Chapter 6. Sociological Theories of Drug Abuse

Introduction

This chapter discusses sociological theories of substance use and abuse. For our purposes, sociological theories understand substance abuse as a societal phenomenon, having largely cultural, social, and economic origins or ties. Such causes are often external to the individual, i.e., they are not biological, genetic or psychological traits possessed by them. Instead, these theories direct our attention away from individuals to both the immediate and more distant social worlds around them.

This approach to substance abuse differs dramatically from that discussed in the previous chapter. There, you learned about micro-level theories, which explain drug-related matters using characteristics or experiences of individuals. Such explanations are attractive, for many reasons, to both researchers and policy makers. For example, by focusing on individuals, micro-level theories (e.g., social-psychological theories) lend themselves better to traditional scientific methods, e.g., quantitative studies using surveys and questionnaires administered to students, adolescents or drug offenders. The people under study are often targeted directly by anti-drug programs and social policy. At times, sociologists use them to understand substance use and abuse as well.

Another important quality of micro-level theories is that they often, but not always, identify causes (i.e., independent variables) immediately preceding drug-related behaviors, instead of focusing on more distant precursors of them. For example, poor decision-making skills (a commonly cited cause in social psychological research), occurs in close proximity to drug taking, e.g., people make "poor" decisions when they use drugs. Factors like this are perceived as a more "direct" cause of drug use, making them attractive to policy makers when

fashioning interventions.

Flay and colleagues call the factors immediately preceding or most directly linked to the behavior under investigation "proximal causes," and claim they are among those most important in understanding why people use and abuse drugs. "Distal" and "ultimate" causes, they maintain, are more removed from immediate behavior but also have an important impact on it. Typically, distal and ultimate causes are more sociological in nature. This chapter discusses these more distal and ultimate causes.

Sociological theories utilize broader and often more abstract phenomena and concepts to explain drug and alcohol use and abuse. Causality becomes more difficult to establish as researchers attempt to measure more abstract concepts and to specify their direct and indirect ties to behaviors that may occur long before drugs are bought or consumed. Inequality (usually economic) is one such concept. In some form, it is a component of several theories of drug abuse, however, it's place in the causal chain and its measurement differ among them. We will discuss this point more below.

Two other matters contribute to the lesser utility of sociological theories in drugs research and policy. One pertains to the types of methods used by sociologists, which have been both consistent with and more removed from the conventions of natural science. For example, ethnographies (i.e., investigation that takes place where people of interest and behaviors exist) of certain locations, drugs and groups (e.g., studies of inner-city crack users in Harlem or heroin users in Chicago) have been utilized to inform sociological theories, in addition to the more quantitative survey approach. Furthermore, many sociological theories, as we will learn here, often identify how other social problems, e.g., poverty, inequality, social disorganization, explain the prevalence of drug use and abuse in society or individuals' gravitation to it. These problems

are not only difficult for researchers to study, but also challenging for policy makers to address. Moreover, the solutions they often advocate might not be popular with the public or government officials.

Sociological definitions of drug and alcohol abuse

Understanding how phenomena such as drug and alcohol use and abuse are defined is important in helping us to discover explanations and creating social policies. Thus, it is important to note that sociologists utilize a somewhat different approach in defining drug use and abuse than scholars from the fields of biology, pharmacology, and psychology– which were reviewed in the last chapter and earlier in the book.

Sociologists tend to focus more on the social meaning of drugs and alcohol, norms and patterns regarding their consumption in certain settings, and consequences resulting therefrom. They typically do not focus on genetic predispositions, chemical imbalances, neurological processes, or personality traits. For example, Anderson (1998) articulated a more sociological definition in her cultural identity theory (see more below).

(1) a pattern of regular and heavy use over a significant period of time, (2) a set of drug-related problems (at work, or with interpersonal relationships, one's own health, and formal social control agencies), (3) previous and failed attempts to terminate drug consumption, and (4) self-awareness as having a drug and/or alcohol problem.

Another important point is that few theories from any discipline, including sociology, have done a good job explaining the differences between drug or alcohol use, abuse, or addiction. Earlier in this book, we discussed these varied terms. Yet, drugs and alcohol theories do not always specify which they seek to explain. Often by sin of omission, they assume one theory explains all substance abuse behaviors and consequences. This is problematic, because it

compromises our ability to more fully understand what we seek to explain and remedy.

Part of this problem may stem from our society's strategy in addressing the drug problem. For more than 25 years now (see the History chapter), the U.S. has waged a punitive War on Drugs that locates drug problems within the individual and targets zero tolerance of drug use. Thus, it has been interested in explaining **any use** of drugs, because **any use** is deemed undesirable and problematic. What this means is that research – to a large extent– has focused on explaining **any use**, rather than distinguishing between use, abuse, and tolerance, dependence and addiction. Finally, there is a notion that use of illicit drugs leads to abuse of harder ones (via the gateway theory– see below). Thus researchers have assumed that explanations for the use of drugs will also be valid for the abuse of or addiction to them. However, Males (1997, p.5) reminds us:

> Current drug policy ignores the lessons of the 1960s: Moderate drug, particularly marijuana, experimentation is normal and widespread among the young– and will abate without frantic suppression measures. However, the smaller number of habitual users of harder drugs and multiple drugs require urgent and focused attention regardless of their ages.

Sociologists have also made this assumption. The theories we discuss below, for example, tend to assume, by sin of omission, that the factors explaining drug use will also work to explain abuse and addiction. Even more problematic is that many theories used to explain drug use are more general theories of crime and deviance. Thus, they do not theorize drug use or alcohol use or abuse as independent phenomena worthy of separate explanation. They consider it a form of deviance that can be explained and understood by a more general deviance theory. The first few theories we review adopt this general deviance approach in understanding

substance abuse.

Origins of Substance Abuse Theories

Before we discuss specific theories, it is useful to review the major under-pinnings of these three paradigms since their tenets shape the theories below and offer us a way to identify both common ground and differences among them. At a basic level, sociology categorizes theory into the structural-functional, social-conflict, and symbolic interactionist paradigms. Many different theories map onto these three paradigms, including those we review in this chapter.

Structural-Functionalism. The structural-functional paradigm- credited largely to August Comte, Emile Durkheim, and Talcott-Parsons– adopts a macro (broad focus on structures that shape society as whole) view of society as a complex system whose parts work together to promote solidarity and stability. Humans are believed to be able to thrive under these conditions. The focus is on society as an entity that can flourish, making things like unity, cohesiveness, stability, and order fundamental necessities for social existence. Chaos, instability, and alienation disrupt society's functioning and are considered undesirable.

A second important proposition is that consensus about morality and values and conformity to norms are necessities for society's smooth functioning. Consensus and conformity ensures, according to structural-functionalists, solidarity and stability. Conflict and deviation challenge those things. Thus, while some conflict and deviation can be expected, especially as societies grow and become more complex, too much conflict and deviation will hinder solidarity and stability and thus throw society into a state of chaos. Structural-functionalists maintain that dysfunction and alienation in society's components fosters alienation or anomie, which can become a motivator for conflict, deviance and chaos.

