Crime and Deviance knowledge Organiser

Social Order: For people to live and work together a certain amount of order and predictability is needed.

Functionalists argue this is based on value consensus.
Marxists: Social order is maintained because of class conflict. The bourgeoise have power and control to enforce order and influence the law.

Social Control: Much of our behaviour is socially controlled.

Formal Social Control: Based on written rules and laws.

Agencies of formal social control:
- Houses of Parliament

Informal Social Control: Based on unwritten rules and processes such as approval & disapproval

Agencies of informal social control:
- Family members
- Peers
- Teachers
- Work colleagues

Functionalist

Crime is vital and necessary of all societies. It helps to remind people about boundaries of acceptable & unacceptable behaviour. When the public come together over a reaction to a major crime, it creates social cohesion. (Durkheim)

Marxist

Because society is based on values such as materialism, consumerism and competition- an unequal society. Some people cannot earn enough to fit these norms & values, therefore they commit illegal activities to get them.

Feminist

Women are treated and punished as double deviants- they have firstly broken the law and second the norms that govern their gender behaviour. Arguments around the 'chivalry thesis'

Interactionists

Labelling produces a self-fulfilling prophecy. Social groups create deviance by making rules and applying them to particular people and labelling them as 'outsiders'. Groups whose social position gives them power are able to label people. These people see this as a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Sources of data into crime:
- Victim Surveys
- Self-report studies
- Crime Survey
- National Statistics

How useful are statistics recorded by the police?
- If a crime isn't witnessed it won't be reported.
- Many crimes are witnessed and not reported.
- **The dark figure of crime**

Mass Media & Deviancy Amplification (Stan Cohen 1972):
- The media creates **moral panics-** exaggerating the extent and significance of a social problem.
- A particular group is set as **folk devil-** a threat to society's values.
- The media distorts the events and incidents and create a false image of young people and their activities.
- This can encourage other young people to behave in the way the media portrays.
- Recent moral panics: school violence, bullying & shootouts, benefit cheats and single mothers, refugees & asylum seekers.

The class deal & the gender deal.
- Most people conform to the rules because of the 'deals' that offer them rewards.
- **Class Deal:** Material rewards if you work for your wage
- **Gender deal:** Material & emotional rewards if you live with a male breadwinner within the family.

Refusing the class deal: Not found legitimate ways of earning a decent living. More to gain than to lose by offending.

Refusing the gender deal: Supposed to be rewarded with happiness & fulfilment from family life. Many women may be abused, no bonds with family & friends. Nothing to lose and everything to gain.

Those at high risk from crime:
Class: The poor, living in private rented housing
Gender: Males
Age: The Young
Ethnicity: Minority ethnic groups.

Crime: An illegal act punishable by law.

Deviance: Behaviour that does not conform to society's norms

White Collar Crime: Crimes committed by people in relatively high-status positions. E.g. tax evasion, fraud, misuse of expense account

Crime and Deviance knowledge Organiser

keythinkers				
Albert Cohen (1955) **(Functionalist)**	**Robert Merton (1938)** **(Functionalist)**	**Pat Carlen (1988)** **(Feminist)**	**Frances Heidensohn (1985, 1996)** **(Feminist)**	**Howard Becker (1997)** **(Interactionist)**

<table>
<tr>
<td>

This functionalist study explores why working-class boys join delinquent subcultures and, as a result, are more likely to commit crimes.

As a functionalist, Cohen thinks that everyone learns the same values and goals through socialisation, part of creating a value consensus. In that way, working-class boys have the same life goals as middle-class boys. However, Cohen notes that working-class boys are much less likely to achieve at school than middle-class children. For Cohen this is down to **cultural deprivation** - working-class attitudes to school and education - rather than a structural issue relating to capitalism or **material deprivation**.

Because pupils don't get the status they crave, they instead form delinquent subcultures. A subculture is a group with its own norms and values, separate from those of mainstream society. For Cohen, it was not that the members had not been socialised into mainstream values - they had - but to gain status they turned them on their head. So things that would be viewed as bad in mainstream society - like vandalism and truancy - are viewed as good within the subculture. In some ways this is similar to Paul Willis' study of "the lads" (even though he was coming from a Marxist perspective, rather than a functionalist one).

Cohen's theory is often referred to as **status frustration** and is used to explain why young working-class males are more likely to commit crimes than other people, why they do it in groups, and why it includes crimes that does not materially benefit them (i.e. why they might commit vandalism or fight). It was inspired by Merton's **strain theory** but developed it further to explain crime by groups.

Critics suggest that members of delinquent subcultures may have been socialised into deviant values, rather than sharing the same values and goals as everyone else. Others question why Cohen only focused on boys. Marxist critics criticise Cohen for ignoring the causes of social class inequality.

