is rarely found in other societies (Thio, 2004; Osborne, 2001).

### Suicide Bombings

Since the September 11 terrorist attacks, many in the West have assumed that so-called suicide bombers must be psychotic, or at least irrational, and that they must be poor and uneducated. But evidence seems to suggest just the opposite. According to a study on the 149 Palestinian suicide bombers who tried to attack Israel between 1993 and 2002, the majority had about the same social background as the September 11 terrorists. They were young, male, and single. They came from relatively well-off, middle-class families, and they were better educated than most people in their countries. Thus, they were rational enough to know, for example, that they could resort to a suicide bombing as their ultimate weapon in perpetrating an asymmetrical war with Israel. They knew that, like the September 11 terrorists, they couldn’t fight a conventional war with their enemy because they had no tanks, no artillery, and no air force, while their enemy had one of the world’s most powerful and modern militaries (Dickey, 2002; Krueger and Maleckova, 2002; Ripley, 2002).

Why, then, do these individuals choose to get themselves killed while most other terrorists do not? One apparent reason is the suicide bombers’ Muslim religious belief that by becoming martyrs, they will be rewarded in heaven, which includes being greeted by virgins. But this may not hold true for most of the Muslim Chechen suicide bombers in Russia, who are women, nor for the bombers in Sri Lanka and other countries, who are not Muslims (see Figure 6.3, p. 156). Again, what motivates not only the Palestinian terrorists and the September 11 attackers but also the female Chechen bombers and the non-Islamic terrorists to engage in suicide bombing?

The answer can be found with the aid of the sociological concept of altruistic suicide (Pedahzur, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003). Individuals who commit altruistic suicide are so strongly tied to their group that they effectively lose their selves and stand ready to do their group’s bidding. Examples from the past include the elderly Inuit and Hindu widows, who faithfully followed the tradition of their societies that encouraged people in their circumstances to commit suicide (see Chapter 1: The Essence of Sociology). Such suicide was relatively common in ancient societies, in which the group reigned supreme at the expense of the individual.
Suicide Bombers and Other Terrorists

Suicide bombers and other terrorists operate and strike in many countries other than Islamic ones. While the bombers in Islamic countries have the religious belief that they will be greatly rewarded in heaven for being martyrs, this is not true of non-Islamic bombers. What suicide bombers everywhere likely share is a strong bond to a terrorist organization, such that they will sacrifice their lives at its direction.

Critical Thinking: Is it appropriate to call suicide bombing a form of altruistic suicide? Why or why not?


Not surprisingly, the suicide bombers of today typically live in traditional societies that give priority to conformity over individuality. And like the altruistic suicides of the past, the suicide bombers are too deeply integrated into their groups—terrorist organizations—and identify completely with them. A number of social factors support their all-consuming ties to these organizations. The candidates for suicide bombings are recruited and then subjected to intense spiritual and ideological indoctrination and terrorist training. In the Middle East, the bomber's surviving family is further provided with such rewards as cash bonuses, pensions, and health benefits. And the bomber is celebrated as a hero in the community. After a young man carries out a suicide attack, his parents may proudly announce his martyrdom in the newspaper (Ripley, 2002).

FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVE: FUNCTIONS AND DYSFUNCTIONS

Most scholars other than sociologists generally attribute deviance to a certain biological or psychological abnormality in the individual. But sociologists
have long assumed that there is nothing physically or mentally wrong with most deviants. This assumption is a legacy of the French sociologist Émile Durkheim (1858–1917), one of the founders of functionalism in the discipline. For him, deviance is not only normal but also beneficial to society because, ironically, it contributes to social order. Whereas Durkheim emphasized the functions or benefits of deviance, today’s functionalists focus on society’s dysfunctions or problems as the causes of deviance.

**Durkheim: Functionalist Theory**

According to Durkheim, deviance can serve a number of functions for society. First, it helps enhance conformity in society as a whole. Norms are basically abstract and ambiguous, subject to conflicting interpretations. Even criminal laws, which are far more clear-cut than other norms, can be confusing. The criminal act that a deviant commits and is punished for provides other citizens with a concrete example of what constitutes a crime. From deviants we can learn the difference between conformity and deviance, seeing the boundary between right and wrong more clearly. Once aware of this boundary, we are more likely to stay on the side of rightness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>myth</th>
<th>Deviance is always harmful to society.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reality</td>
<td>Deviance can bring benefits to society if it occurs within limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, deviance strengthens solidarity among law-abiding members of society. Differing values and interests may divide them, but collective outrage against deviants as a common enemy can unite them, as it did Americans in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Because deviance promotes social cohesion that decreases crime, Durkheim (1915) described it as “a factor in public health, an integral part of all healthy societies.”

Third, deviance provides a safety valve for discontented people. Through relatively minor forms of deviance, they can strike out against the social order without doing serious harm to themselves or others. Prostitution, for example, may serve as a safety valve for marriage in a male-dominated society because the customer is unlikely to form an emotional attachment to the prostitute. In contrast, a sexual relationship with a friend is more likely to develop into a love affair that could destroy the marriage.

Fourth, deviance can induce social change. Martin Luther King, Jr., and other civil rights leaders were jeered and imprisoned for their opposition to segregation, but they moved the United States toward greater racial equality.

There is a limit, however, to the validity of Durkheim’s functionalist theory. If deviance is widespread, it can threaten social order in at least two ways. First, it can wreck interpersonal relations. Alcoholism tears apart many families. If a friend flies into a rage and tries to kill us, it will be difficult to maintain a harmonious relationship. Second, deviance can undermine trust. If there were many killers, robbers, and rapists living in our neighborhoods, we would find it impossible to welcome neighbors into our home as guests or babysitters.

Nevertheless, Durkheim’s theory is useful for demolishing the commonsense belief that deviance is always harmful. Deviance can bring benefits if it occurs within limits.

**Merton: Strain Theory**

In the 1930s, U.S. sociologist Robert Merton agreed with Durkheim that deviance is “an integral part of all healthy societies.” More significantly, Merton drew on Durkheim’s concept of anomie to develop a theory of deviance that later became well known among sociologists for a long time as anomie theory but has also been known since the 1980s as strain theory. Literally meaning “normlessness,” anomie is a social condition in which norms are absent, weak, or in conflict. Anomie may arise, said Merton, when there is an inconsistency in society between the cultural goals and the institutionalized (socially approved, legitimate) means of achieving the goals. In the United States, such an inconsistency surrounds the issue of success.

According to Merton, U.S. culture places too much emphasis on success as a valued goal. From kindergarten to college, teachers prod students to achieve the American dream. Parents and coaches pressure even Little League players not just to play well but to win. The media often glorify winning not only in sports but also in business, politics, and other arenas of life. This emphasis on success motivates hard work, thereby contributing to society’s prosperity. But at the same time, people are not equally provided with the legitimate means (such as good jobs and other opportunities) for achieving success. There is, then, an inconsistency between too much emphasis on the success goal and too little emphasis on the availability of legitimate means for achieving that goal. Such inconsistency produces a strain among people in the lower classes, pressuring them to achieve success through what Merton calls innovation—using illegitimate means of achieving success, such as committing a robbery or selling drugs.