These themes and presumptions about solidarity or bonding, alienation and stability will appear frequently below. This is because several theories– social and self-control, social disorganization, and anomie and strain theory and social capital theory, all contain some allegiance to them. Thus, while we have been critical here about the inability of theories to distinguish drug use from other types of deviance, an important point is that sociological theories of drug use begin by viewing drug use as a form of deviance that potentially disrupts the functioning of society. Another central theme is that understanding and combating deviance, like substance abuse, requires attention to individuals' and groups' places and integration in society.

Symbolic Interactionism. Unlike the structural-functionalist and social-conflict paradigms, the symbolic interactionist perspective takes a more micro-level orientation to deviance and drugs, or a more close-up focus on social interaction in specific situations. It sees society as a product of the everyday interactions of individuals. Thus, society and reality are what people make them.

This latter point earmarks a critical tenet of interactionism; that realities and society are created or socially constructed by individuals. What is required for these constructions? At one level, consensus or shared meaning. Therefore, like structural-functionalism, symbolic-interactionism embraces the idea of consensus. However, since the social construction of symbols can vary dramatically among individuals and groups, symbolic interactionism also acknowledges variation and conflict.

The social construction of reality is important in understanding deviance like drug use. According to interactionists, deviance is what is so labeled, or what people say it is. It does not exist objectively or naturally. Thus, nothing is inherently deviant or wrong. Such designations

are socially defined by people, who reach those conclusions via shared and contested views of the world, society, and their own lived experience. This point was made earlier in the history chapter, which reviewed the changing legal definitions of drug use over time. By showing that some drugs were once accepted and legal to consume only later to be criminalized, we demonstrated at a basic level the inner propositions of symbolic-interactionism: the social reality, meaning, and reaction to drugs and alcohol have changed over time.

The social process theories, like labeling theory below, and part of Anderson's cultural identity theory, adhere to the interactionist tradition. While social control theory is listed in the social process theory section, many believe it originates from structural-functionalism instead. Both are "process" theories in that they are concerned with how people interact and how deviance and drug use unfold over time.

The Social-Conflict Paradigm. Unlike the two prior paradigms which embrace the idea of consensus, social-conflict theories view society as an arena of inequality and conflict. At times, some interactionist work assumed the same (cites from Cynthia). Conflict arises over disparities in material (e.g., wealth, property) and immaterial resources (i.e., power, ideology, group identity). Conflict theorists are macro-oriented like structural-functionalists, albeit they are nearly opposite on how that structure originates and functions. For conflict theorists, society's structure is controlled by those with the greatest economic, social, and cultural assets. This "capital" enables them to rise to positions of power in the public and private sectors, where they continue to create structures that perpetuate their power and interests. Social reproduction theory, discussed below, is a good example of these ideas, although it also integrates elements of symbolic interactionism into its theoretical approach.

For conflict theorists, deviance is theorized as a response to the alienating conditions of

material and immaterial inequality and group (e.g., ethnic and racial minorities) marginalization. While it is true that not all individuals experience inequality and marginalization and resort to deviance to remedy their situations, conflict theorists argue that those who do so are either actively engaged in changing systems of inequality and related government policies or resisting the status quo via adopting alternative lifestyles and defiant identities. Two modern day examples of conflict theory's utility in the drugs debate is official lobbying by harm reduction supporters to decriminalize marijuana in favor of individual's rights to consume it and gang members who claim to sell drugs to empower themselves, their families and their communities.

In the paragraphs below, we review the leading sociological theories of substance abuse, tying them to these three larger paradigms as appropriate. Our discussion covers each theory's ideas about the causes and development of substance abuse, mostly as a form of deviance. It also examines their policy implications and their limitations. We begin with the social process theories.

Social Process Theories

Social process or socialization theories focus on how people or groups become involved with drugs and alcohol, how their involvement changes over time, and what might initiate that change. Process theories are developmental in the sense that they identify key factors over a period of time, one demarcated by social boundaries and meanings leading to drug and alcohol-related behaviors and consequences. Both social process theories discussed in this section– labeling theory and social control theory– adopt the structural functionalist tenets about consensus and solidarity.

These theories emerged in the sociology of deviance literature years ago, which was, early on, interested in the process of becoming deviant. Thus, social process theories like

labeling theory, are really theories of deviant behavior and identification. Consequently, drug use was simply a way to learn about more generic deviance processes.

Distinguishing qualities of social process theories are the questions asked and addressed and definitions of drug-related phenomena to be explained. To begin, social process theories have attempted to explain a more wide-ranging set of drug-related dependent variables that are sociological in nature. For example, labeling theory and symbolic interactionism have been concerned with the formation and transformation of deviant identities (e.g., becoming a drug user, addict, or recovering alcoholic), roles and behaviors. Thus, social process theories can be used to explain diverse conceptual phenomena which can teach us about many different aspects of the drugs and alcohol experience and larger sociological concepts in general. Other sociological theories we consider here have adopted a more limited focus on drug-related behaviors.

Labeling Theory and Deviant Roles, Careers, and Identities.

Symbolic interactionists, like Hughes, Becker, Lemert, Goffman, Matza, Brown, Denzin etc., have traditionally maintained that deviance, such as drug and alcohol use and abuse, could best be understood as a type of "career," or a set of behaviors, roles, and identities that comprise a lifestyle, running counter to conventional society in some ways and consistent in others. In short, deviance, like drug use, was best understood as a phenomenon that changed over time, with a beginning or entry point and often a desistance or end point. The "middle" period featured enmeshment in deviance, with the adoption of drug-related roles and identities. Their concept of "career" embodies this notion of deviance as a lifestyle, with fluctuations over time.

While interactionists and labeling scholars did not theorize directly about physical dependency or drug use consumption, they presumed a more social escalation in a drug lifestyle

or career via labeling, stigma, role-taking and identity change. Original drug use (i.e., primary deviance) was something interactionists did not write much about. They were more concerned about the social reaction (i.e., people, officials, agencies, etc.) to drug use, which they viewed as the most critical factor in influencing one's career with drugs or any other type of deviance.

Interactionists maintain that negative social reactions (label or stigma) to individual drug use facilitated more, not less, drug use because individuals would likely internalize the negative labels applied to them and persist in deviant activities. In other words, when people are labeled and assumed to possess the negative traits that accompany the substance abuser stigmas, their deviant careers expanded because they accept society's pejorative view of them. They called this the self-fulfilling prophecy (Cooley, Lemert). The internalization of negative labels, leads to adopting deviant roles (i.e., tasks, behaviors) and identities (definitions of the self).

When individuals adopt deviant identities or roles, they become greatly enmeshed in deviant careers. Thus, the so-called middle period of the deviant career features heavy engagement in deviant behaviors and related activities. This has deeply concerned both scholars and policy-makers, who are interested in understanding and circumventing the experiences, activities, and consequences of active involvement in the illicit drug world, heavy alcohol consumption, or both.

