

## **“Social Control, Self-Control, and Gang Membership”**

by

David Brownfield

### ***Abstract***

*Among the most influential and widely cited criminological perspectives is control theory. For decades, social control theory and, in particular, Travis Hirschi’s version of social control theory was regarded as one of the most empirically supported. Hirschi and Gottfredson emphasized self-control in their general theory of crime; this theory incorporated and expanded upon the earlier versions of social control theory. In this paper, an assessment of how well both social control theory and the general theory – with its emphasis on self-control – is made regarding how these explanations help to account for gang membership. We compare the effects of control theory variables with the influence of peer delinquency.*

### **Social Control, Self-Control, and Gang Membership**

Control theory has been one of the most influential criminological theories for many years. Along with anomie theory and subcultural theory, control theory has been one of the central perspectives in the study of crime and delinquency. Early social disorganization theorists such as Charles Cooley developed concepts such as the primary group, which many subsequent control theorists used as a foundation for their explanations of crime. When the primary group breaks down or becomes less functional, then individuals are left to pursue instinctual desires such as greed and lust. Control theorists seem to agree that there is no need to provide a motivation for crime, such as financial need or peer influence. Instead, human instinct is sufficient motivation or explanation for crime; if instincts are not controlled or channeled by the primary group (exemplified by the family), crime is an inevitable result of instincts.

There have been several versions of control theory. Reiss (1951) distinguished

internal and external (or “personal” and “social”) controls. External or social controls are exemplified by legal sanctions or the potential of punishment by police and courts. Internal or personal controls might be described by the individual’s sense of morality or the conscience. Toby (1957) emphasized the individual’s “stakes in conformity” or what a person risked losing (status, money, relationships, etc) by being involved in crime. Toby’s version of control theory focused more on the rational calculations and controls on human behavior (rather than emotional restraints). Reckless (1961) developed a containment theory version of the control perspective; self-concept was crucial in Reckless’s theory, as individuals fostered images of themselves as law-abiding or as being inclined to break social rules. Nye (1958) described three categories of social control that inhibit delinquency; Nye identifies “direct control,” exerted through punishment and rewards (often by parents); “indirect control” that refers to children’s concern for the disappointment generated by delinquency for parents; and “internal control” or the child’s conscience or sense of guilt that may inhibit delinquent behavior.

Travis Hirschi’s (1969) version of social control theory became the most widely cited perspective. *Causes of Delinquency* is one of the most influential books in criminology. Hirschi draws from several of the earlier versions of control theory and developed a more complete and thorough explanation; Hirschi also provided a rigorous empirical test of his theory, and made several important comparisons with other theories (such as strain theory and differential association). In his later work with Gottfredson in *A General Theory of Crime*, Hirschi focuses on self-control. The concept of self-control draws extensively upon earlier social control theory by including elements such as attachment and commitment, as well as a focus on impulsivity and inability to defer gratification.

In this paper, first there is detailed consideration of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory. Second, there is a comparison of the self-control theory of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) with Hirschi’s social control theory. Points of similarity between these two control theories will be discussed, as well as the unique aspects of the concept of self-control. Finally, an empirical assessment is conducted of Hirschi’s social control and Gottfredson and Hirschi’s self-control theories as explanations of gang membership. There is a brief comparison of the effects of peer delinquency with the variables drawn from control theories.

Given the assumptions made by social control theorists that crime is an expression of human instincts, crime or deviance is viewed as naturally occurring. What requires an explanation, therefore, is conformity or obedience to rules. Hirschi (1969) noted that that question is not “Why do they commit crimes?” Instead, we should ask why do law-abiding people or non-criminals obey the rules? Hirschi’s answer for the question of conformity is the presence (or absence) of four types of social bonds: attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief.

Durkheim’s work has a key influence on Hirschi’s social control theory. Much of Durkheim’s sociological theory can be seen as a reply to the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, who believed that the state of nature was brutal and could only be restrained by fear and

by power exercised by the state. Durkheim attempted to show that there are other controls on the behavior of people besides fear.