But most people do not resort to innovation as a response to the goal—means inconsistency. In addition to innovation, four other responses are possible, depending on whether the cultural goal of success
and the institutionalized means are accepted or rejected (see Table 6.2):

1. **Conformity**, the most popular form of response, involves accepting both the cultural goal of success and the use of legitimate means for achieving that goal.

2. **Innovation**, the response described earlier, involves accepting the goal of success but rejecting the use of socially accepted means to achieve it, turning instead to unconventional, illegitimate methods.

3. **Ritualism** occurs when people no longer set high success goals but continue to toil as conscientious, diligent workers.

4. **Retreatism** is withdrawal from society, caring neither about success nor about working. Retreatists include vagabonds, outcasts, and drug addicts.

5. **Rebellion** occurs when people reject and attempt to change both the goals and the means approved by society. The rebel tries to overthrow the existing system and establish a new system with different goals and means. An example would be attempting to replace the current U.S. competitive pursuit of fame and riches with a new system that enhances social relations through cooperation.

In short, Merton’s theory blames deviance on society’s failure to provide all people with legitimate means to achieve success. The theory is useful for explaining the higher rates of robbery, theft, and other property crimes among lower-class people, who are pressured to commit such crimes by their lack of good jobs and other legitimate means for success. But the theory fails to explain embezzlement, tax fraud, and other white-collar crimes because the people who commit such offenses are typically not deprived of the legitimate means for success, as the lower classes are. As a functionalist, Merton assumes that the same value—belief in material success—is shared throughout society. But this assumption runs counter to the pluralistic and conflicting nature of U.S. society, where many groups differentiated by class, gender, ethnicity, or religion do not share the same values. Some groups, for example, are more interested in pursuing strong relationships than in “big bucks.”

### Hirschi: Control Theory

A functionalist like Merton, U.S. sociologist Travis Hirschi (1969) assumed that the family, school, and other social institutions can greatly contribute to social order by controlling deviant tendencies in all of us. If such control is lacking or weak, in Hirschi’s view, people will commit deviant acts.

According to Hirschi, the best control mechanism against deviance is our bond to others or, by extension, society. He proposed four types of social bond:

1. **Attachment to conventional people and institutions.** Teenagers, for example, may show this attachment by loving and respecting their parents, making friends with conventional peers, liking school, or working hard to develop intellectual skills.

2. **Commitment to conformity.** This commitment can be seen in the time and energy devoted to conventional activities—getting an education, holding a job, developing an occupational skill, improving professional status, building a business, or acquiring a reputation for virtue.

3. **Involvement in conventional activities.** Following the maxim that “Idleness is the devil’s workshop,” people keep themselves so busy doing conventional things that they do not have time to think about deviant activities or even to think about deviance.

4. **Belief in the moral validity of social rules.** This is the conviction that the rules of conventional society should be obeyed. People show this moral belief by respecting the law.

If society fails to strengthen these four types of social bond, deviance is likely to flourish. Indeed, many studies have found that the lack of social bond causes deviance. But most of these studies, like the theory, have ignored the fact that the lack of bond can also be the effect of delinquency. Just as the loss of bond can cause youths to commit delinquency, delinquency can cause youths to lose their bond to society.

### Braithwaite: Shaming Theory

While Hirschi sees how society controls us through bonding, Australian sociologist John Braithwaite

---

**TABLE 6.2**

Merton’s Typology of Responses to Goal–Means Inconsistency

In U.S. society, according to Merton, there is too much emphasis on success but too little emphasis on the legitimate means for achieving success. Such inconsistency may cause deviant behavior, yet various people respond to it differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Success goal</th>
<th>Legitimate means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conformity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Innovation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ritualism</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retreatism</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rebellion</td>
<td>– +</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + signifies accepting; – rejecting; and – + rejecting the old and introducing the new.
(1989) looks at how society controls us through shaming. Shaming involves an expression of disapproval designed to evoke remorse in the wrongdoer.

There are two types of shaming: disintegrative and reintegrative. In disintegrative shaming, the wrongdoer is punished in such a way as to be stigmatized, rejected, or ostracized—in effect, banished from conventional society. It is the same as stigmatization. Reintegrative shaming is more positive and involves making wrongdoers feel guilty while showing them understanding, forgiveness, or even respect. It is the kind of shaming that affectionate parents administer to a misbehaving child. It involves “hating the sin but loving the sinner.” Thus, reintegrative shaming serves to reintegrate—welcome back—the wrongdoer into conventional society.

Reintegrative shaming is more common in communitarian societies such as Japan, which are marked by strong social relationships or interdependence. Disintegrative shaming is more prevalent in less communitarian societies (characterized by weaker social relationships), such as the United States. Whereas reintegrative shaming usually discourages further deviance, disintegrative shaming tends to encourage more deviance. This is one reason why crime rates are higher in the United States than in Japan. Braithwaite concludes by arguing that the United States can significantly reduce its crime rates if it emphasizes reintegrative shaming, as Japanese society does, rather than stigmatization.

Braithwaite may be correct that the practice of reintegrative shaming can reduce crime, especially if it is applied to first-time offenders who have committed relatively minor crimes. But it can hardly have the same positive impact on hardened criminals with little sense of shame for their crimes. And this lack of shame is apparently the result of having been subjected to disintegrative shaming.

OUT IN THE COLD
Shackling prisoners to a chain gang is an example of disintegrative shaming, in which the wrongdoer is punished in such a way as to be stigmatized, rejected, or ostracized. Shaming theory suggests that disintegrative shaming is less effective in controlling deviance than reintegrative shaming, in which wrongdoers are made to feel guilty at the same time as they are shown understanding and forgiveness and welcomed back into conventional society.

CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE: SOCIAL CONFLICT OR INEQUALITY

We have seen how functionalists describe the functions of deviance and attribute deviance to such dysfunctions of society as anomie, weak social bonds, and disintegrative shaming. Now, we will look at how conflict theorists regard social conflict—in the form of inequalities or power differentials—as the cause of deviance.

Conflict Theory

Many people assume that the law is based on the consent of citizens, that it treats citizens equally, and that it serves the best interest of society. If we simply read the U.S. Constitution and statutes, this assumption may indeed be justified. But focusing on the law on the books, as William Chambliss (1969) pointed out, may be misleading. The law on the books does indeed say that the authorities ought to be fair and just. But are they? To understand crime, Chambliss argued, we need to look at the law in action, at how legal authorities actually discharge their duties. After studying the law in action, Chambliss concluded that legal authorities are actually unfair and unjust,
favoring the rich and powerful over the poor and weak and consequently creating more criminals among the latter.

Richard Quinney (1974) blamed unjust law directly on the capitalist system. “Criminal law,” said Quinney, “is used by the state and the ruling class to secure the survival of the capitalist system.” This involves the dominant class’s doing four things. First, the dominant class defines as criminal those behaviors (robbery, murder, and the like) that threaten its interests. Second, it hires law enforcers to apply those definitions and protect its interests. Third, it exploits the subordinate class by paying low wages so that the resulting oppressive life conditions virtually force the powerless to commit what those in power have defined as crimes. Fourth, it uses these criminal actions to spread and reinforce the popular view that the subordinate class is dangerous in order to justify its concerns with making and enforcing the law. These factors and the relationships among them are shown in Figure 6.4. The upshot of these four related factors is the production and maintenance of a high level of crime in society (Quinney, 1974).