One of the most influential studies of the addict's middle career was offered by Stephens (1991). His work on the drug addict role documented the daily routines of addicts, which included serious involvement in a wide range of deviant and criminal activities required for living the drug lifestyle. He argued that the drug addict role was a master status in a deviant subculture, that featured a unique street language, manipulation of others, and an anti-social viewpoint in addition to the criminal activity.

Later on scholars such as Hamid (1996), Dunlap (get years here), Bourgois (1996), Miller (2000) and others noted that while drug users committed lots of problematic behaviors during their active using careers, they also managed to remain tied to the conventional world in some capacity. Most financed their drug and alcohol use via a combination of legal and illegal activities and retained connections and relationships to conventional others (e.g. family and friends).

Deviant Career Entry and Exit. Becker's classic study "Becoming a Marijuana Smoker" described how one started using marijuana via learning to perceive the effects of being high. Thus, while many believe that "feeling" or "being" high is an automatic or natural phenomena, Becker's work taught us that perceiving the effects of drugs is a social process that includes embracing shared meanings about marijuana's effects. This is consistent with the interactionist premise that all social phenomena and meaning are socially constructed.

Scholars have propose that social "awareness" of a drug's effects could act as an important step in launching a drug career, because it exposed and connected the novice user to reward and more experienced others who may be part of a drug subculture. Later work by interactionists would specify other phenomena that would demarcate entry into drug using careers. Classic studies by Biernacki (1996) and Waldorf et al. (1991) established identity issues (a desire for change) as important to drug career entry. Anderson (1998a; 1998b) added personal and social marginalization and identity complications as still other important influences. *** add examples and cites on alcohol via Denzin- per Cynthia's suggestion***

Labeling and Adopting the Drug Addict Role. With continued drug use and acceptance of the deviant label, individuals began adopting drug addict and alcoholic roles and identities. This transition indicates that drugs have become much more than substances one can chose to

use. Drug addict and alcoholic roles and identities imply that substances have become a more all-encompassing activity around which the self is organized (roles) and defined (identities). Thus, termination from drug-taking behavior requires a redefinition of the self (Denzin and Anderson) and adoption of dramatically different roles (Stephens, Anderson).

Becoming and "Ex:" Terminating Drug Use. Research has found that drug careers come to an end in many different ways. People terminate their drug use voluntarily, under pressure from others, or by some external force (e.g., arrest and incarceration). Much work has documented the role of substance abuse treatment programs in bringing about drug use cessation. We discuss these more in chapter X. Other work describes the impact of formal social control (arrest, probation, imprisonment) in achieving the same. Some "controversial" studies have demonstrated that people also desist using drugs on their own without much fuss or intervention from others. There is no firm estimate of which avenue is more common than the others. However, most studies have found pathways out of drug and alcohol abuse vary somewhat by race, class, and gender (see more below).

Interactionist-based work on the termination of a drug use has centered on leaving the alcoholic or addict role or in transforming the addict or alcoholic identity. Their work focuses on the processes of role performance and re-defining the self, since the user is– at this stage in the drug or alcohol career– a person whose lifestyle and definition of self revolves around the use of substances. These changes can be initiated by drug treatment, incarceration or some of the other avenues above. However, the contribution of interactionism to terminating serious drug and alcohol use requires altering the roles and identities that one has adopted around it. This, is a very difficult process and may be one of the leading reasons for vacillation back and forth between using and abstinence in the recovery or abstinence process.

Policy Implications of Labeling Theory.

Since the appearance of labeling theory, drug use and abuse and many alcohol-related experiences/problems have fallen under the purview of the U.S.'s punitive war on drugs, largely criminalizing those involved. By waging an all-out war against drugs, the U.S. criminal justice system confers a derogatory label and heavy social stigma on those convicted of drug use and sales. In many respects, this label is irreversible, for it follows felony processing that permanently marks one's record and exacts other social consequence. Other social institutions, like the media, schools, social support agencies etc, follow in endorsing the stigma.

Due to the heavy and wide-ranging consequences of substance use-related stigmas, scholars from the interactionist tradition have called for a wide range of policy options that would reduce the so-called social death that can accompany the formal labeling and penalization of substance users. These policies range from decriminalization of "softer" drugs, like marijuana, to restorative justice or re-integrative shaming programs, which seek to reduce the lasting implications of stigma. For labeling theorists, reducing the severity of the formal social reaction to deviance would reduce the lasting impact of stigma on the so-called deviant or offender. Consistent with this idea would be elimination of mandatory minimums for drug offenses, three-strike felony laws, felony disenfranchisement etc. Decriminalizing some drug offenses, would dramatically resolve the harmful effects of drug-related stigma by removing the criminal label altogether.

Another remedy advocated is the restorative justice approach, which has shown promising results with many types of crime and deviance, not solely substance abuse. It's primary goals are to (1) restore the health of the community following offenses or negative events, (2) repair any injury or harm, (3) remedy the needs of victims' and (4) and force the

offender to participate in this process. Critics complain, however, that restorative justice ignores the very real harm and suffering caused by those offenders .

Other policy implications follow from interactionist work on deviant career entry and exit. First, specification of factors leading to drug use can greatly enhance prevention strategies seeking to eliminate drug use before it ever happens or to halt the adoption of drug-related roles and identities which further enmesh users in problematic drug careers and lifestyles. Second, articulation of drug career exit processes can inform treatment and reintegration efforts with those heavily enmeshed with alcohol and drugs.

Limitations of Labeling Theory. While labeling theory never attempted to explain "why" people initially engaged in deviance, the most common criticism of it has been that it does not explain, for example, why people use drugs or commit crime in the first place. As stated above, theories of substance use have shifted toward explaining initial use partially because of the U.S. war on drugs' goal of zero tolerance. Labeling theory has not attempted to theorize this matter. Thus, many believe its utility is limited.

Perhaps a more contentious criticism is that labeling theory both overestimates AND underestimates the importance of the official labeling process. At face value, the over-estimation charge seems ill-conceived given the heavy criminalization of drug users in the U.S. However, critics note the theory presumes innocent people are arbitrarily stigmatized by an oppressive society and that, as a result, they begin a life of crime. This is not completely accurate, as many scholars have investigated and written about people actively engaged in deviance, which would not include an "innocent" population. Critics also note that the failure of most delinquency to persist into adulthood is yet another example of how labeling theory over-estimates the detrimental effects of labeling and stigma. Research shows many youth do "age-out" of

offending and criminal justice interventions with them are more rehabilitation-oriented. Still, there is no clear sense of how stigma obtained early in life impacts one over the long-term.