Durkheim [1961] stressed that rules automatically develop when people combine or join together in groups. When people gather to form societies, most people have to accept the rules of their society, and they take pleasure in obeying the rules, principally by receiving rewards for being obedient. (Higher status individuals obtain the education and occupational training which will reward them with security and recognition.) Society, with its rules and restrictions, arises automatically according to Durkheim. People become quickly attached to other people because of the awareness that greater power and strength comes through cooperation. While some contemporary sociologists dismiss Durkheim as naïve and idealistic, Durkheim was, in fact, well aware of the desire for power. Durkheim did not attribute social solidarity to some altruistic concern for others, but rather as the desire for strength and security.

However, Durkheim did such a good job of accounting for or replying to Hobbes's philosophy, that he had no way to account for deviant or criminal behavior in his earliest publications. (Durkheim had stated that people naturally cooperate with others.) To overcome this problem, Durkheim argued that deviance is due to a societal breakdown, an unnatural state of "anomie" (or a lack of rules). In this unnatural state of anomie, the individual recognizes no other rules of behavior than those based on self-interest.

Hobbes argued that the desire for power must be controlled by the state. Similarly, Durkheim argued that ambition --- or unlimited desires --- are restrained by society or must be regulated. But when society breaks down or becomes disorganized, individual ambition may become unlimited or unrestrained. Durkheim described or characterized disorganized societies as entities wherein people aspire for everything and are satisfied with nothing (an observation that some would consider appropriate for today's society).

Classical psychologists such as Freud emphasized the need to control the id, a reservoir of instincts, desire, and aggression. The impulses of the id play the same role in Freudian psychology as ambition does in Durkheim's theory and the desire for power in Hobbes's philosophy. All three of these perspectives describe a similar motivation or driving force for destructive and criminal behavior that is common to all people, and this constant and universal motivation is a basic assumption of control theory.

Control theorists describe the motivation for crime and deviance as intrinsic to human nature; for control theorists, the motivation to commit crime is a constant across all people. The important difference that distinguishes individual behavior is the strength of the forces that restrain or inhibit deviance. A basic assumption of control theorists is that crime will occur whenever the bond to society is weakened or broken. It is the bonds or links to society that vary in strength for different people. The more loosely or weakly that the individual is tied to society, the more likely they are to deviate. More specifically or precisely than many other control theorists, Hirschi (1969) identified the ties to society in terms of four types of restraints or social bonds to others: attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief.

### Attachment

Hirschi's conception of attachment draws directly on Durkheim's observation (in *Moral Education*, [1961]) that "we are moral beings only to the extent we are social beings." If slightly rephrased, a better translation might be that "we are moral beings only to the extent we are attached to something outside ourselves"; we need to have ties or bonds to society or, more simply, to other people. The concept of attachment is based on one of the most common observations or conclusions about deviant behavior, namely that those committing deviant acts are likely to be isolated from others. Those who engage in crime and delinquency are more likely to be emotionally detached or to feel little affection or love for others.

The concept of attachment is similar to concepts such as the conscience or superego. Hirschi (1969: 16) defines attachment as sensitivity to the opinion of others. The significance or strength of this social bond of attachment is illustrated by studies of high levels of achievement (as opposed to studies of deviant behavior). Hirschi notes that people with high levels of occupational and educational achievement tend to have strong attachments to others (or a strong "superego") with strong family relationships and friendships. The strength of attachment is even illustrated by the guilt and remorse of those who violate the rules, in spite of their ties and concerns for other people.

### Commitment

A useful way to think about "commitment," the second bond in Hirschi's social control theory, is that people have a rational investment in conformity. In contrast, Hirschi (1969) states that the idea underlying attachment is that people have emotional ties to other people. For example, they want to be thought well of by others, or they want others to have a good opinion of them. They do not want to hurt other people by embarrassing them by deviant acts. Hirschi argues that the social bond of attachment is a somewhat irrational force, in the sense that self-interest does not act as the guiding factor in determining an individual's behavior.

In contrast, the social bond labeled "commitment" emphasizes the degree to which people are tied to society for selfish and rational reasons. Few would deny that people do on occasion obey rules solely out of fear of the negative consequences (some slow down in driving when they see a police car). This rational calculation in Hirschi's version of social control theory is termed "commitment." Just as people have more or less attachment to others, so do they have varying levels of commitment or "stakes in conformity." The more that a person has invested in some conventional activity – such as getting an education, or building up a legitimate business, or acquiring a reputation for integrity – the more that a person risks losing by engaging in crime. Rational individuals supposedly weigh the potential and rewards of deviance as well as consider the costs or risks they run of losing investments. Another useful way to think about the social bond of commitment is that we acquire things and prospects that are society's insurance policy that people will obey the rules.

