A recent USA Today featured a short article on weird laws from around the world. While all are truly “weird,” some appear to actually have a rational reason for their existence, while others do not. For example, in Rome it is illegal to eat or drink near landmarks, and in Greece it is illegal to wear stiletto heels. While both these laws appear to be rather random, when explored they make perfect sense. The laws are designed to preserve the ancient landmarks found in both places. It is fairly obvious that eating and drinking in historic places could lead to sticky walls or ruined artifacts, but stiletto heels may be just as dangerous. It turns out that the pressure from a thin stiletto heel is roughly equal to the pressure of an elephant walking in the same spot. Thailand and Canada both have laws that dictate how people treat or use their currency. In Thailand, it is illegal to step on the nation’s currency. All currency in Thailand carries a picture of the king, and, because the king is so revered, it is a great offense to treat the currency and thus the king disrespectfully. In Canada, it is illegal to use more than 25 pennies in a single transaction. Why? Not quite sure, except there appears to be a strong feeling that the penny is worthless—the government has phased out the coin. Not to be outdone, the United States has its fair share of weird laws, too. In Washington State it is illegal to harass Bigfoot, Sasquatch, or any other undiscovered subspecies. In North Dakota, it is illegal to serve beer and pretzels at the same time at a bar or restaurant. And in Missouri, you can’t ride in a car with an uncaged bear.

Introduction

It is fun to sit and ponder the weird laws that exist around the world, but there are two larger points to be made in a chapter on global perspectives on deviance and social control. First, there is no greater example of the relativist nature of deviance than examining the laws of a country or region. While it is unlikely anyone is getting into a car with an uncaged bear anytime soon, it is much more likely that beer and pretzels will be served at the same time, that stiletto heels will be worn, and that someone might mistreat the currency of a country. While some might engage in these acts knowing their behavior will be defined as deviant, it is our bet that a good number will have no clue that their actions are defined as deviant, at least by the laws in that country. Second, the responses to these forms of deviance are also relative. While it is true that the law says you cannot eat or drink near historic landmarks in Rome, it is rarely enforced, and while the authors have not had the pleasure of drinking a beer in North Dakota, we bet we could find at least one restaurant that would serve us a pretzel, too. None of us are willing to test the uncaged bear law. As you will see in this chapter, there is much to be studied about global deviance and social control.

Most of this book is dedicated to how we think about, understand, describe, and explain deviance. In other words, most of this book is dedicated to a sociological and theoretical understanding of deviance. For this reason, this chapter is outside the norm (or, as some might say, deviant) in this book. We have chosen to include it because we believe that an analysis of global perspectives in deviance and social control helps us appreciate an examination of deviance by including perspectives we do not often experience. It also allows us the opportunity to apply those theories we have been discussing in the rest of the book. For this reason, you will see the structure of this chapter mirrors the structure of the book: first we examine researching deviance globally, then we look at empirical tests of theories of deviance globally, and finally we discuss social control in a global context.

Researching Deviance Globally

For the undergraduate student of deviant behavior, and especially those interested in deviance across the globe, research should always start with the work of others. There are a number of journals that purport to publish studies of crime and criminal justice outside the United States or internationally. Others focus on particular forms of deviance and make an effort to include research with an international or interdisciplinary focus. Thumbine through those journals one will find some research outside the United States and some truly international research—that is, research that transcends borders. Alternatively, a great deal of research will be conducted by Americans and focus on American citizens. On its Web site, the journal Deviant Behavior purports to be

the only journal that specifically and exclusively addresses social deviance. International and interdisciplinary in scope; it publishes refereed theoretical, descriptive, methodological, and applied papers. All aspects of deviant behavior are discussed, including: crime, juvenile delinquency, alcohol abuse and narcotic addiction, sexual deviance, societal reaction to handicap and disfigurement, mental illness, and socially inappropriate behavior.

While the journal is open to research from around the world, and perhaps even actively strives to be international and interdisciplinary, a great many of the articles are written by U.S. researchers.
focused on American citizens. The next section discusses issues surrounding doing research outside of the United States.