As for the under-estimation of stigma's effects, critics charge labeling theorists presume offenders resist deviant labels, accepting them only when they are no longer capable of fighting them. This is, they maintain, an under-estimate, for many people find labels so damaging to their self-esteem, they cannot resist them at all. In short, the extent of the self-fulfilling prophecy is much wider, they maintain, than interactionists contend. *** insert cites here to back up these points***

Social and Self Control Theories

A second popular social process theory is Hirschi's social control theory. It's focus has been almost exclusively on deviant behaviors, such as delinquent acts (theft, vandalism, etc.) and drug use, rather than deviant roles and identities. It does not address the transition from drug use to abuse directly, but unlike interactionist theories, it does explain original or primary deviance.

As a general theory of crime and delinquency, social control theory begins with a rather novel question: Why do people conform? This runs counter to the more common question– why do people deviate or break the law– asked by scholars and policy makers alike.

Intrigued by society's and sociology's innocuous expectation of conformity, Hirschi began theorizing about deviance by assuming people would violate norms and break the law unless they were actively prevented from doing so. The key to such prevention was effective socialization, which was a long process starting in childhood and lasting into adulthood. Thus, social control theory is considered one about process.

Who and what was responsible for this socialization? Hirschi pin-pointed three institutions or entities (i.e., families, peers, and schools) having the most profound impact on

each of our lives, especially as children and adolescents. He argued that close associations with parents and siblings, law-abiding peers, and teachers or other school officials, for example, were required to control individuals' behavior. The establishment of a strong moral bond between the juvenile and society, consisting of an attachment to others, commitment to conventional behavior, involvement in conventional activities, and a belief in the moral order and law, promoted conformity and prevented delinquency. Thus, attachment, commitment, involvement and belief became four elements of a critical moral bond between the individual and society which would guard against deviance.

For Hirschi, delinquent behaviors, like drug use, would be a likely outcome of ineffective ties to these things, i.e., improper socialization. Specifically, it is likely to occur if there is inadequate attachment (to parents and school), inadequate commitment (to educational and occupational success), inadequate involvement in conventional activities (e.g., scouting and sports leagues), and inadequate beliefs in such things as the legitimacy and morality of the law. **need citations of studies testing social bond theory***

While social control theory maintains that all four elements of the bond are important, it prioritizes attachment to conventional others. Recently, Gottfredson and Hirschi have argued that the primary cause of a variety of deviant behaviors, including many different kinds of crime and delinquency, is ineffective bonding with parents or poor child rearing. They maintained this produced people with low self-control. This, in turn, adversely affects a person's ability to accurately calculate the consequences of his or her actions. Because Hirschi believes everyone has a predisposition toward criminality, social control theory proposes that those with low self-control find it more difficult to resist.

Hawkins and Catalano's Social Development theory. An important extension of social

control theory in the area of substance use and abuse is Hawkin and Catalano's social development theory. In addition to elaborating on weak bonds between children, families, and institutions, it also combines insights from social learning and differential association theory to explain adolescent substance use. There is a very large literature supporting Hawkin and Catalano's work. It too was developed via empirical analysis of large national data bases funded, in part, by the Federal government.

Social development theory focuses on the bonds youth develop with those around them, indicating strong ties to social control theory. It is a process-based theory, noting the importance of understanding socialization influences over time. In short, bonds develop between youth and socializing agents (families, school officials etc) around them during adolescent development. Depending on whom the individual bonds with (i.e., law-abiding or deviant adults), will influence their own participation in deviance and drug use. The youth who bond with drug-using adults will likely gravitate into drug use themselves. ** insert examples from empirical studies to support this***

Cultural diversity (race and ethnicity) and demographic group variance (social class, gender, age, geography, birth cohort).***need to develop and complete this section***.

Social Control and Social Policy. Perhaps the most obvious recommendation for social policy emanating from social control theory is improving how young people are socialized. Such efforts must, advocates contend, promote the development of a strong moral bond to society and increased self-control. Resources and programs offering parent training and functional-family therapies facilitate this goal. If children reside in extremely problematic families, group homes and surrogate families might be a necessary option. Finally, other important socialization agencies, like the schools, can make available counseling and problem-

solving and social skills training with "at risk" children.

Limitations. Since social and self control theories have had such a dramatic impact on the study of crime and deviance, they have received considerable criticism. Much of the critique pertains to the research methods used to assess control theories. These debates are important, but are beyond the scope of this text. Students will likely encounter them in research methods and criminological theory classes.

Some of the more substantive concerns pertain to the theory's presumptions about offenders and offending. For example, some criminologists are troubled by the theory's rejection of delinquent motivation. By starting with the premise that all youth will deviate unless they are controlled not to, critics charge social control neglects an important understanding of the origins and variation in criminal motivation.

The theory also does not explain how juveniles are socialized. For example, how are attachments to others produced and changed? This cripples it in explaining delinquency among those "properly" socialized, or conformity by those who are not "properly" socialized. Furthermore, the theory unrealistically assumes people are equally capable of committing crime.

Closely related to this is a problematic assumption that consensus exists in society over moral values and that conflict over them is negligible. This charge is made by more critical and left-oriented scholars. Such scholars are critical of structural-functionalist theories in general, that presume consensus over social life.

Other criticisms of social control theory include its failure to (1) address delinquent peers as an influential factor in commencing substance abuse, (2) explain more serious delinquency or any adult drug use or criminality, (3) consider that society, itself, or at least some aspects of society, may be criminogenic, (4) clarify the causal direction between delinquency and the social

bond (i.e., does weak bonding create delinquency or vice-versa?). Finally, social control theory

has been remiss to investigate variations by geography as well as by demographic subgroup

(race, class, and gender).

Social Learning Theories

Social learning theories have focused on explaining actual drug use, i.e., frequency and

level of drug use. Most of the scholarly work investigating this theory (see below) has utilized a

quantitative survey approach, featuring questions to individuals about the types of drugs they

use, how frequently they use them, and how much of each they use. This research approach is

consistent with the leading indicators of substance use, funded by the federal government (as

discussed in chapter 3).

Social learning theorists have not studied drug-related behaviors or roles and identities of

a deviant lifestyles. In this respect, social learning theories have a more narrow theoretical scope

than other theories reviewed here. Nevertheless, some would argue that they are more useful

since they attempt to explain what policy-makers and the general public care about most: actual

individual drug use. ***cite James Orcutt's research on social learning theory and drinking***

Like the social process theories, most learning theories explain deviance, and maintain

that drug use, as an example of deviance, can be accounted for via a more generic model.

Below, we review the evolution of these theories, beginning with Donald Sutherland's

Differential Association theory and three leading modern-day variations of it.

Differential Association. In the period surrounding the Great Depression (1930s-1940s),

Donald Sutherland articulated a theory of deviance called "differential association" that

attempted to explain new forms of deviance by "unusual" suspects, i.e. people who were

otherwise law-abiding prior to the Great Depression. His theory integrates ideas from both

structural-functionalism and symbolic interactionism by proposing that criminal behavior is learned through a process of associating with others who define law-breaking as desirable. The two key elements here are the definition of law-breaking as favorable and the association with others who adopt such definitions. Sutherland proposed that macro-level factors, like the economic depression of the 1930s and 1940s, altered people's life circumstances and, consequently, their peers and perceptions about the law. In other words, Sutherland proposed it became difficult to maintain favorable opinions of the law and to abide by it when one was out of work and in the bread line.