To Marxists, the capitalists’ ceaseless drive to increase profits by cutting labor costs has created a large class of unemployed workers. These people become what Marxists call a *marginal surplus population*—superfluous or useless to the economy—and they are compelled to commit property crimes to survive. Marxists argue that the exploitive nature of capitalism also causes violent crimes (such as murder and assault) and noncriminal deviance (such as alcoholism and mental illness). As Sheila Balkan and her colleagues (1980) explained, economic “marginality leads to a lack of self-esteem and a sense of powerlessness and alienation, which create intense pressures on individuals. Many people turn to violence in order to vent their frustrations and strike out against symbols of authority, and others turn this frustration inward and experience severe emotional difficulties.”

Marxists further contend that the monopolistic and oligopolistic nature of capitalism encourages corporate crime because “when only a few firms dominate a sector of the economy they can more easily collude to fix prices, divide up the market, and eliminate competitors” (Greenberg, 1981). Smaller firms, unable to compete with giant corporations and earn enough profits, also are motivated to shore up their sagging profits by illegal means.

Conflict theory is useful for explaining why most laws favor the wealthy and powerful and why the poor and powerless commit most of the unprofitable crimes in society (such as murder, assault, and robbery). The theory is also useful for explaining why crime rates began to soar after the communist countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe turned to capitalism. But the theory has been criticized for implying that all laws are unjust and that capitalism is the source of all crimes.

### Power Theory

It seems obvious that power inequality affects the quality of people’s lives. The rich and powerful live better than the poor and powerless. Similarly, power inequality affects the *type* of deviant activities likely to be engaged in. Thus, the powerful are more likely to perpetrate profitable crimes, such as corporate crime, while the powerless are more likely to commit unprofitable crimes, such as homicide and assault. In other words, power—or the lack of it—largely determines the type of crime people are likely to commit.

Power can also be an important *cause* of deviance. More precisely, the likelihood of powerful people perpetrating profitable crimes is greater than the likelihood of powerless persons committing unprofitable crimes. It is, for example, more likely for bank executives to cheat customers quietly than for jobless persons to rob banks violently. Analysis of the deviance literature suggests three reasons why deviance is more common among the powerful (Thio, 2004).
First, the powerful have a stronger deviant motivation. Much of this motivation stems from relative deprivation—feeling unable to achieve relatively high aspirations. Compared with the powerless, whose aspirations are typically low, the powerful are more likely to raise their aspirations so high that they cannot be realized. The more people experience relative deprivation, the more likely they are to commit deviant acts.

Second, the powerful enjoy greater opportunities for deviance. Obviously, a successful banker enjoys more legitimate opportunities than a poor worker to make money. But suppose they both want to acquire a large sum of money illegitimately. The banker will have access to more and better opportunities that make it easy to defraud customers. The banker also has a good chance of getting away with it because the kinds of skills needed to pull off the crime are similar to the skills required for holding the bank position in the first place. In contrast, the poor worker would find his or her illegitimate opportunity limited to crudely robbing the banker, an opportunity further limited by the high risk of arrest.

Third, the powerful are subjected to weaker social control. Generally, the powerful have more influence in the making and enforcement of laws. The laws against higher-status criminals are therefore relatively lenient and seldom enforced, but the laws against lower-status criminals are harsher and more often enforced. Not a single corporate criminal, for example, has ever been sentenced to death for marketing an untested drug that “cleanly” kills many people. Given the lesser control imposed on them, the powerful are likely to feel freer to use some deviant means to amass their fortunes and power.

There is some evidence to support this theory, presented in greater detail elsewhere (Thio, 2004). It has been estimated, for example, that in the United States, about six industrial deaths are caused by corporate violation of safety regulations for every one homicide committed by a poor person. It is difficult, however, to get direct data on powerful deviants. Compared with their powerless counterparts, powerful deviants are more able to carry out their deviant activities in a sophisticated and consequently undetectable fashion.

Feminist Theory

Many theories about deviance are meant to apply to both sexes. But feminists argue that those theories are actually about men only. Consequently, the theories may be valid for male behavior but not necessarily for that of females.

Consider Merton’s strain theory. First, this theory assumes that people are inclined to strive for material success. This may be true for men but not necessarily for women. In a patriarchal society, women and men are socialized differently. Consequently, women are traditionally less interested in achieving material success, which often requires one-upmanship, and are more likely to seek emotional fulfillment through close personal relations with others.

Second, the strain theory assumes that women who have a strong desire for economic success but little access to opportunities are as likely as men in similar circumstances to commit a crime. Nowadays, given the greater availability of high positions for women in the economic world, the number of ambitious women in the so-called men’s world is on the rise. But faced with the lack of opportunities for greater economic success, these women have not been as likely as men to engage in deviant activities.

Finally, the strain theory explicitly states that Americans are likely to commit a crime because their society overemphasizes the importance of holding high goals while failing to provide the necessary opportunities for all of its citizens to achieve those goals. But this may be more relevant to men than to women. Despite their greater lack of opportunities for success, women still have lower crime rates than men (Beirne and Messerschmidt, 2000).

The lack of relevance to women in strain and other conventional theories of deviance stems from a male-biased failure to take women into account. In redressing this problem, feminist theory focuses on women. First, the theory deals with women as victims, mostly of rape and sexual harassment. The crimes against women are said to reflect the patriarchal society’s attempt to put women in their place so as to perpetuate men’s dominance.

| myth | Because of the feminist movement for gender equality, women today are about as likely as men to commit crimes. |
| reality | Men still greatly outnumber women in committing crimes because the recent increase in female crime has not been great enough to be significant. |

Feminist theory also looks at women as offenders. It argues that the recent increase in female crime has not been great enough to be significant. This is said to reflect the fact that gender equality is still far from being a social reality. Like employment opportunities, criminal opportunities are still much less available to women than to men; hence, women are still much less likely to engage in criminal activities. When women do commit a crime, it tends to be the type that reflects their subordinate position in soci-
ety: minor property crimes such as shoplifting, passing bad checks, welfare fraud, and petty credit card fraud (Miller, 1995; Steffensmeier and Allan, 1995).

In fact, recent increases in female crime primarily involve these minor crimes, largely reflecting the increasing feminization of poverty—more women falling below the poverty line. Not surprisingly, most women criminals are unemployed, high school dropouts, and single mothers with small children. They hardly fit the popular image of the newly empowered, liberated woman, who benefits from any increase in gender equality. There has been no significant increase in female involvement in more profitable crimes, such as burglary, robbery, embezzlement, and business fraud (Miller, 1995; Steffensmeier and Allan, 1995; Weisheit, 1992). Feminist theory is useful for understanding female deviance. But its focus on female deviance cannot be easily generalized to male deviance.

## Symbolic Interactionist Perspective: Association, Reaction, and Interpretation

Both the functionalist and conflict perspectives portray deviance as a product of society. In contrast, symbolic interactionists see deviance as a process of interaction between the supposed deviant and the rest of society. This process of interaction involves association, societal reaction, and subjective interpretations that shape the world of deviance.