 Trials and Tribulations Involved in Researching Deviance Across the Globe

Laws and official reporting and recording practices vary significantly across countries (Newman, 2008), thus making comparisons of deviance rates using official statistics problematic. That is, while official statistics may be very useful, they measure as much what officials do as how deviant individuals behave and the correlates of that behavior. This leaves many thinking that self-report measures may provide more valid information regarding deviance in other countries. While this may be true, there are definite problems collecting data regarding deviance in other countries and cultures, and many things must be considered in advance.

As with any scientific research, the research protocol must be approved by an institutional review board (IRB). As discussed in Chapter 3, while most IRBs support research, they have to make sure that certain procedures are followed, and this may become even more complex and problematic when one is proposing to do research outside the United States. First, the IRB will want evidence that the researcher has permission to do research in a foreign country. Some countries legally prohibit research. Indeed, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Web site (http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/intlcompilation/intlcompilation.html) provides “a listing of over 1,000 laws, regulations, and guidelines on human subjects’ protections in over 100 countries and from several international organizations.” IRBs will want documentation from public citizens, schools, or local officials showing that they understand the nature of the research and that they agree to allow the research to take place.

Second, and most generally, an IRB will want to make sure that culturally appropriate procedures are in place to protect participants in the research activity. Although the researcher may (or indeed may not) know a great deal about the culture and local customs outside the United States, it is very likely that some IRB members will not be aware of the norms, customs, and beliefs that may offend research participants or their leaders, and the IRB will probably need to be educated in these regards before it can approve research. It would behoove a researcher, even one with a vast knowledge of a particular culture, to have an endorsement from another expert that the research will not cause offense or concern in the society in question.

A third issue is language. If the research involves in-depth interviews, the researcher or research team must know the language well enough to conduct the interviews. Usually, in-depth interviews do not follow a specific script, and the researcher will begin with only a set of key questions that he or she expects will change as more is learned about the specific issues being studied. This could become a slippery slope in studies of deviance because the research may go down a path that was not approved by an IRB and lead to problems. There is not much an IRB can do about this, but the researcher(s) would be required to let the IRB know if any adverse events occur.

When conducting survey research in a foreign country that speaks a language other than English, it is likely that the survey will need to be translated. Once again, IRB members will not likely speak the other language, and so they may want to have the survey translated, then back-translated, so that they know that what is being included in the translated document is consistent with the original. While this may be time consuming and potentially expensive, it would appear to be the right thing to do and would ultimately make the results of the research more valid.
A fourth issue has to do with protected groups. There are several protected populations where special consideration must be given to the respondents’ ability to provide consent to participate in research. For example, prisoners may feel compelled to do research if a guard is supplying the survey or even in the room when the researcher is asking for consent. Children are also an issue as they are not legally eligible to give consent. In the United States, the legal age of consent is 18, but it may be older or younger in other countries. This raises an interesting question. It may seem self-evident that if the legal age of consent in a country is older than 18, the local law should be followed. However, if the local law is younger than 18, do we follow local custom or U.S. regulations? Another issue that arises when studying children is parental consent. In the United States, parental consent is usually required to conduct research on children. But what if parental consent is culturally inappropriate in a particular society—for example, one in which tribal elders or other family members are responsible for the children? In any case, the person who needs to provide the consent, be it a parent or other person, must be provided with a request that is written in the language of the resident at such a level that he or she will understand the protocol (what is being asked of the child). This request should inform the consent giver that he or she does not have to allow the child to participate and/or can stop the research at any point without penalty. If a waiver of active parental permission is granted, a letter informing the parents of the research, written at a literacy level that would be understood by the parents, may be required and should be prepared and sent to them by the most expeditious method possible.

Finally, how the data will be kept anonymous or confidential must be specified. If and how the data will be handled by different individuals or agencies must be laid out. How the data might be transferred physically or electronically and how the information will be protected must be demonstrated. In some cases, it will be important to describe how the data will be analyzed and presented to the public so that concerns about disclosing individual information are minimized.

These are many issues to consider, and they may not seem all that relevant to undergraduate students. However, just because undergraduates may not be conducting their own actual research outside the United States, it does not follow that such issues should not be considered and discussed. Understanding the practical and ethical issues surrounding such research will help us to understand the limitations of other studies we come across, making us both more appreciative and skeptical of what we are reading or hearing about in class or in social media. The next section provides a quick look into a few alternatives available to study deviance in other countries.