</td>
<td>

In this book, Merton outlined his well-known **strain theory** of deviance.
Robert Merton took a standard functionalist view that there was a value consensus: that - through socialisation - we all share the same norms and values and life goals. With that in mind, he set out to try and explain why some people committed crimes, apparently seeming to deviate from the norms and values of society. In doing this, he looked to develop the ideas of Durkheim and apply them to the American society he was living in.
Merton argued that people were encouraged to believe in the American Dream: that is that, through hard work, everyone can have a comfortable life with their own home and access to consumer goods. However, Merton noted that, in reality, achieving this was much easier for some people than others. In other words, there was a **strain** between what people wanted in life and the socially-acceptable way of getting it (hard work, qualifications, etc.)
Merton argued that people could respond to that strain in 5 different ways:

1. **Conformity**. This is where people accept both the social goals (material success) and the social means (hard work, qualifications, etc.) and so they work hard and try to be successful that way. This does not lead to crime.

2. **Innovation.** This is where people accept the social goals (material success) but reject the social means (hard work, qualifications, etc.) and so they try and find other ways to get material success. While these ways are not necessarily criminal, some innovators will break the law as a shortcut to material success. Merton argues that this might be a popular option from "lower" class individuals who might struggle to get the best qualifications. (Merton does not focus his study on why this might be the case).

3. **Ritualism**. This is the idea that some people are not striving for the social goals (material success) - perhaps because, like the innovators, they think it is too difficult / out of reach - but do embrace the social means (hard work, qualifications, etc.) because they have been socialised to conform. Merton suggests that such people may stay in low-status occupations but have a strong focus on rules and bureaucracy (what is sometimes described as "jobsworths").

4. **Retreatism**. Merton suggests some people reject both the social goals and the social means and drop out of society altogether. Merton suggests that such people could come from any social class background, but they are likely to be deviant and commit crimes such as illegal drug use.

5. **Rebellion**. Finally there are those who, like the retreatists, reject goals and means but set out to replace them with new ones. For Merton these are revolutionaries who want to build a new sort of society.

Criticisms of strain theory include: it doesn't really explain deviant or criminal behaviour that doesn't help achieve material success (such as vandalism or fighting) and doesn't explain why people often break the law in groups.

</td>
<td>

This feminist study, based on interviews with 39 women, looks at why some women commit crimes.

Most sociologists who have considered the issue of gender and crime have focused on why women commit far fewer crimes than men - after all, that is what the crime statistics show us. However, some women do commit crimes, and Carlen looked into that question.

She concluded that working-class women made a **class deal** and a **gender deal** that generally kept them under control. The class deal was that they would work hard in exchange for pay which they could then use to pay for consumer goods. The gender deal was that they should do domestic labour and give love and companionship to their husbands, in exchange for love and financial support. Both these deals keep working-class women **respectable**.

It was, Carlen suggested, when these deals broke down that working-class women were then more likely to commit crimes, as a rational choice. For Carlen both these "deals" were really exploitative. As a feminist she believed that women were exploited in families, and she also believed that the working class was exploited by employers in the capitalist system (agreeing with Marxists). However, there was an illusion of fairness and respectability about these deals that, most of the time, kept women under control.

In one respect, Carlen agrees with functionalists, such as Durkheim or Hirschi, that social control prevents crime and a lack of control can lead to an increase in crime. But Carlen points out how that control is often maintained through exploitation.

</td>
<td>

Feminist Frances Heidensohn outlined an argument for why women are less likely to commit crime than men, in her classic book from the 1980s. Statistics show that men are much more likely to commit crimes than women. There have been various studies as to why this might be the case. Heidensohn seeks to explain it in terms of the way girls and women are controlled by men, leaving them with fewer opportunities to commit crime. This is known as **control theory**.

According to Heidensohn, girls are controlled by fathers and male siblings. They have to be home earlier than their brothers, and have less time when they are unsupervised. While boys were out playing together out of the home, girls had a "bedroom culture" in the home. She also said that there was more informal control of girls than boys in society more generally. (To be "respectable" girls had less freedom than boys).

Heidensohn argued that this control, both by family members and social expectations, continues for women in adulthood. They go from being controlled by fathers to being controlled by husbands. While working men would socialise with their fellow workers at pubs or sport, working women would return home to carry out homework and childcare. As such, Heidensohn suggests that it is patriarchy - the male-dominated society - which accounts for women committing fewer crimes than men.

Some suggest that this is an outdated picture. Are girls and women still more controlled than boys and men? Freda Adler suggests that women today have much more freedom (and suggests that is why female crime is now increasing.)

Functionalists would suggest that men and women perform different gender roles in the family in order for society to function properly, rather than society being patriarchal and male-dominated.

</td>
<td>

Becker's classic study in which he introduced his **labelling theory** and the famous quotation: **"deviant behaviour is behaviour people so label".**

Howard Becker was an interactionist. He was interested in the idea of deviance, not so much as a social problem that needed to be solved, but as an idea: how people chose to see other people and how they chose to see themselves. He was interested in interactions between individuals and small groups and the impact of such interactions.