Rather than theorizing how such macro-level change as the Great Depression directly impacted people, he focused on how normally law-abiding citizens got involved in deviance. He proposed that deviance was learned through a process of interacting with others. In other words, people learned about illegal drug use by associating with others who used them. If the ratio between obeying the law and defying it tilted in the wrong direction, the individual was likely to deviate. Such perspectives would strengthen as the individual got involved with subcultures or groups engaged in deviance. However, people's levels of deviance would vary by the frequency, intensity, and duration of their interactions with others who either promote or discourage crime. Moreover, it also depended on the priority they gave to such relationships and activities.

Sutherland's theory was widely influential at the time and it spawned a great deal of scholarly attention over the years. In fact, differential association and its related theories are still prominent in the study of crime and deviance today. The paragraphs below review two enhancements that specifically targeted drug use by young people.

Differential Reinforcement. Akers (1979) theory of "differential reinforcement" is one major advancement of Sutherland's ideas. It has been especially popular in the drugs and

alcohol field because it has targeted drug use and abuse directly.

Akers used the word "reinforcement" to describe the kinds of tensions and ratios that Sutherland argued troubled people about obeying the law. Akers maintains drug use results from the reinforcing effects of drugs that out-weigh negative ones. When drugs produce undesirable outcomes (e.g., throwing up, producing panic), they deliver negative reinforcement. However, they could also return positively reinforcing effects (e.g., euphoria), which might outweight the negative ones. This was especially likely if the individual received social reinforcement from other users, who viewed drug use positively. ***add examples of Aker's empirical work on adolescent drug and alcohol use among teens and the elderly***

Elliott's Integrated Model of Delinquency. Elliott is yet another scholar to extend Sutherland's differential association theory to illicit drug use, especially among teens. Unlike Aker's focus on reinforcement, Elliott combines elements of social control and strain theory to extend social learning theory's ability to explain substance use. His main contribution is that strong bonding with deviant peers is the primary cause of drug use. Thus, his work addresses one of the fundamental criticisms of social control theory, i.e., an inattention to influential deviant peers, which was discussed above.

Elliott's focus on peers here is one of association, making this theory similar to learning theory's claim that deviant peers model behavior that others emulate. This follows in the tradition set by Sutherland. The motivation for such bonding comes from weak ties to parents, schools and other conventional entities and is encouraged by previous delinquent behavior and social disorganization in the environment.

Verification of Elliott's ideas is well-documented. For many years, Elliott and his colleagues have investigated youth substance use with the NYS (National Youth Study) data set.

Citing all of the published accounts on this data set or Elliott's ideas is beyond the scope of this chapter. Suffice it to say, it is one of the leading theories of substance abuse today.

Cultural diversity (race and ethnicity) and demographic group variance (social class, gender, age, geography, birth cohort). ***Complete this section***

Social Policy Implications. ***Complete this section***

Limitations. While differential association and other social learning theories have been popular in studies of substance use, they have several shortcomings that disallow a more comprehensive understanding of it. One criticism is that Sutherland's version was untestable, i.e. not easily subjected to evaluation. This charge emanated from researcher's inability to study what Sutherland meant by people having definitions favorable and unfavorable to the law. In other words, how can "an excess of definitions favorable to law violation" be measured or observed? How would researchers find instances where an excess of definitions favorable to law violation existed? Most research has concluded that the majority of residents in high-risk communities conform to the law and possess conventional values. Moreover, differential association might over-predict crime by postulating that poor people will commit it because of the reward attached. Most do not break the law and/or engage in problematic substance abuse behaviors. This point also neglects the fact that many more privileged substance abusers both abide by and break the law.

The reinforcement component of social learning theories may also be one-sided and tautological, when all repeated behavior is declared to somehow be reinforced or rewarded. Careers in crime, deviance and substance use are taxing on the people involved and those around them. They often bring great pain and consequence, yet people persist in problematic lines of action. This challenge is especially relevant for the drug abuser and may be explained more by

enmeshment in the addict life, acceptance of an addict identity, and the physiological and psychological dependencies that often accompany substance abuse.

Social learning theory also does not address the origins of new types of crime and deviance. Consequently, it cannot explain the sources of new types of deviance. For example, earlier we discussed the problem of prescription drug abuse that results form diverting licit drugs from the legal market, e.g., oxycontin abuse. How does social learning theory explain this new form of drug abuse?

Finally, reinforcement theories have generally ignored social structural influences on the determination of rewards and aversive stimuli. Only recently have they begun to consider such factors. This criticism is shared with social control theories. This so-called "astructural bias" is directly addressed with the social structural theories reviewed in the next section.

Social Structural Theories

A third category of sociological theories that has addressed substance use and related deviance can be called "social structural" theories. They differ from those discussed above by focusing on phenomena that exist outside of individuals and small groups, but which are theorized to have an impact on them, i.e., macro-level factors.   Macro-level factors organize a society, community or neighborhood. They range widely and can include dimensions of stratification (e.g, disparities in status and power by race, class and gender), environmental characteristics (e.g., poverty, job availability, and ethnic heterogeneity), and institutions (schools and community and government agencies)-- their resources, practices and policies.

The social structural or more macro-level theories we discuss below emanate from both the structural-functionalist and conflict paradigms. To a somewhat lessor extent, they also include ideas from the interactionist tradition. While there are profound differences among

them, they share the idea that larger social forces– external to the individual– play an important part in causing and/or shaping the manifestation of such deviant acts as drug and alcohol abuse. This is an important departure from social process theories and those discussed in the previous chapter. By showing how external forces, such as economic and social inequality, cause or create types of deviance, we learn that working solely with individuals will not effectively remedy problems, especially for any significant period of time. Moreover, through an understanding of how environmental factors influence problems and individual behavior, we get a better vision for an improved society.

Social structural theories have asked somewhat different questions about substance use, abuse and related deviance than have social process and social learning theorists. For example, they've investigated how drug and alcohol use and abuse varies culturally (e.g., by race and ethnicity or between societies), over time (historically), and by geographic location (e.g., the city versus the suburbs). Their objective has not been to solely explain individual behaviors– which has been the objective of previous theories discussed in this book. Social structural theories do not typically employ biological, genetic, or neurological definitions of substance use and abuse. They study, instead, drug and alcohol-related norms, behaviors, and consequences.

Social Disorganization Theory

One of the earliest and perhaps most influential of the social structural theories is social disorganization theory. It first appeared in the deviance literature via Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay's work on delinquent boys in Chicago, circa 1930. Shaw and McKay were influenced by human ecology and the work of Park and Burgess. Human ecologists take note of the distribution of phenomena across physical space, paying attention to environmental boundaries and other characteristics (e.g. land use).