### DEVIANCE IN POPULAR CULTURE

Because many of us have not had the opportunity to travel around the world—or the misfortune to be held in a foreign prison—much of what we think we know about deviance and social control in global context comes from popular culture. Here we have selected a few films that portray foreign cultures, deviance, crime, and prisons. What messages do you think these films share with their mainstream audiences? How do they shape perceptions of deviance and social control in countries around the world?
More Reasonable Strategies for Undergraduates to Study Deviance Outside the United States

Most students will not have the resources to directly study (e.g., go to the foreign country and conduct surveys or interviews) deviance outside the United States. There are several existing large-scale data sets for studying deviance across countries. Sometimes the focus is on the criminal justice system or reactions to deviance. For example, Interpol and the United Nations provide data on what crimes are known to the police across a large number of countries and also about how these crimes are handled—for example, the number or rates of arrests, prosecutions, and convictions. Alternatively, a number of data sets exist that use surveys to collect self-reported measures of “crime,” “delinquency,” or “victimization” across countries. While these titles highlight a criminological emphasis, note that these generic terms include numerous offenses that may or may not come to the attention of the police and softer forms of deviant behavior that even if they came to the attention of authorities might provoke little or no reaction.
For example, the International Self-Reported Delinquency Study of 1992 (Junger-Tas et al., 1994) focused on self-reported misbehavior and victimization among youth aged 12 to 15 in 13 countries. A follow-up of this project resulted in the Second International Self-Reported Delinquency Study (Enzmann & Podana, 2010), now expanded to 31 countries. Self-report items ranged from relatively minor forms of deviance (e.g., “Steal something from a shop or department store”) to quite serious ones (e.g., “Intentionally beat someone up, or hurt him with a stick or knife, so bad that they had to see a doctor”) (Enzmann & Podana, 2010, p. 183). Vazsonyi and his colleagues (2001) developed the Normative Deviance Scale, which was designed to measure noncriminal forms of lifetime deviance. They collected data from several countries, including the United States, Switzerland, Hungary, and New Zealand.

The following list highlights just a few data sets that are available through the International Consortium of Political and Social Research (see Chapter 3), which your university may be affiliated with. These data sets focus on deviance and social control internationally, or at least outside the United States.

- International Crime Victimization Survey, 1989–2000 (the 2000 wave covering 47 industrialized and developing countries)
- Citizenship, Democracy, and Drug-Related Violence, 2011 (Mexico)
- Center for Research on Social Reality [Spain] Survey, December 1993: Attitudes and Behavior Regarding Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drugs
- Euro-Barometer 32: The Single European Market, Drugs, Alcohol, and Cancer, November 1989

In the following section, we describe how several theories developed in the United States have been tested in other countries.

◊ **Empirical Tests of Theories of Deviance Globally**

Studying deviance around the world is nothing new. Indeed, much anthropological work might be seen as the study of customs, attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs that modern Western society might find deviant. However, the sociological research focusing on the theories described in this book, most all carried out in the United States or in other developed Western societies, has only recently been empirically investigated outside the United States. This investigative extension might very likely stem from the seemingly audacious claim by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) that their general theory of crime could explain not only crime but other analogous behaviors (i.e., deviance) across all cultures and historical times; this claim led others to test Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory, and other theories of deviance as well. In this chapter, we examine empirical evidence as it relates to a variety of theories of deviance and social control.
Empirical Tests of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s General Theory of Deviance: Self-Control and Deviance in Other Countries

As discussed in Chapter 7, Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) general theory of crime, which focuses on the relationship between low self-control and crime and analogous behaviors (i.e., deviance), has been well researched, especially in the United States. Indeed, in the meta-analysis conducted by Pratt and Cullen (2000), they concluded that “with these caveats stated, the meta-analysis reported here furnishes fairly impressive empirical support for Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory” (p. 951). Interestingly, the meta-analysis, which was conducted nearly 10 years after Gottfredson and Hirschi first published their book, did not include empirical tests conducted outside the United States, presumably because they were not available to be included. Subsequent to the publication of the meta-analysis, there have been a number of important empirical tests of the relationship between self-control and deviant behavior outside the United States.