### Involvement

The third social bond in Hirschi's (1969) version of control theory is termed "involvement," or time spent in conventional activities. To the extent that individuals are absorbed or engrossed in conventional activities, they should be less likely to engage in crime. The assumption underlying this social bond is based on common sense reasoning that a person may be too busy doing conventional or law abiding activities to find time to engage in crime or deviance. A person who is involved in conventional activities is tied to certain deadlines, dates, working hours, and plans. These conventional activities may be so highly structured and demanding that the opportunity for deviant acts is reduced significantly.

The effect of involvement on crime and delinquency has been somewhat limited; in empirical research, including Hirschi's (1969), one of the few measures of involvement shown to be a deterrent to delinquency has been time spent on homework (Williams and McShane, 2004). Hirschi observes that when you consider many forms of delinquency, many such acts take only a matter of seconds to commit. Some deviant acts can be carried out as part of conventional activities, such as shoplifting in the course of otherwise legal and conventional shopping, or embezzlement committed by a bank employee in the course of an otherwise routine work day. Other deviant acts may take much longer and they may require that conventional routines be modified substantially, such as by drug addiction. The utility of the concept of involvement, however, needs to be questioned when so many deviant acts take so little time and effort away from conventional activities.

### Belief

The fourth type of social bond in Hirschi's (1969) version of control theory is termed "belief," or the degree to which people have faith in common values and institutions, such as rules that stealing is wrong or that the police are fair. Control theorists such as Hirschi assume that there is a common value system, or that all people have the same beliefs about what is right and wrong, or what is good and desirable behavior and what is not.

The question then becomes, why do people violate the rules in which they believe? It is assumed by control theorists that people have been socialized (with more or less success) into a group or society with a single, common set of values or rules. This may seem to create a logical dilemma for control theorists: how can a person break the rules even when he knows this is wrongful behavior (or how can a person steal when he believes that it is wrong to steal)? If we take the classic example of the starving person stealing a loaf of bread, then it is easy to understand that the motivation to steal is compelling or demanding. The starving person can still believe that it is wrong to steal in principle or generally.

Control theorists assume that the motivation to commit crime is a universal and that criminals and non-criminals believe that rule violations are wrong. If these assumptions are correct, how do control theorists account for deviance? Control theorists have taken two approaches to this problem or question (Hirschi, 1969). One approach simply states that beliefs are merely words that have little substantive meaning or influence on behavior. A criminal may know that crime is wrong and hurtful, and they will even state this is true; and

yet they still will commit the crime.

A second, perhaps more sophisticated approach, states that the offender can rationalize his behavior. This permits the offender to both violate the rules and to maintain his faith or allegiance to the rules. Sykes and Matza (1957) detail the process of rationalizing rule violations in their well known work on “techniques of neutralization.” One technique of neutralization is termed “denial of responsibility,” wherein the offender claims that he has been forced or propelled into crime by forces beyond his control, outside of himself. The offender can claim that he is not responsible for his behavior because his parents do not provide love and affection, or that his companions led him astray. Criminology textbook authors state such things about the causes of crime, so it may be easy to conceive that the offender will adopt these textbook justifications or rationalizations himself. Offenders frequently do adopt a “billiard ball” conception of the self, wherein the individual is driven by forces beyond his control.

### Self-Control

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) developed their general theory of crime as an extension of Hirschi’s (1969) earlier social control theory. It is clear that both the elements of attachment and commitment are incorporated into the general theory. One of the elements of low self-control is the tendency “to be self-centered, indifferent, or insensitive” to other people and their needs (1990:89). Those with low self-control also lack cognitive or academic skills and they lack investment in jobs, marriages, family, or friends. Both lack of attachment and commitment are key elements of self-control.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) define the elements of self-control in direct relationship to the characteristics of crime. Crime provides immediate gratification of desires, so those with low self-control are oriented to immediate satisfaction rather than deferred gratification. Crimes “provide money without work, sex without courtship, revenge without court delays” (1990:89).