### Differential Association Theory

According to Edwin Sutherland (1939), deviance is learned through interactions with other people. Individuals learn not only how to perform deviant acts but also how to define these actions. Various social groups have different norms; acts considered deviant by the dominant culture may be viewed positively by some groups. Each person is likely to be exposed to both positive and negative definitions of these actions. An individual is likely to become deviant if the individual engages in differential association, the process of acquiring, through association with others, “an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law” (Sutherland, 1939).

Suppose a father tells his children that “It’s all right to steal when you are poor.” He is giving them a prodeviant definition. On the other hand, if the father tells his children that “It’s wrong to steal,” he is providing an antideviant definition. If the youngsters pick up a greater number of prodeviant definitions, they are likely to become deviant.

While definitions play a crucial role in the process of becoming deviant, Sutherland emphasized more strongly the importance of social interaction because this is the source of definitions. Thus, Sutherland also stressed that deviance will arise if interactions with those who define deviant behavior positively outweigh interactions with those who define it negatively. Which definitions are most influential depends not just on the frequency and duration of the interactions but also on the strength of the relationship between the interactants.

Sutherland developed his theory to explain various forms of deviance, including white-collar crimes such as tax evasion, embezzlement, and price fixing. All these misdeeds were shown to result from some association with groups that viewed the wrongdoings as acceptable. Still, it is difficult to determine precisely what differential association is. Most people cannot identify the persons from whom they have learned a prodeviant or antideviant definition, much less whether they have been exposed to one definition more frequently, longer, or more intensely than the other.

### Labeling Theory

Most theories focus on the causes of deviance. In contrast, labeling theory, which emerged in the 1960s, concentrates on the societal reaction to rule violation and the impact of this reaction on the rule violator.

According to labeling theorists, society tends to react to a rule-breaking act by labeling it as deviant. Deviance, then, is not something that a person does but merely a label imposed on that behavior. As Howard Becker (1963) explained, “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.” The label itself has serious and negative consequences for the individual even beyond any immediate punishment.

Once a person has been labeled a thief or a delinquent or a drunk, the individual may be stuck with that label for life and may be rejected and isolated as a result. Finding a job and making friends may be extremely difficult. More important, the person may come to accept the label and commit more deviant acts. Labeling people as deviants, in short, can push them toward further and greater deviance.

Much earlier, Frank Tannenbaum (1938) noted this process of becoming deviant. According to him,
NOT JUST “STICKS AND STONES” According to labeling theory, being called a “deviant” can make a person a deviant. Youngsters may annoy people, bully others, play hooky, and do other things that they innocently consider just a way of having fun. But if these pranks cause the police to label some of those youngsters as “delinquents” and haul them into juvenile court, they are likely to develop a delinquent self-image and try to live up to that self-image by getting increasingly involved in delinquent activities, like the members of this youth gang.

children may break windows, annoy people, steal apples, and play hooky—and innocently consider these activities just a way of having fun. Edwin Lemert (1951) coined the term primary deviance to refer to these violations of norms that a person commits for the first time and without considering them deviant. Now, suppose parents, teachers, and police consider a child’s pranks to be a sign of delinquency. They may dramatize the evil by admonishing or scolding the child. They may even go further, haul-
suit with a skirt and never undressed in her female roommate’s presence.

In his more recent analysis of murderers, robbers, and other criminals, Jack Katz (1988) also found a similarly positive self-perception that conflicts with society’s negative view of the deviant. Murderers, for example, tend to see themselves as morally superior to their victims. In most cases of homicide, because the victims humiliated them, the killers felt outraged and considered the killing a justifiable way of defending their identity, dignity, or respectability.

Phenomenological theory is useful for understanding the subjective world of deviants. But it is doubtful that all, or even most, deviants have a positive view of themselves and their deviance. Some are bound to develop a negative self-image from having been condemned or ridiculed by society, as suggested by labeling theory.

The key points of the theories presented under the functionalist, conflict, and symbolic interactionist perspectives are summarized in the Theoretical Thumbnail at the top of this page.
SOCIAL DIVERSITY IN DEVIANCE

Race, class, and gender play a significant role in deviance, particularly crime and delinquency. As research has often shown, large differences in deviance rates exist among whites, African Americans, and other ethnic groups; between higher and lower income groups; and between men and women (Harris and Meidlinger, 1995; Hawkins, 1995; Steffensmeier and Allan, 1995).

Race and Deviance

Self-report studies, in which teenagers are asked whether they have committed any offenses, reveal no significant racial differences in the commission of such minor deviant acts as petty theft, vandalism, and drunkenness. But as the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports suggest, African Americans are more likely than whites to commit and be arrested for relatively serious crimes such as murder and robbery, and Asian Americans have lower crime and arrest rates than whites. Similarly, according to victimization surveys, crime victims are more likely to identify African Americans than whites as their offenders and are less likely to finger Asian Americans (Harris and Meidlinger, 1995).

These data, however, do not mean that the biological factor of skin color causes deviance. After all, whites in the United States have a much higher crime rate than blacks in African countries. Why, then, do U.S. blacks have a higher crime rate than U.S. whites? Major reasons include a higher incidence of poverty and broken homes, largely the result of racism (Mann, 1995; Regulus, 1995). But why are Asian Americans, who also experience racism—though to a lesser degree—less likely to commit crimes than whites? A key reason is the close-knit Asian family, with which its members identify so strongly that they are disinclined to commit crime for fear of bringing shame to the entire family (Kittano and Daniels, 1995; Min, 1995).

Class and Deviance

Whether class is related to deviance depends on the type of deviance involved. Lower-income teenagers are just as likely as their higher-income peers to engage in nonpredatory victimless deviant acts, such as drug use, drunkenness, and truancy. But lower-income youths tend to commit more serious predatory crimes, such as aggravated assault, robbery, and auto theft, popularly referred to as “street crimes.”

Lower-income adults are also more likely than those with higher incomes to commit predatory or street crimes. But higher-income adults tend to commit more profitable white-collar or corporate crimes, such as price fixing, tax evasion, and fraudulent advertising (Harris and Meidlinger, 1995). Reasons include greater motivation to be deviant, greater opportunity, and weaker social control among higher-
Gender and Deviance

Deviance is mostly men’s activity. With the exception of prostitution, men are more likely than women to engage in virtually all kinds of crime. The types of offenses more likely to be committed by men range from minor economic crimes (forgery, fraud, and petty theft) to serious economic and violent crimes (robbery, homicide, and aggravated assault). But over the last decade, there has been a great increase in female involvement in mostly minor deviances (see, for example, Figure 6.5). Men still outnumber women, though, in committing most deviant acts, especially the serious ones (Steffensmeier and Allan, 1995).

Several factors may explain the lower rates of deviance among women. One is socialization: Females are taught to be less aggressive and violent than males. Another is social control: Females are subjected to greater parental supervision and social control than males. A third factor is lack of deviant opportunity: Women are less likely to hold jobs, such as truck driver, dockworker, or carpenter, that would provide opportunities for theft, drug dealing, fencing, and other illegitimate activities.