Shaw and McKay observed that crime and delinquency (e.g., vandalism, minor theft, curfew violations, and drug use), did not exist similarly across Chicago neighborhoods. Some areas had much higher rates of crime and delinquency than others. They asked "Why did some areas have higher rates of crime and delinquency than others?" This viewpoint highlights the structural focus on rates of deviance– a more collective entity-- rather than individual behavior.

Upon closer examination, Shaw and McKay found patterning in the distribution of crime and delinquency across Chicago, which they segmented into five zones based mostly on land use patterns (i.e., business, commercial, residential). Their study showed that Zone 2 consistently had the highest rates of delinquency in Chicago despite almost complete turnovers in the ethnic composition of population living there. They concluded there was something about Zone 2 which produced high delinquency rates, regardless of who lived there. ***elaborate more about these zones- especially zone 2 because it was problematic***

This observation continues to be an important sociological discovery. Consider, for instance, the questions such an observation raises to the more individual-based theories of deviance and substance abuse. For example, if drug use is more highly concentrated in one area of a city than another, what does that imply for theories claiming substance use results from poor decision-making or low self-control? Let us ask this question differently. If low self-control and poor-decision-making explain deviance like substance use and abuse, are we then to assume that some neighborhoods have larger groups of people with these qualities than others? Whatever the answer, this observation implies that structural or macro-level factors also influence the individual and must be considered for a fuller understanding of substance use.

Shaw and McKay's original work, and the extremely large literature it has spawned, has consistently observed that areas high in delinquency and deviance are socially disorganized, i.e.,

the usual controls over things such as deviance are largely absent. The theory begins by assuming so-called delinquents are basically normal youth and that delinquent acts, like drug use, are caused by neighborhood and environmental factors. These more macro-level factors include residential turnover, neighborhood decay, poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, and crowding. Such factors create opportunities for delinquent behavior, i.e., by providing motivation for offenses (poverty and the absence of adequate employment) and the space for them to happen. They also disallow the strong bonding needed among residents to block crime. It is this latter consequence- the inability to monitor or control wrongdoing in neighborhoods– that permits crime and delinquency to flourish.

Many contributions to Shaw's and McKay's work have been forthcoming since their seminal study. Their theory has been expanded conceptually, geographically, and demographically (to account for group variation). However, there has been little advancement on its ability to explain substance use and abuse. Most work still does not target this directly. For example, Sampson and Raudenbusch (xxx) have advanced Shaw and McKay's observations about the inability of people to monitor or control wrong-doing in their neighborhoods. Renaming this theoretical mechanism "collective efficacy," Sampson and Raudenbusch have shown that a neighborhood's ability to control the wrong-doing of its residents (especially younger ones) will protect it from high rates of drug and alcohol abuse and other forms of deviance. **insert cites of related drug work, e.g., Anderson on deindustrialization and drug dealing, etc- Bourgois***

Social Policy Implications. Most of the recommendations for addressing crime and deviance to emerge from social disorganization theory center on community-level changes, rather than individual interventions. For example, neighborhood empowerment programs that

assist people in solving community problems were advocated by early research (Shaw and McKay cites here) using this perspective as well as more recent undertakings (Sampson and Raudenbusch– collective efficacy stuff).

The goal is to elicit the state's support in sponsoring socially positive activities that help individuals bond with each other to strengthen their communities against crime, drugs, and deviance. Such programs might include summer camps and sports leagues, as well as housing supports to reverse neighborhood deterioration. For example, during the Clinton administration, Attorney General Janet Reno proposed funding midnight basketball programs to achieve this purpose. Congress, however, declined to fund them. Senator Jack Kemp– during the late 1980s and early 1990s– advocated community empowerment zones that would replace abandoned housing with new units to be purchased by lower income families. The theory here was that individual investment and improved housing conditions would bolster people's stakes in and ties to their communities while increasing property values.

Limitations and Criticisms. Over the years, numerous shortcomings in social disorganization theory have been identified by scholars. One of the most commonly mentioned is the theory's tendency toward circular reasoning. In short, the theory advocates that social disorganization causes things like delinquency and substance abuse, but that those things are also indicators of social disorganization. This concerns scholars most, who seek to establish causality (which comes first, the chicken or the egg?) via empirical methodologies.

Another shortcoming could be that the theory fails to explain how neighborhood disorganization and problems might emanate directly and indirectly from decisions made by political (city council members to White House policies) and economic (small and large business) elites. For example, cuts in housing support, which characterized the latter 20th

century, contributed to homelessness and abandoned properties in highly stressed inner-city neighborhoods. The situation was exacerbated by local law enforcement policies that disallowed community members to congregate on the premises of an abandoned unit. Consider the following scenario and its impact on neighborhood bonding and empowerment.

Mrs. Jones has owned her home on Jefferson street for 30 years. She raised her children there and is now active in helping them raise their children in the same house. Next door to her, is a unit rented via a Section 8 permit. For years, other families resided in there, but with cutbacks in the Section 8 program in the 1980s, the house attached to Mrs. Jones' home is now vacant and boarded up (a requirement of the policy). Mrs. Jones and her grandchildren like to sit on their stoop and chat with neighbors. Sometimes, there are too many and they spill over onto the vacant house's steps. With new tough law enforcement policies (war on drugs strategies implemented in the 1980s), anyone "trespassing" on a vacant property can be cited by the police. Thus, inner-city residents– like Mrs Jones' family– find themselves constantly under surveillance of the police for engaging in the kind of community bonding activities social disorganization theory would advocate. Furthermore, such law enforcement policies promote hostility between police and community members.

While social disorganization theory fails to consider such things, another criticism concerns what scholars have called the ecological fallacy. Attempts to explain individual behaviors and actions using more aggregate measures is problematic. In other words, using group or community-level data- such as rates of neighborhood decay and distress to predict individual offending features crossing levels of analysis that make unstable assumptions. One is that all members of a community will be impacted in the same fashion by the more macro-level, aggregated factor, e.g., neighborhood distress. How does the theory explain that most youth

exposed to these conditions and living in such areas do not become delinquent?

Strain and Opportunity Theories

Another widely used structural theory of crime, deviance and substance abuse is called strain or opportunity theory. It emerged directly from Emile Durkheim and the structural-functionalist paradigm. Writing about societal change after the industrial revolution and the growth of advanced capitalism, Durkheim warned about the rise of a condition called "anomie:" the absence of social ties that bind people to society, a state where norms about good and bad have little salience in people's lives. For him, advanced capitalism's ideology of individualism and preference for organic solidarity (specialized, fragmented social relations highlighting individual difference) weakened social ties among individuals, destabilized society and could lead to chaos.

Robert Merton (1958) was the first to directly tie Durkheim's ideas about anomie to the study of crime and deviance, including drug and alcohol abuse. Merton's work targeted delinquents of the era– usually poor and working class boys of myriad ethnic minority backgrounds– who experienced blocked opportunity in obtaining the middle-class dream, which was rapidly taking shape in the United States.