Cretacci and his colleagues published several studies examining self-control theory based on convenience samples collected in China (Cretacci et al., 2010; Cretacci & Cretacci, 2012). In their most direct test of the theory, which focused on the relationship between self-control and deviance, they collected data from students (n = 148) in the law and social work departments at a Beijing university (Cretacci et al., 2010). Interestingly, the survey was administered in English. At least one of the authors, however, had interacted enough with the respondents to be confident that they could complete the relatively simple survey the researchers had designed. Deviance was measured with a 14-item scale asking about various forms of deviance. The study found support for Hirschi’s (1969 and 2004) social control construct, which was significantly associated with lower levels of deviance.

Lu and colleagues (2013) provide a more recent analysis using the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study. The data came from a probability sample of seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade students from nine schools in five urban areas in the city of Hanzhou, China (the capital city of the Zhejiang Province). In this study, the self-report instrument was translated and pretested with exchange students at an American university. Two dependent variables measuring deviance were (1) minor “risky behaviors” (e.g., drinking and smoking); and (2) “delinquency” (e.g., fighting, carrying a weapon, vandalism). Self-control was measured with a shorter adaptation of Grasmick’s scale, including the dimensions of “impulsivity, risk-seeking, self-centeredness, and temper” (Lu et al., 2013, p. 39). Social control measures included family and school bonding, school commitment, and beliefs. As in most studies conducted in the United States, the results supported the general theory of crime, showing self-control to be a significant and relatively robust predictor of both forms of deviance after controlling for a number of theoretically relevant variables (e.g., measure social control) and standard control variables (e.g., age and sex). Some support was also found for social control theory, especially as family bonding and beliefs appeared significant in at least two models. Given that this was a much more rigorous examination of the relationship between self-control and deviance, we conclude that the Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory of deviance is indeed generalizable to China.

Self-control has been tested in other countries as well, by researchers such as Vazsonyi and his colleagues. One especially interesting study (Vazsonyi et al., 2001) involved a test of self-control theory among youths in America (n = 2,213), Switzerland (n = 889), Hungary (n = 4,018), and the Netherlands (n = 1,315). Deviance was measured with a 55-item normative deviance scale, with subscales including...
vandalism, alcohol and drug use, school misconduct, general deviance, theft, and assault. Self-control was measured with Grasmick's 24-item scale. The researchers found consistent support across countries for the general theory of crime in that self-control explained between 10–16% of the variation in the deviant behavior subscales and over 20% of the variation in the full measure of deviance. In another study using the same measures, Vazsonyi and colleagues (2004) tested the theory among Japanese youth (n = 334), finding comparable outcomes to a U.S. sample of youth. In yet another study using similar measures but with the addition of family process measures related to social control (closeness, support, and monitoring), Vazsonyi and Klanjsek (2008) examined the relationship between self-control, social control, and deviance with over 3,000 Swiss. They found at least some support for both Hirschi's social control theory and Hirschi's general theory of crime.

Øzbay and Köksoy (2008, 2009) provided tests of self-control theory in the developing country of Turkey. They focused on predicted general violence and political violence among college students (n = 974) using a modified version of Grasmick's scale. Øzbay and Köksoy (2009) found that low self-control was associated with a significantly greater likelihood of both forms of violence after controlling for a host of theoretically relevant variables (e.g., strain, criminal friends) and standard control variables (e.g., age and gender). In another article, Øzbay (2008) examines the generalizability of self-control across gender. Using the same data set, the researcher finds that not only is self-control generalizable across males and females, the empirical evidence suggests that the theory is more generalizable than other theories, including bonding and strain theories.

We will conclude this section with a discussion of what is clearly the largest global test of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory. In “Self-Control in a Global Perspective,” Rebellon, Straus, and Medeiros (2008) tested several aspects of the general theory within and across fully 32 nations spanning “all six humanly habitable continents” (p. 331) and including Western, non-Western, developed, and developing countries. The data came from the International Dating Violence Consortium, which collected it from college students in universities across the 32 countries. Straus and Medeiros developed a six-item scale to measure the six dimensions of self-control described by Gottfredson and Hirschi. These items included the following:

Self-Centered: I don't think about how what I do will affect other people
Risk-Taking: I often do things that other people think are dangerous.
Temper: There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me.
Preference for Physical: I often get hurt by the things that I do.
Impulsivity: I have trouble following the rules at work or in school.
Long-Term Consequences: I have goals in life that I try to reach.