A GLOBAL ANALYSIS OF DEVIANCE

Analysis of deviance around the world reveals societal differences in a number of deviant activities (Thio, 2004). First, homicide is generally more likely to occur in poor than in wealthy countries, suggesting
that poverty is a major contributing factor. Among wealthy countries, the United States has the highest homicide rate, largely because the poverty rate is considerably higher than in Western Europe, Canada, and Japan. But the ratio of property crimes to violent crimes is generally higher in rich than in poor countries. While poverty serves as a strong *motivation* for committing a crime, property crimes cannot occur without the necessary *opportunities*, namely, the availability of properties as targets for robbery or theft. Since such opportunities abound in more prosperous countries, more property crimes can be expected.

Second, prostitution has recently become a fast-growing global industry. Many unemployed women in formerly communist Russia and Eastern Europe have flocked to more prosperous Western Europe to sell sex. Some of these women, however, have been tricked into prostitution with promises of singing, dancing, modeling, or waitressing jobs from pimps posing as businessmen in their home countries. More women from poor Asian countries have been lured with promises of legitimate jobs to Japan, Western Europe, and North America, only to be sold to brothels (see Figure 6.6). Large numbers of Thai, Indian, and Filipino prostitutes who remain in their home countries cater to local men, as well as to hordes of Japanese and Western men on organized sex tours. Most of these prostitutes come from poor villages. Thus, poverty, along with exploitation by richer countries, contributes to the sex trade.

**FIGURE 6.6**

The Global Sex Trade

Prostitution has turned into a multibillion-dollar global industry, and it thrives on the inequality between rich and poor countries. Generally, women in poor countries in Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe are lured with promises of good jobs to rich countries such as Japan and those in Western Europe and North America, where they are forced into prostitution.

**Critical Thinking:** What fuels the demand for foreign prostitutes? And how could the global sex trade be stopped?

Third, suicide is generally more common in modern than in traditional societies. But among modern societies, countries such as Finland, Denmark, and Austria have higher rates of suicide than do the United States, Spain, and Italy. The higher suicide rate seems related to greater social equality. In societies with greater equality, people are less subjected to social regulation—and weak regulation is a key contributor to suicide. As Durkheim (1915) suggested, less regulated individuals are more encouraged to expect too much from life and thus become more liable to greater frustration when expectations fail to materialize.

Fourth, organized crime differs across societies. Members’ loyalty to crime organizations appears stronger in Japan and Hong Kong than in the United States. The syndicates in Hong Kong, Japan, Italy, and Russia have penetrated legitimate business and politics more deeply than those in the United States. Not surprisingly, antisyndicate measures fail more frequently in those countries than in the United States. There is one important similarity between U.S. organized crime and its counterparts in other countries: They all serve as a “crooked ladder of upward mobility” for the ambitious poor, who can become rich by joining a syndicate (Thio, 2004).

Controlling Deviance

As discussed in Chapter 3 (Socialization), society transmits its values to individuals through socialization. If families, schools, and other socializing agents do their jobs well, then individuals internalize the values of their society, accepting society’s norms as their own. Even in poor inner-city neighborhoods, many people successfully internalize the norms of the society at large, becoming conformists and law-abiding citizens.

Internalization through socialization is the most efficient way of controlling deviance. It produces unconscious, spontaneous self-control. As a result, most people find it natural to conform to most social norms most of the time. Violating the norms makes them feel guilty, ashamed, or at least uncomfortable. They act as their own police officers.

Nevertheless, for reasons suggested by the various theories that we have discussed, a few people commit serious crimes, and everyone deviates occasionally, at least from some trivial norms. Thus, control by others is also needed to limit deviance and maintain social order. This control can be either informal or formal. Relatives, neighbors, peer groups, and even strangers enforce informal controls through discipline, criticism, ridicule, or some other treatments. Formal controls are usually imposed by police, judges, prison guards, and other law enforcement agents.

Compared with small traditional societies, large industrialized societies have a more extensive system of formal control. Perhaps formal control has become more important in modern nations because they have become more heterogeneous and more impersonal than traditional societies. This societal change may have increased social conflicts and enhanced the need for formal control, particularly the criminal justice system.

Criminal Justice

The criminal justice system is a network of police, courts, and prisons. These law enforcers are supposed to protect society, but they are also a potential threat to an individual’s freedom. If they wanted to ensure that not a single criminal could slip away, the police would have to deprive innocent citizens of their rights and liberties. They would restrict our freedom of movement and invade our privacy—by tapping phones, reading mail, searching homes, stopping pedestrians for questioning, and blockading roads. No matter how law abiding we might be, we would always be treated like crime suspects—and some of us would almost certainly fall into the dragnet.

To prevent such abuses, the criminal justice system in the United States is restrained by the U.S. Constitution and laws. We have the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty, the right not to incriminate ourselves, and many other legal protections. The ability of the police to search homes and question suspects is limited. Thus, our freedom, especially from being wrongly convicted and imprisoned, is protected.

In short, the criminal justice system faces a dilemma: If it does not catch enough criminals, the streets will not be safe; if it tries to apprehend too many, people’s freedom will be in danger. Striking a balance between effective protection from criminals and respect for individual freedom is far from easy. This may be why the criminal justice system is criticized from both the right and the left, by one group for coddling criminals and by the other for being too harsh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>The U.S. criminal justice system is, by any measure, soft on criminals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>The United States appears to be soft on criminals because extremely few criminals are apprehended and punished. But compared with other democracies, the United States is tougher in imprisoning proportionately more criminals and imposing longer prison terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both criticisms have some merit. Most criminals in the United States are never punished. Of the 35 million crimes committed every year, less than half—about 15 million serious crimes—are reported to the police. Of these serious crimes, only 20 percent (3 million) result in arrest and prosecution. Of the 3 million prosecuted, 2 million are convicted, of whom 25 percent (500,000) are sent to prison. Ultimately, then, less than 2 percent of the original 35 million offenders are put behind bars. Moreover, most of these prisoners do not serve their full terms because they are released on parole. The average prisoners serve only about one-third of their sentences (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003; Anderson, 1998, 1994).

Does this mean that the U.S. criminal justice system is soft on criminals? Not necessarily. The United States punishes crime more severely than any other democratic nation. It has been for many years the number-one jailer in the world (see Figure 6.7). Since 1985, the U.S. prison population has more than doubled to about 1.6 million inmates—more than 2 million if local jail inmates are included. Imprisonment is also generally longer than in other democratic countries. The length of imprisonment is generally measured in weeks and months in Sweden but in years in the United States. The United States is also the only industrialized nation in the West that still executes convicted murderers (Anderson, 2003; Mauer, 1999; Currie, 1998; Gilliard and Beck, 1996).

Does the comparatively harsh treatment in the United States help reduce crime rates? The increasing rates of incarceration and the lengthening of prison sentences since the early 1980s have indeed reduced crime by removing from the streets many more hardcore criminals, who commit most of the crimes in society. But the decline in crime cannot be attributed to stepped-up imprisonment alone. Other factors are also involved, such as the economic boom in the 1990s, increases in citizen-led policing, and a dwindling population of teenagers—the age group with a very high crime rate. However, “we are sitting on a demographic crime bomb” because in the new millennium, the proportion of teenagers in the U.S. population will be much greater than it was in the 1990s (Rosenfeld, 2002; DiIulio, 1995).