He discussed another phenomena– unequal opportunity– which could also produce anomie and, consequently, deviance for many. At issue was people's access to opportunities for a full, productive life. Merton argued that such opportunities (economic and educational) were not equally available to all. Instead, access to them was largely a function of one's status set, i.e, occupation, neighborhood, age, sex, race, education, and religion. Anomie or "strain" emerged when there existed a discrepancy between socially approved goals and access to their legitimate attainment. Groups and people with lower status sets were likely to have less access and,

consequently, more strain.

Merton posited numerous responses to strain or anomie, which he agreed with Durkheim was a fundamental consequence of advanced capitalism. Some people would continue to conform to social conventions even if they experienced strain. He called these folks "conformists." Others accepted socially approved goals (.e.g., material comfort), but would reject conventional means for obtaining them, opting for more "innovative" and illegitimate avenues. Corporate embezzlers and drug dealers are good examples of "innovators." Ritualists were those who embraced socially approved goals and legitimate means even while not believing in them. Retreatists and rebels, on the hand, rejected both goals and legitimate means. Rebels actively tried to change things in society, while retreatists simply faded into the background and disconnected from social institutions and ideals. Merton maintained that drug addicts and skid row (i.e., homeless) alcoholics were examples of retreatists.

Merton's strain theory– today called classic strain– was accepted immediately, for it debuted during a period of great social change– 1950s and 1960s. Civil rights groups were calling attention to the persistent inequities between the rich and poor, men and women, and whites and blacks, Hispanics, and other minority groups. Like Sutherland's differential association theory, Merton's strain theory was proposed in the midst of macro-level societal change. Its tenets about inequality and adaptations to it resonated with Kennedy and Johnson's vision of a "Great Society," where government should and would take an active role in empowering individuals, especially those most alienated, toward better lives. Thus, strain theory proposed that responsibility for crime and deviance was shared between social institutions and the individual.

As the years went by, strain theory fell out of favor both politically and scientifically.

Studies failed to find consistent support for it an it eventually fell out of favor by the early 1980s. Politically, strain theory's presumptions about macro-level inequality and society's role in producing deviance was rejected by conservative politicians like Nixon and Reagan, who championed free will and individual responsibility. By the mid 1980s, however, a new version of Merton's theory was developing which would find favor among scholars and policy-makers by calling attention to individual factors.

Robert Agnew (1985; 1992; 2001) has led the revitalization of strain theory, with a more social-psychological version called general strain theory (i.e., GST). Unlike Merton's classic strain theory, GST focuses more on the individual, by positing important affect variables that influence the strain/crime relationship. Agnew and colleagues have shown that unequal opportunity can produce negative feelings that make innovative adaptations to anomie more likely. Agnew posited that strain was likely to result when youth place a high value on monetary success, do not view adherence to legit norms as a source of status or prestige, and feel they won't be able to achieve monetary success through legitimate channels. This predicament creates negative affect (e.g., anger) for some and can foster criminal adaptations. For example, the innovative response of selling drugs to attain material goods or the retreatist response of using drugs to escape negative feelings (Anderson 1998) depends on the individual's emotional response to the sources of strain or the presence of pro-social coping strategies to quell them.

Agnew's GST has not only helped revitalize an important theory, it has also informed the longstanding sociological puzzle regarding the micro/macro or individual/environment debate. By articulating individual factors that "mediate" between macro-level concepts and individual delinquency, Agnew and colleagues have not only addressed criticisms of Merton's work, they have also created the possibility of new and effective policy options in ameliorating drug abuse,

deviance and crime.

Social Policy Implications. At a very basic level, policies or programs that either

increase people's access to legitimate opportunities for goal attainment or reduce their

aspirations for them will likely reduce strain and the deleterious effects of it. Merton's train

theory helped inspire the juvenile delinquency and control act of 1961. This Act provided

employment and training, along with community organization and improved social services, to

disadvantaged youths and their families. The program was later expanded to become the

foundation for Johnson's "War on Poverty.

During the 1960s, billions of dollars on programs such as the Peace Corps, Jobs Corps,

Comprehensive Employee Training Act (CETA), and Project Head Start. However, the success

of such programs was never established. They triggered a backlash by conservatives who feared

an expansion of a welfare state. Shortly after their creation, Nixon discontinued most of them,

arguing that they had failed to achieve their goals. While many supporters claim that the

opportunity programs of the 1960s "Great Society" were not given a fair chance to show positive

results, many subsequent educational and vocational training programs for delinquent youths

have also failed. Scholars attribute the poor performance of such programs to the following: (1)

they promote stigma of the lower-class by blaming the victim, (2) they provide only dead-end

jobs that do little to advance economic mobility, (3) they adopt a middle-class bias, assuming

that all lower-class individuals aspire to a middle-class lifestyle.

Limitations of the Theory.   A common criticism of strain theory, which was similarly

made about social disorganization theory, is that of over-prediction. If, in fact, strain is an

outcome of not achieving the so-called American dream, crime and deviance should be more

pervasive since many people never realize this goal. Underneath this criticism lies the challenge

posed above to social disorganization theory about the difficulties in using macro-level, aggregate factors to explain individuals outcomes.

A related criticism of strain theory is that delinquents do not necessarily report major discrepancies between their aspirations and expectations in the fashion theorized. Most have fairly low aspirations for and expectations of material success. Agnew's work addressed this shortcoming by pointing to other types of strain neglected by Merton and structural strain theorists. He identified various types of strain that were more immediate to individuals and more social-psychological or affect based, e.g., children who can't escape abusive parents or an insulting teacher. The proliferation of criminological and sociological support for Agnew's version in the 1990s and early 21st century could signify an improved understanding of strain ideas and their relevance in combating substance abuse and other types of deviance.

Social Reproduction and Social Capital Theories

Outside of the U.S., there developed another structural theory around the same time strain theory was being revitalized by Agnew and others. At the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies, Bordieu called attention to how the school system, a major social institution, did not perform in the fashion people believed or how it was intended. The presumption that schools were the primary place where anyone and everyone could accrue the skills and training necessary to obtain socially approved goals and upward mobility was a myth. Schools did not, Bordieu argued, enable upward mobility via meritocracy. Instead, they **reproduced** inequality, discouraging improvements in class position, by channeling working class kids into coursework targeting semi-skilled employment and upperclass kids into academic coursework needed for college. Inequality in society was, consequently, maintained.

Developments to Bordieu's claims about the school centered on the various types of

capital (material and immaterial resources) people possessed and how they would impact their lives. These developments extended both Marxist ideas about capital and inequality (a more conflict-oriented theory) and Merton's ideas about opportunity and access.

Social capital scholars proposed people acquired at birth and accumulated throughout their lives unequal shares of several types of capital (social, financial, human, and personal) that affected their life chances. Financial capital, i.e., tangible forms of wealth such as money, credit, investment, and assets– the kind Marx discussed, are what most think of when assessing inequality. Young people are dependent their parents' financial capital for many things, ranging from basic sustenance needs to school tuition. Parents with greater financial assets can simply pay for better opportunities for their children. Poorer parents cannot provide these things. Thus their children are dependent on social supports (e.g., college tuition, loan programs) from the state. Absent such financial capital and the opportunities it provides, lower-class children may result to alternative, illegal means to achieve the same things. This was a major premise of Merton's structural strain theory.