Gottfredson and Hirschi describe criminal acts as exciting, risky, or thrilling; crimes may often involve danger and the use of deception and power. Those who lack self-control tend to be risk takers and physical and adventuresome. People with high levels of self-control tend to be more cautious and cognitive, deliberating the consequences of different courses of action.

Criminal acts typically involve little skill or planning, with armed robberies often entailing less than an hour of planning, for example. Those with low levels of self-control do not tend to have or value cognitive or academic skills. Those with high levels of self-control tend to have above average academic skills and grades in school.

Many crimes may be a means to seek relief from irritation or situational frustrations, such as dealing with a crying child or taunting by a stranger in a bar. People with low levels of self-control have little tolerance of frustrations or irritations, and often lack the verbal

ability to resolve disputes peacefully and resort to physical ways to resolve conflicts.

A substantial body of research has focused on the general theory and the concept of self-control. Meta-analyses of much of this research over the past two decades by Pratt and Cullen (2000) and by Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2004) have confirmed hypotheses based on Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory and the predictive value of self-control. Recent research by Chapple (2005) and Burt et al (2006) has found that self-control is linked to both delinquent behavior and to relationships with delinquent peers. Using data collected in a survey of Ukrainian adult respondents, Antonaccio and Tittle (2008) find considerable support for the link between self-control and crime, though measures of "morality" or beliefs and principles were also strongly correlated with criminal behavior. The Ukrainian study illustrates the cross-cultural validity of the general theory of crime, which has been confirmed in research in other countries (see Pratt and Cullen, 2000).

LeBlanc (2006) emphasizes the compatibility of social control and self-control theories, although much work remains to be done in assessing the various versions of control perspectives in a developmental and environmental or community context. Most of the empirical work on self-control and social control theories has been done separately, with little attempt to integrate or contrast the two versions of control theory. LeBlanc (2006) points out that Gottfredson and Hirschi have predicted that self-control is a sufficient cause of crime, and that all other factors operate through their effect on levels of self-control. Hence, holding constant levels of self-control should eliminate the effects of all other factors, including those elements specified in Hirschi's (1969) earlier version of social control theory.

#### Data and Measures

The data used in this paper are taken from a 2006 survey of high school students in a large metropolitan area in Canada. We obtained signed parental consent from more than six hundred ( $n = 618$ ) students who completed questionnaires. The respondents were selected for participation in the study based on random sampling of names from class lists provided by the schools.

The representativeness of the sample was assessed by comparing the age and gender composition of the sample and the school population. We obtained data on the school population demographic profile from local school boards; in terms of age and gender composition, the sample and the school population are very similar. For example, slightly more than half (52.1%) of the school population was female, and nearly the same percentage (52.8%) of the sample were female students.

A self-reported measure of gang membership was used in the analyses. Respondents were asked, "Do you belong to what some people might call a youth gang?" This measure replicates the item on gang membership used in the Seattle Youth Study (Hindelang et al, 1981). It is similar or identical to measures of gang membership used in several previous studies (see, eg, Esbensen and Winfree, 1998; Brownfield, 2006). Peer delinquency was measured by asking respondents, "Have any of your best friends ever been picked up by the police?"

Several indices based on multiple items were created to construct measures of attachment, commitment, involvement, belief, and self-control. Latent class models (McCutcheon, 1987) were fit to the observed measures to construct the scales or indices. For the measure of attachment, a scale was created based on the following three items: (1) "Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your mother?"; (2) "Would you like to be the kind of person your father is?"; and (3) "If you got into trouble with the police, would your mother be hurt by this?" A latent class model provided a good fit ( $L^2 = 9.73$ ,  $df = 11$ ,  $p > .10$ ) to the observed measures, indicating that a scale of attachment can be created.

The measure of commitment was based on a set of four observed measures that focus on stakes in conformity regarding education and occupational aspiration. The four observed measures were: (1) "How important would you say that getting good grades are to your satisfaction?"; (2) "Compared to other students, how do you rate yourself in the school work you do?"; (3) "How important would you say that getting good grades are to your parents?"; and (4) "How important would you say your grades are to getting the kind of job you want?" A latent class model provided an excellent fit ( $L^2 = 7.15$ ,  $df = 15$ ,  $p > .10$ ), indicating that these four items can be combined into a single index or measure of commitment.