### The Death Penalty

In 1998, Karla Faye Tucker, age 38, was executed in Texas for murdering two people with a pickax 15 years earlier. She was the first woman put to death by the state since the Civil War and the second woman in the United States officially killed since 1976, the year when the U.S. Supreme Court reinstated the death penalty. Most Americans believe that the death penalty is an effective deterrent to murder. Many sociologists, however, have for a long time found otherwise, given the following forms of evidence.
First, the homicide rates in states that have retained the death penalty law are generally much higher than in states that have abolished it. As Figure 6.8 shows, Southern states, which still practice the death penalty, generally have higher murder rates than the states in other regions, which have mostly abolished capital punishment. This suggests that the death penalty does not appear to deter murder.

Second, within the same states, murder rates generally did not go up after the death penalty was abolished. Moreover, the restoration of capital punishment in states that had abolished it earlier did not lead to a significant decrease in homicides.

A third piece of evidence came from comparing the number of homicides shortly before and shortly after executions of convicted murderers that had been widely publicized. If the death penalty has a deterrent effect, the execution should so scare potential killers that they would refrain from killing, and the number of homicides in the area should decline. This may sound logical, but reality contradicts it. In Philadelphia during the 1930s, for example, the number of homicides remained about the same in the period from 60 days before to 60 days after a widely publicized execution of five murderers. This finding, among others, suggests that the death penalty apparently does not prevent potential killers from killing even when the state shows people that it means business.

Finally, similar findings have appeared in studies of various societies. As a classic study of 14 nations concludes:

If capital punishment is a more effective deterrent than the alternative punishment of long imprisonment, its abolition ought to be followed by homicide rate increases. The evidence examined
The Death Penalty in the United States

Capital punishment is much more prevalent in the United States today than a decade ago. But since 1976, the methods of execution supposedly have become more humane, with lethal injection being by far the most often used.

Critical Thinking: Do you think the death penalty deters people from committing murder? Why or why not?

Source: Data from Death Penalty Information Center, 2003.

here fails to support and, indeed, repeatedly contradicts this proposition. In this cross-national sample, abolition was followed more often than not by absolute decreases in homicide rates, not by the increases predicted by deterrence theory. (Archer and Gartner, 1984)

Why doesn’t the death penalty seem to deter murder? One reason is that murder is a crime of passion, most often carried out under the overwhelming pressure of a volcanic emotion, namely, uncontrollable rage. People in such a condition cannot stop and think about the death penalty. Another reason is that the causal forces of murder, such as severe poverty and child abuse, are simply too powerful to be neutralized by the threat of capital punishment.

Although it does not seem to deter murder, most Americans support the death penalty, and increasing numbers of people have been put to death in recent years (see Figure 6.9). There is, however, an apparent attempt to appear civilized in doing away with convicted killers. As Figure 6.9 further indicates, barbaric methods of execution, such as hangings and firing squads, are for all intents no longer used; they have been replaced by the supposedly more humane methods of lethal injection and electrocution. Concern has also increased that innocent people are sometimes executed. In 2003, for example, the Illinois governor commuted the sentences of all the death-row prisoners in his state because he believed that “the capital system is haunted by the demon of error.” The error of executing innocents usually comes from racial bias, coerced confessions, and unreliable witnesses (Cloud, 2003).

The Medicalization of Deviance

Deviance can be willful or unwillful. Increasingly in modern industrial societies, especially the United States, if deviance is considered willful, it tends to be defined as a crime, and the criminal justice system is called on to control it. But if deviance is considered unwillful, it tends to be defined as an illness, and medicine, as a social institution, is used to control it. This involves the medicalization of deviance, di-
agnosing and treating deviant behavior as a disease. A good example is the common practice of diagnosing hyperactivity in schoolchildren as a medical problem and then treating it with drugs such as Ritalin, Concerta, and Adderall (Zernike and Petersen, 2001).

Even more commonly, medical psychiatrists, who use drugs to treat mental illness like a physical disease, define many ordinary problems in our lives as mental disorders. Consider, for example, what the psychiatric profession calls the *disorder of written expression*. This so-called mental disorder consists of the poor use of grammar or punctuation, sloopy paragraph organization, awful spelling, and terrible handwriting. It is possible that some students who exhibit these traits may be mentally ill, but it is doubtful that most students with similar problems are mentally ill; they are simply weak or unskilled writers. Also, consider the *oppositional defiant disorder*, from which children are said to suffer if they often do any four of the following things: lose tempers, argue with adults, disobey adults, annoy people, blame others for their own behavior, or act touchy, angry, or spiteful. It is possible that in the heat of the moment, some parents may say that their disobedient kids are mentally ill. But it is doubtful that most parents believe that these irritating behaviors are signs of mental disorder (Kirk and Kutchins, 1994, 1992).

Once diagnosed as mentally ill, the individual is likely to be treated or controlled. Various social and government agencies, for example, often recruit psychiatrists to treat youngsters whose behaviors offend or disturb others, behaviors such as being defiant, using drugs, fighting, hating school, or being disrespectful. Actually, most of these youngsters have experienced poverty, child abuse, or family misery. But instead of dealing with the abnormal environment that causes troublesome behaviors, the psychiatrists label those normal children as mentally ill and then isolate or incarcerate them and give them drugs. In short, kids who stand out as different may be labeled mentally ill and controlled accordingly (Armstrong, 1993).

### The War on Drugs

The war on drugs consists of two basic strategies. One is punitive: using law enforcement to stop the supply of drugs and punish drug sellers and users. The other is supportive: using drug prevention (or education) and treatment to reduce the demand for drugs and help drug addicts. The U.S. war on drugs is mostly punitive, as the government devotes most of its antidrug budget to law enforcement. (This has caused the U.S. prison population to double over the last 15 years, reaching 2.1 million in 2003.) But the war is targeted mostly at relatively powerless groups, particularly poor African Americans and Hispanics, who are much more likely than affluent whites to be arrested and convicted for drug offenses (Anderson, 2003; Musto, 2002; Currie, 1993).

The law enforcement approach has failed to reduce the general level of drug use, and this has led to calls for the legalization of drugs. Advocates of legalization contend that, like Prohibition (of alcohol) in the 1920s, current drug laws do more harm than good. They are said to generate many crimes, including homicides, and to encourage police corruption. By legalizing drugs, proponents argue, the government can take away obscene profits from drug traffickers, end police corruption, and reduce crime drastically. Finally, legalizers believe that with legalization, the huge amount of money currently spent on law enforcement can be used for drug treatment and education, which will dramatically reduce abuse.

Those who oppose legalization respond that if drugs are legalized, drug use and addiction will skyrocket (Forbes, 1996). As William Bennett (1989), a former national drug control policy director, points out, “After the repeal of Prohibition, consumption of alcohol soared by 350%.”

Sociologist Elliott Currie (1999; 1993) has argued that neither drug warriors nor legalizers can solve the problem of widespread drug abuse and crime because they ignore the root causes of the problem—namely, poverty, racism, and inequality. Currie proposes that the government eradicate the causes of the problem by providing employment to all, increasing the minimum wage, expanding the Job Corps, boosting health care for the poor, offering paid family leave, providing affordable housing, and reducing social inequality.