However, social reproduction theorists pointed to other types of capital that widened the inequality/goal attainment gap not previously discussed by Merton and others. One type was human capital, i.e., degrees, education, skills, training, and experience, which is required so that individuals can provide for themselves and others and alter their class position. This Bordieu called attention to when criticizing the schools for reproducing class position via channeling youth to certain human capital training programs based on the class positions of their parents. However, even when lower-class youth managed to attain advanced education and training, they lacked another critical form of capital possessed by the middle and upper classes: social capital, which is one's ties or connections to others who can do things for you or provide special

treatment and access. For example, many college students are unaware of the importance of this premise in understanding inequality and crime in society. Yet, they are aware that jobs or internships they secure often result from the connections their parents, relatives, teachers, and friends have to important others who make recommendations and hiring decisions on their behalf. Research shows that social capital (e.g., networking and access to powerful others) is critically important in securing valuable resources, including college admission and employment. It also shows such capital is not evenly distributed by class, race, ethnicity or gender.

Support for these ideas has come from recent ethnographic work on the illicit drug economy. Studies by Venkatesh (...) on criminal and drug gangs in Chicago, Bourgois (1996), Maher (1999- sexed work), Hamid (1996) in New Yok city, MacLeod's (...) account of high school youth in the midwest, and Jacobs (..) and Millers' (2000) work in St. Louis all lend support to the social reproduction theory claims that inequities in social, financial and human capital serve as a form of alienation that marginalizes people from conventional society and put them at increased risk for illegal activities. These premises about inequality and marginalization make social reproduction theory consistent with various tenets of conflict theory, as was discussed above.

Add to this the recent contribution that "personal capital" – a desire for wealth, risk-taking propensity, willingness to cooperate, and competence– is yet another important point matter to address. McCarthy and Hagan (2001) introduced it to the delinquency, crime and drugs literatures. One of their central arguments is that selling drugs and/or participation in criminal markets requires some of the same personality traits or identity characteristics required for success in corporate America. Hagan and colleagues maintain, however, that the utilization of personal capital for successful illicit gain fosters strong disincentives for conventional

activities. Anderson (2005) also makes this point, showing that competence in negotiating the illicit drug world instills a kind of validation that participants perceive they cannot find in a punitive society that stigmatizes them. "Criminal success" unfortunately cements enmeshment in deviant activities. Alas, it is short-lived. Continued illegal activities increase the likelihood of arrest and incarceration, which conversely further damages any type of capital one possesses.

Social Policy Implications. The literature on social reproduction theory is relatively new and is not as widely cited in criminology or studies of deviance and substance abuse. Thus, fewer policy recommendations from the theory have been advocated. Those that have are similar in concept to those discussed above in the strain theory section. Reductions in inequality and programs that empower people with increased capital are likely starting points. Scholars from this perspective have also proposed scaling back punitive anti-drugs policies so as to quell the negative effects they have on offenders. This latter recommendation is shared by interactionists, who we showed earlier urge reducing stigma and labeling as a way to prevent enmeshment in crime and re-integrate offenders.

Limitations. Because social reproduction theory has ties to conflict theory, it shares some of its shortcomings. Perhaps the one most often cited is its failure to acknowledge individual differences among criminal offenders and/or those engaged in deviance. Related to this is the charge that conflict-based theories ignore the variation in people's responses to powerlessness, inequality and the conflict that often results. Some contend that the continued persistence of inequality and alienation without higher crime rates or levels of civil disobedience among the poor is indicative of moral consensus rather than conflict as the theory suggests. Finally, like other structural theories, conflict-based theories may naively presume that social problems like crime can be corrected by existing social institutions (e.g., better schools and a more effective

criminal justice system).

Cultural Identity Theory.

This theory was developed by Anderson (1998...) one of the authors of your book, after several years if her own research on drug abusers and thorough enmeshment in the social science literatures on drug and alcohol use and abuse. Cultural identity theory attempts to explain substance abuse as an identity change process. It also employs a career framework, describing both entering and exiting drug abuse. These characteristics make cultural identity theory consistent with symbolic interactionism. However, as we will see below, it also integrates ideas and concepts from the structural-functional paradigm.

The theory begins with a sociological definition of drug abuse, that includes (1) a pattern of regular and heavy use over a significant period of time, (2) a set of drug-related problems (at work, or with interpersonal relationships, one's own health, and formal social control agencies), (3) previous and failed attempts to terminate drug consumption, and (4) self-identification as having a drug and/or alcohol problem.

At a very basic level, the cultural identity theory envisions drug abuse as a deviant identity matter featuring motivation and opportunity. Individuals are motivated toward altering their identities via drugs because of personal and social alienation experienced in childhood and early adolescence. The motivational component is consistent with symbolic interactionism. Negative events (e.g, child abuse, school expulsion, frequent geographic moves, death of significant others, etc.) or statuses (e.g., being lower class) harm the ability to view the self positively and can earn one a negative label or identity. However, these things remain problematic even if they go undetected by others because the individual (as a child or teenager) experiences them as troublesome.

Participation in the illicit drug world and in drug subcultures become a solution (opportunity) to this identity quagmire, because drugs make people "feel" better (affect control), allow for the adaptation of new, more preferable identities (identity creation), or deliver a lifestyle one desires (material symbolism). This avenue is especially likely for those with compromised economic opportunity and educational opportunity, which is a similar point raised above by social structural scholars.

Attention to cultural diversity. (race and ethnicity) and demographic group variance (social class, gender, age, geography, birth cohort).

Implications for social policy.

Limitations.

VII. Risk and Protective Factors: Important Sociological Concepts/Variables (five pages)

a. Peers and Peer Groups

b. Parents and Guardians

c. Age of Onset

d. Identity versus Behavior

e. Gateway hypothesis

f. Prior criminal activity

III. Summary/Conclusions (five pages)

Sociological Theory	Causes	Policy
Labeling	stigma, deviant identity immersion	decriminalization, reintegration, restorative justice

Social and Self Control	ineffective socialization, immorality, low self-control	parent training, counseling, development of social bonds
Social Learning	Law-breaking acceptable, association with deviant others, positive reinforcement for deviance	more effective negative reinforcement, more use of positive reinforcement
Social Disorganization	disorganized neighborhoods	community empowerment
Strain and Opportunity	economic and educational goal blockage	increased opportunities
Social Capital and Social Reproduction	Curriculum-based tracking of students by class, unequal educational and employment opportunity, deficient parental resources	School reforms, increased opportunity, family empowerment programs
Cultural Identity	marginalization, adoption of deviant identities, economic and educational opportunity blockage, popular culture	destigmatization, individual and family empowerment, decreased inequality, increased opportunity, pop culture campaigns against drugs