As noted previously, Hirschi (1969) concedes that there is relatively limited empirical support for the element or bond of involvement. One of the few measures of involvement or time spent in conventional activities that has been found to be significantly correlated with delinquency is time spent on homework. Only a single item ("On the average, how much time to you spend doing homework (ie, outside school)?") was used as a measure of involvement. The respondents indicated a range of time spent on homework, from "none" to "three or more hours daily."

The social bond of belief is very similar to Sutherland's concept of "definitions favorable to law violation" (Costello and Vowell, 1999; Liska and Messner, 1999). Three observed items that assess instrumental attitudes toward the law were used in the latent class analysis: (1) "To get what you want in this world, you have to do some things which are against the law"; (2) "Suckers deserve to be taken advantage of"; and (3) "It's all right to get around the law if you can get away with it." Each of these three items was measured using Likert scale responses, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." These observed measures provided a good fit ( $L^2 = 18.21$ ,  $df = 12$ ,  $p > .10$ ), indicating that a single index of belief can be constructed.

The measure of self-control is derived from an index of items that describe impulsivity, diligence, and risk-taking, based on Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) description of this characteristic. A latent class model was fit to create a scale based on the following five items: (1) "I find it difficult to concentrate at times"; (2) "I like to do things that are exciting and even dangerous"; (3) "I get bored very easily"; (4) school grade point average; and (5) "I have a great deal of affection or love for my father."



Four of the five items (with the exception of school grade point average) were measured with Likert scale responses ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The measure of grade point average was based on a scale ranging from excellent (or “A”) to below average (or “D” or lower). Measures of paternal affection and school grades were reverse coded to be consistent with the other three measures of self-control. A latent class model provides a good fit ( $L^2 = 27.63$ ,  $df = 22$ ,  $p > .10$ ) for these observed measures assessing various aspects of self-control, including impulsivity, risk-taking, and diligence.

### Analysis

In Table 1, the bivariate correlations between gang membership and the indices based on self-control and social control theory are presented. The table also includes bivariate correlations for the measure of peer delinquency. The strongest correlate of gang membership, though only by a slight margin, is peer delinquency ( $r = .31$ ). The indices of belief ( $r = -.30$ ) and commitment ( $r = -.26$ ) are nearly as strongly correlated with gang membership as is peer delinquency. The social control theory measures of involvement ( $r = .13$ ) and attachment ( $r = .16$ ) are moderately but significantly correlated with gang membership. The index of self-control is also moderately but significantly correlated with gang membership ( $r = -.17$ ).

Table 1. Correlation Matrix of Social Control, Self-Control, Peer Delinquency, and Gang Membership

	Gang	Attachment	Commitment	Involvement	Belief	Self-Control
Attachment	.16	1.00				
Commitment	.26	.18	1.00			
Involvement	.13	.003*	.22	1.00		
Belief	-.30	-.22	-.25	-.13	1.00	
Self-Control	-.17	-.10	-.12	-.05*	.24	1.00
Peer Delinquency	.31	.15	.17	.14	-.33	-.17

\* Not significant at .05 level

Self-control is also significantly related to three of the four indices based on social control theory; only time spent on homework or “involvement” is not significantly correlated with the index of self-control. If self-control is to provide a full account of the effect of other factors (as Gottfredson and Hirschi predicted), significant associations between the self-control measure and these other factors should be expected.

In Table 2, the multivariate analysis of how measures based on social control theory, the self-control index, and peer delinquency affect gang membership is presented. In the logistic regression, peer delinquency ( $B = .85$ ) again appears to be the strongest correlate

of gang membership. Controlling for self-control and social control theory indices, the odds on gang membership increase by more than two-fold ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 2.34$ ) if the respondent has had a best friend who has been picked up by the police. The index for attachment and the measure of involvement (or time spent on homework) are not significantly related to gang membership, controlling for the other control theory indices and peer delinquency.