Since 1996, California and eight other states have legalized the use of marijuana by patients with cancer, AIDS, and other serious diseases to ease their pain. More states are expected to follow suit. But the federal government has been challenging those laws and won a victory in 2001 when the U.S. Supreme Court effectively ordered a California group to stop distributing marijuana for medical use. The Court stopped short of invalidating those states’ medical-marijuana laws, however, which meant individual patients still could obtain and use the drug. Even if the Court later finds those states’ laws unconstitutional, juries are unlikely to convict sick people for pot possession, as polls have shown that the majority of Americans (nearly 75 percent) favor medical-marijuana use (Roosevelt, 2001).

Even so, it is doubtful that marijuana and other illicit drugs will soon be legalized for use by the gen-
eral population throughout the United States. Most Americans seem viscerally opposed to the legalization of drugs. They particularly do not want to have heroin, cocaine, and other hard drugs as easily available as tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and other legal drugs (Bennett, 2001; Rosenthal, 1995).

**sociological frontiers**

**Shyness as a New Disease**

As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, what constitutes deviance varies from one historical period to another. Thus, what was not considered deviant in the past could become deviant today if it is labeled as such. This may explain why a fast-growing number of people are doing something they would not have thought of doing before: going to their doctors for a prescription drug to cure their shyness.

In the past, many people knew that they were shy, but it never crossed their minds that shyness was a pathology, a disease that requires medical treatment. Recently, though, a number of social forces have converged to turn shyness into a mental disorder. First, in 1980, the psychiatric profession labeled extreme shyness as a social phobia or social anxiety disorder. At that time, the condition was regarded as a rare disorder, as it involved experiencing not only a distracting nervousness at parties or before giving a speech but also a powerful desire to avoid these social situations altogether. Next, some movie stars, big-name athletes, and other celebrities appeared on talk shows, in magazines, and on other media to disclose their struggles with shyness. Finally, the pharmaceutical company Smith Kline Beecham entered the picture by advertising and selling its antidepressant Paxil as a medicine for shyness. And thus, Americans were left with the impression that shyness is far more serious and widespread than they had ever realized.

As a result, many people today regard shyness as a disease, a medical problem serious enough to require treatment with a drug. But shyness is a serious problem only for a very few—those who are extremely bashful or truly incapacitated by fears of others’ disapproval and need relief through the use of psychoactive drugs. For the majority, however, shyness is only a mild problem. According to a recent survey, nearly half of all Americans consider themselves shy and still manage to carry on a normal social life. Also consider the fact that many of these Americans may actually not be shy at all. In American culture today, it is difficult not to feel shy given the ubiquitous media full of immodest and even brazen talkers, just as it is difficult not to feel fat with the media presentation of extremely thin beauties (Talbot, 2001).

In short, what was once considered a personality trait is now labeled as a disease and treated with drugs.

---

**Using Sociology**

**How to Manage Your Drinking**

As noted earlier, heavy drinking is a serious problem on many college campuses. The traditional approach to this problem has been simply to stop teenagers from drinking. Thus, since 1988, every state has raised the legal drinking age to 21. Doing so seems to have produced some positive results, such as a drop in drinking and in alcohol-related auto deaths among underage youths.

But a growing number of college administrators have argued recently that the higher drinking age has, in some ways, made drinking more dangerous. Before the enactment of the drinking age law, drinking took place in the open, where it could be supervised by police, security guards, and even health-care workers. When the drinking age went up, drinking did not stop, however. It simply moved underground to homes, cars, and frat-house basements, hidden from adults and authorities. In response to this development, campus administrators have tried to find another more effective way to solve the problem of excessive drinking.

A solution was found at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in New York. In 1996, one of the colleges’ sociology professors, Wesley Perkins, did a survey at his school and found that students believed their peers were drinking five times a week when in reality they were drinking only twice a week. In another study conducted on 100 other campuses, students also overestimated their peers’ drinking. These findings prompted Perkins to ask: If young people believe that most of their fellow students drink a lot, might they be more inclined to join them? But if they believe excessive drinking is relatively rare on their campus, might they drink more moderately? In short, Perkins hypothesized that students would drink in accordance with the social norm of drinking or, as has been suggested earlier in this chapter, the dictates of peer pressure at their school.

In 1997, Perkins’s school spent about $2,000 to test the hypothesis. Using posters and newspaper ads, college officials publicized the fact that most students drank only twice a week and that just one-third of the students drank three-quarters of the alcohol on campus. Over the following two years, Perkins observed a significant (21 percent) drop in excessive drinking. When the same program was later carried out at other colleges, the reduction in frequent drinking was also significant—from a 20 percent drop at Western Washington Univer-
sity to a 44 percent plunge at Northern Illinois University (Kluger, 2001b).

What this study suggests is clear: If you drink, you should know that most of your fellow students actually drink less than you think, so you should not feel any pressure to drink heavily. Thinking critically, what would you do to overcome the pressure to drink heavily? Which deviance theory or theories provide the best ideas to deal with this problem and why?

**CHAPTER REVIEW**

1. **What is deviance?** It is an act considered, by public consensus or by the powerful at a given time and place, to be a violation of some social rule.

2. **In what ways does homicide occur?** Homicide involves nonstrangers more than strangers. It takes place most frequently during weekend evenings, especially for lower-class offenders. Guns are often used to commit homicide, and their easy availability has contributed to a startling upsurge in teen homicide. **What is the culture of rape?** It encourages men to rape women by treating women as if they are men’s property, as if they are the trophies of men’s masculinity contests, and as if they want to be raped. **Why do many college students binge drink?** One reason is stress from having to work hard for good grades; another reason is the social pressure to get drunk so as to fit in. **How does corporate crime differ from street crime?** Corporate crime is more rationally executed, more profitable, and less detectable. Corporate offenders do not see themselves as criminals, their victims unwittingly cooperate with them, and society does little to punish them. **What group is more likely than others to have mental problems?** People who are poor are more prone to mental problems primarily because their lives are more stressful than others’. Gender, ethnicity, and culture are also involved in the development of specific types of mental disorder. **Why do suicide bombers choose to die?** They choose to die because of their extremely strong ties to terrorist organizations, which indoctrinate and train them and also provide their surviving relatives with various benefits.

3. **What does Durkheim’s functionalist theory tell us about deviance?** Deviance helps enhance conformity, strengthen social solidarity, provide a safe release for discontent, and induce social change. According to Merton’s strain theory, **what is the cause of deviance?** U.S. society emphasizes the importance of success without providing equal opportunities for achieving it. One possible response to this inconsistency is deviance. **How are Hirschi’s and Braithwaite’s theories similar, and how are they different?** Both assume that social control leads to conformity and, therefore, the absence of control causes deviance. According to Hirschi, the absence of control arises from a lack of social bonds. To Braithwaite, the absence of control comes from disintegrative shaming.