The heart of labelling theory is actually quite a simple idea: what makes something deviant is the fact that other people say it is deviant. As such, the interesting thing (for Becker) was not the deviant act itself but the reaction to it. An example to explain this could be the ultimate deviant or illegal act: killing someone. Initially, we might think that killing someone would always be deemed deviant, but actually it depends on the context: for soldiers in a war, for example, killing someone is part of their job: it is normal. So it is not the act itself which is deviant - what matters is where it is happening, who is doing it, who is observing it, how **agents of social control** (e.g. the police) respond to it, etc. This could be true of almost any deviant act we can think of. Some anti-social behaviour might be seen as "high jinx" when carried out by white, middle-class students and as deviant and unacceptable behaviour when carried out by other youths.

It is the agents of social control who have the ability to make a label stick, and do their labelling in public. Once someone has been labelled as a deviant, there are a number of possible consequences. The first is that it could become their **master status** - the way they see themselves - and this can lead to a **self-fulfilling prophecy** where people end up living up to their label, starting a **deviant career** and ending up part of a deviant **subculture**. It also has the effect that people might want to socialise with that person, or offer them work, and this too can effect the likelihood of them following a deviant career.
Because Becker is an interactionist, rather than a Marxist, he does not develop the idea that this process might be designed deliberately to control and police the working class (although others, like Stuart Hall, have considered these ideas). Others question whether Becker's concept is useful in the real fight against crime. Deviant behaviour may just be the behaviour that people so label, but for the victims of crime, crime is a very real problem that requires solutions.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Crime and Deviance knowledge Organiser

Who commits crime? Why do differences occur?

Gender	Ethnicity	Class	Age
Women committing less crime. • Gender socialisation • Fewer opportunities • More domestic responsibilities • May be treated differently in the criminal justice system e.g. sad, rather than bad, given a lenient sentence. Chivalry thesis • Others argue they are treated more harshly- double deviancy. Therefore do not commit crime. **Women's involvement in crime is increasing:** • Lost a lot of their controls and restraints • Women are not experiencing equality in the work place-gender pay gap.	• Inaccurate statistics Labelling- racism and stereotyping within the police practice. More ethnic groups are stopped and searched. Institutional racism within the police- most police officers are white and may label particular groups (Stephen Lawrence murder) • Linked to their social class, higher levels of crime in the ethnic minority groups could link to the fact they are also possibly experiencing poverty and this leads to crime. • Media reinforcing views- reporting in the media on particular groups can generate mistrust and hostility.	• Inaccurate statistics- lower-class criminals may commit crimes that are more identifiable and more likely to be targeted by the police. • Socialisation • Material deprivation- may commit crime to obtain the things others have • Education- W/C more likely to be in the bottom sets/streams so may look for other routes to get what they need e.g. crime. • Anomie- mismatch between goals and the means to achieve the goals. • Labelling. • White collar crime is not as easily identifiable as crimes committed at lower levels.	• Status frustration- lack of independence and caught in transition. Lack of responsibilities can lead them to drift into deviant and criminal behaviour. • Peer Pressure • Edgework- thrill seeking and risk-taking. Getting a "buzz" from committing a crime or displaying deviant behaviour. • Socialisation- Some young people are inadequately socialised and have learned criminal behaviour as a norm or value. • Police stereotyping • Media moral panic/folk devil. • Subcultural theory

Debate: Treatments of young offenders:
Should young people be sentenced for crimes or educated to prevent them committing crime in the future?
• Age of criminal responsibility is 10.
They **should** be put in custody
✓ They must take the punishment
✓ If they are danger the public needs to be protected
✓ They need to learn societies norms & values
They **should not** be put in custody:
x 73% reoffend within a year
x Too much money is spent on youth offender institutes
x Education would be more worthwhile

Debate: Punishment:
Should people be punished and sent to prison or rehabilitated?
They **should** be put in prison:
✓ Criminals deserve to be shamed and deprived of their liberty
✓ Prison is a deterrent
✓ Essential to keep others safe
They **should not** be put in custody:
x Doesn't make people take responsibility for their actions
x Reoffending rate is 57% of adults, 73% within young people.
x Heavily structured regime can damage a prisoners abilities to think and act for themselves
x They are ineffective- too easy.

MEDIA

Debate: The media:
1. Are the media biased in their presentation of crime?
2. Does the media create crime in society?

1. **Are the media biased in their presentation of crime?**
• When individuals do not have direct knowledge or experience of what is happening, they rely on the media to inform them.
• The media set the agenda in terms of what is considered to be important.
• The editors filter what they see as newsworthy (news value) they tend to include and emphasis elements of a story for their audience. Stories they are more likely to report (news value) are stories involving children, violence, celebrities, if the event has occurred locally, easy to understand and if graphic images are involved.
• 46% of media reports are about violence or sexual crimes, yet these only make up for 3% of crime recorded by the police (Ditton & Delphy 1983)
• Deviancy amplification is usually used to describe the impact of the media on the public perception of crime.

2. **Does the media create crime?**
• Media content can have a negative impact on the behaviour of young people, particularly children.
• It is suggested that some people may imitate violence and immoral or antisocial behaviour seen in media. The media are regarded as a powerful secondary agent of socialisation.
• Video games are often blamed as a link between increased aggressive behaviour and crime.