The index of self-control remains a significant predictor of gang membership in the multivariate analysis ( $B = -.64$ ). The odds or probability of gang membership is reduced significantly among those with higher levels of self-control. Similarly, the indices of belief and commitment remain significant predictors of gang membership in the multivariate analysis summarized in Table 2. Those who express an instrumental attitude towards the law are more likely to be members of gangs ( $B = -.51$ ). Those with higher levels of commitment or stakes in conformity are less likely ( $B = -.34$ ) to be gang members.

Table 2. Logistic Regression of Gang Membership on Social Control, Self-Control, and Peer Delinquency

	B	SE	Sig.	Exp(B)
Self-Control	-.64	.31	.05	.53
Attachment	-.11	.14	.43	.89
Commitment	.34	.15	.02	1.40
Involvement	.30	.48	.53	1.35
Belief	-.51	.14	.01	.61
Peer Delinquency	.85	.21	.01	2.34
(constant)	-1.06	.89	.36	

Model chi-square = 101.39, 6 df,  $p < .001$

### Conclusion

Measures based on social control theory, such as the indices of belief and commitment, are significant predictors of gang membership. The results do not support Gottfredson and Hirschi's hypothesis that the effects of other factors will be eliminated by controlling for the effects of self-control. The index of self-control is a significant, negative correlate of gang membership, controlling for the traditional social control theory measures and peer delinquency; however, self-control does not eliminate the effects of other variables. Peer delinquency remains the strongest correlate or predictor of gang membership.

It is likely that a model that integrates or combines variables derived from various versions of control theory and differential association theory will be needed to provide a more complete explanation of gang membership. These results are consistent with prior research that documents support for an eclectic theoretical approach in criminology and the study of gangs.

## REFERENCES

- Antonaccio, Olena and Charles Tittle. 2008. "Morality, Self-Control, and Crime." *Criminology* 46:479-510.
- Brownfield, David. 2006. "A Defiance Theory of Sanctions and Gang Membership." *Journal of Gang Research* 4:31-43.
- Burt, Callie, Ronald Simons, and Leslie Simons. 2006. "A Longitudinal Test of the Effects of parenting and the Stability of Self-Control: Negative Evidence for the General Theory of Crime." *Criminology* 44:353-396.
- Chapple, Constance. 2005. "Self-Control, Peer Relations, and Delinquency." *Justice Quarterly* 22:89-106.
- Costello, Barbara and Paul Vowell. 1999. "Testing Control Theory and Differential Association: A Reanalysis of the Richmond Youth Project Data." *Criminology* 37:815-842.
- Durkheim, Emile. [1961]. *Moral Education*. Tr. By Everett Wilson and Herman Schnurer. New York: Free Press.
- Esbensen, Finn and L.T. Winfree. 1998. "Race and Gender Differences Between Gang and Nongang Youths." *Justice Quarterly* 15:505-523.
- Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hanson, R. Karl and Kelly Morton-Bourgon. 2004. *Predictors of Sexual Recidivism*. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Hindelang, Michael, Travis Hirschi, and Joseph Weis. 1981. *Measuring Delinquency*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- LeBlanc, Marc. 2006. "Self-Control and Social Control of Deviant Behavior in Context." Pp. 195-242 in *The Explanation of Crime*, (ed.) Per-Olof Wikstrom and Robert Sampson. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Liska, Allen and Steven Messner. 1999. *Perspectives on Crime and Deviance*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- McCutcheon, Allan. 1987. *Latent Class Analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Nye, F. Ivan. 1958. *Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Pratt, Travis and Francis Cullen. 2000. "The Empirical Status of Gottfredson And Hirschi's General Theory of Crime: A Meta-Analysis." *Criminology* 38:931-964.
- Reiss, Albert. 1951. "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls." *American Sociological Review* 16:196-207.
- Sykes, Gresham and David Matza. 1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22:664-667.
- Toby, Jackson. 1957. "Social Disorganization and Stake in Conformity." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 48:12-17.
- Warr, Mark. 2002. *Companions in Crime*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Frank and Marilyn McShane. 2004. *Criminological Theory*.

Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

#### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

David Brownfield is an Associate Professor at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. He has studied patterns of gang membership and gang crime, and violence and drug use among adolescents; recent research has focused on young offenders and adult offenders receiving treatment through drug courts. He teaches courses in criminology, advanced data analysis, and delinquency.