4. **What does conflict theory say about deviance?** According to Chambliss, law enforcement favors the rich and powerful over the poor and weak. In Quinney’s view, the dominant class produces crime by making criminal laws, hiring enforcers to carry out the laws, oppressing the subordinate class into deviance, and spreading the ideology that the lower class is crime-prone and dangerous. Marxists argue that the exploitative nature of capitalism produces violent crimes and noncriminal deviances. **How does the power theory explain deviance?** The powerful are more likely to engage in profitable deviance than the powerless are in unprofitable deviance because the powerful have a stronger deviant motivation, greater deviant opportunity, and weaker social control. **What is the feminist theory of deviance?** Conventional theories may be relevant to men but not to women. Women are likely to be victims of rape and sexual harassment, which reflect men’s attempt to put women in their place. Although female crime has recently increased, it is not significant because most of the increase involves minor property crimes with very little profit, reflecting the continuing subordinate position of women in a patriarchy.

5. **How does differential association lead to deviance?** Deviance occurs if interactions with those who define deviance positively outweigh interactions with those who define it negatively. **How is being labeled deviant likely to affect people?** The label may cause them to look on themselves as deviant and to live up to this self-image by engaging in more deviant behavior. **What insight about deviance does phenomenological theory offer?** We can understand deviance better by looking at people’s subjective interpretations of their own deviant experiences.

6. **How is deviance related to the social diversity of U.S. society?** African Americans are more likely than whites to be arrested for relatively serious crimes, whereas Asian Americans have the lowest arrest rates. Groups with lower incomes are more likely to commit predatory or street crimes than are their higher-income peers. Men are more likely than women to engage in practically all kinds of crime.

7. **How does deviance differ across societies?** Homicide is more likely to occur in poor countries or in rich countries with high rates of poverty. Property crimes...
are more prevalent in wealthy countries because targets for such crimes are more abundant. Prostitution flourishes in poor countries as a result of both poverty and exploitation by richer countries. Organized crime is stronger and more a part of legitimate business and politics in countries other than the United States, but it serves as an avenue to success for the ambitious poor in all countries.

8. **Is the U.S. criminal justice system soft on criminals?** It appears so because extremely few criminals are apprehended and punished, but compared with other democracies, the United States imprisons proportionately more people and imposes longer prison terms. **Why doesn’t the death penalty deter murder?** Because murder is a crime of passion resulting from uncontrollable rage and because the larger social causes of murder are simply too powerful to be neutralized by the threat of capital punishment. **What is involved in the medicalization of deviance?** Medicine as a social institution is used to control what is considered unwilling deviance by diagnosing and treating it as a disease. **How does the government wage the war on drugs?** It focuses its efforts much more on law enforcement than on treatment and education. Failure of the drug war has led some to advocate legalizing drugs, arguing that it would take away obscene profits from drug traffickers, end police corruption, and reduce crime drastically. Opponents respond that legalization would cause rampant drug use and addiction without reducing crime.

9. **Why do some people today want to take medication for their shyness?** The primary reason is that shyness is now widely labeled a medical problem. **How can college students avoid excessive drinking?** By knowing that the social norm on their campus does not encourage excessive drinking, students can resist the peer pressure to drink.

**Key Terms**

*Anomie*  A social condition in which norms are absent, weak, or in conflict (p. 157).

*Deviance*  An act that is considered by public consensus, or by the powerful at a given place and time, to be a violation of some social rule (p. 148).

*Differential association*  The process of acquiring, through interaction with others, “an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law” (p. 162).

*Disintegrative shaming*  The process by which the wrongdoer is punished in such a way as to be stigmatized, rejected, or ostracized (p. 159).

*Marginal surplus population*  Marxist term for unemployed workers who are superfluous or useless to the economy (p. 160).

*Medicalization of deviance*  Diagnosing and treating deviant behavior as a disease (p. 171).

*Neurosis*  The mental problem characterized by a persistent fear, anxiety, or worry about trivial matters (p. 155).

*Primary deviance*  Norm violations that a person commits for the first time and without considering them deviant (p. 163).

*Psychosis*  The mental problem typified by loss of touch with reality (p. 155).

*Rape*  Coercive sex that involves the use of force to get a woman to do something sexual against her will (p. 150).

*Reintegrative shaming*  Making wrongdoers feel guilty while showing them understanding, forgiveness, or even respect (p. 159).

*Relative deprivation*  Feeling unable to achieve relatively high aspirations (p. 161).

*Secondary deviance*  Repeated norm violations that the violators themselves recognize as deviant (p. 163).

**Questions for Discussion and Review**

**WHAT IS DEVIANCE?**

1. What determines whether a person has violated a social norm?

**EXAMPLES OF DEVIANCE**

1. What does it mean to call homicide a personal crime?
2. What is the culture of rape, and how does it encourage the crime?
3. How common is college binge drinking, and what causes it?
4. What distinguishes corporate crime from street crime?
5. How common are mental problems in the United States, and what does social class have to do with such problems?
6. What causes suicide bombings?
FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVE:
FUNCTIONS AND DYSFUNCTIONS
1. According to Durkheim, in what ways can deviance benefit society?
2. How did Merton explain the high crime rate in the United States?
3. How does Hirschi’s control theory explain deviance?
4. In Braithwaite’s view, how is shaming related to society and deviance?

CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE: SOCIAL CONFLICT OR INEQUALITY
1. How does conflict theory explain the nature of laws and the cause of deviance?
2. How does the power theory explain why deviance is more prevalent among the powerful?
3. How does feminist theory differ from other theories of deviance?

SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE:
ASSOCIATION, REACTION, AND INTERPRETATION
1. How does differential association lead to deviance?
2. What occurs when some people move from primary to secondary deviance?
3. What does phenomenological theory tell us about deviants?

SOCIAL DIVERSITY IN DEVIANCEx
1. How are race, class, and gender related to deviance?

A GLOBAL ANALYSIS OF DEVIANCEx
1. How do some forms of deviance vary from society to society?

CONTROLLING DEVIANCEx
1. In what ways can the U.S. criminal justice system balance the need to catch criminals with the need to respect individual freedom?
2. Why doesn’t the death penalty seem to deter murderers?
3. How does the medicalization of deviance affect people’s lives?
4. How has the drug war been fought in the United States?
5. What are the pros and cons in the debate over drug legalization?

SOCIOLOGICAL FRONTIERS/USING SOCIOLOGY
1. How has shyness been turned into a disease?
2. How did some colleges and universities reduce the incidence of excessive drinking among their students?
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The New York Times
Expand your knowledge of the concepts discussed in this chapter by reading the following current and historical articles from the New York Times. Go to the “eThemes of the Times” section of the Companion Website (www.ablongman.com/thio6e):
“A West Side Story: From Crime King to Mentor”
“Father Steals Best: Crime in an American Family”

Research Navigator.com
Research Navigator, a research database, provides immediate access to hundreds of full-text articles from EBSCO’s ContentSelect Academic Journal Database. If the Research Navigator access code was included with your textbook, go to the website www.researchnavigator.com and read the following articles related to this chapter by typing in the article number:
Blankenship, Kevin L., and Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. “Relation of General Deviance to Academic Dishonesty.” Ethics and Behavior, Jan2000, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p1, 12p, 3 charts. Accession Number:
3176620. Investigates the relationship between cheating and other forms of minor deviance.