For each question, respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the statement on a four-point scale (1 = “strongly disagree” to 4 = “strongly agree”).

Criminal behavior included both property crime (stolen property worth more than $50 U.S. and stolen money from anyone, including family) and violent crime (physical attack of someone with intention of seriously harming them and hit or threatened to hit a nonfamily member). Each of the four items were conditioned in terms of age, so respondents were asked once if the event happened before
they were 15 years old and then asked again if it had occurred after they were 15. Two scales were then created with four items each, measuring property and violent crime, respectively.

Given Gottfredson and Hirschi’s emphasis on child rearing and emotional involvement of parents in children’s lives in the development of self-control, the researchers also included an eight-item “parental neglect scale” that included items measuring direct control (e.g., parents making sure the respondent went to school) and social support (e.g., parent provided comfort). These measures allowed a pretty solid test of the general theory in that parental efforts could be correlated with self-control, which in turn could be related to criminal behavior.

The findings and results of the study are fairly clear and supportive of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory. First, parental neglect was a significant predictor of self-control in all 32 countries, explaining between 15 and 39% of the variation in self-control. Second, self-control was significantly related to violent crime in all 32 countries, and self-control was significantly related to property crime in 28 of the 32 countries.

While the researchers found considerable support for Gottfredson and Hirschi’s general theory of crime across both Western and non-Western nations, they do point out a few caveats. First, the measure of criminal peers was also found to be a relatively robust predictor of crime across nations. Second, even though self-control was largely associated with violence and property crime across countries, there was considerable variation in its predictive ability—that is, the effect of self-control was not constant across cultures, as predicted by the theory.

This study and the others described above, taken together, suggest that self-control is a relatively strong correlate of crime and deviance across 32+ nations. Although empirical evidence is not perfectly consistent across countries, overall there appears to be general support across various forms of deviance.

**Testing Differential Association and Social Learning Theories Outside of the United States**

Like social and self-control theories, tests of differential association and social learning theories have mostly been conducted in the United States. However, some recent efforts have moved beyond the confines of this country. Not far from the United States is the French- and English-speaking country to the north, Canada. There Gallupe and Bouchard (2013) examined social learning theory and substance use through an investigation of party-going among adolescents in a large Canadian city. A total of 829 students were surveyed and 411 of them reported on their behavior at a total of 775 parties. Three hundred and sixty-one students reported on multiple parties, which allowed the researchers to investigate changes in party characteristics and how that affected substance use. The key social learning variable was reinforcement, and this was measured by the number of close friends who drank alcohol or used marijuana at the party and the amount of alcohol and marijuana these friends used. In both the cross-sectional and semi-longitudinal analyses (change), reinforcement variables were found to be relatively strong predictors of both alcohol and marijuana use, thus showing support for differential association/social learning theories.

Moving across the ocean, we find that differential association/social learning theories have also been tested in Europe. By the year 2000, there had been only a few ethnographic and interview-based studies of youth deviance conducted in France, and no systematic self-report studies, so Hartjen and Priyadarsini (2003) initiated a study to test theories in rural France, focusing heavily on differential
association/social learning theory. They argued that France is a particularly interesting country to utilize self-reported methods because,

France appears to have an extremely benevolent and tolerant approach to misbehaving youth. Very few are ever incarcerated and, if so, not for very long. Every effort is made by officials from police to judges to divert misbehaving juvenile from official processing or punitive action. (Hartjen & Priyadarsini, 2003, p. 389)

With official counts of criminal sanctions being so low, self-report research is likely to detect much more deviant behavior and should be a better indicator of misbehavior. Hartjen and Priyadarsini surveyed male and female junior high and high school students ranging in age from 13–18 from three schools. All three schools were located in a single, ethnographically homogeneous, rural town in France.

The survey they used was based on the National Youth Survey, which was translated into French. They included two measures of delinquency—a total delinquency scale based on 50 items and a “petty delinquency” scale that included minor misbehaviors. Measures based on differential association/social learning theories included

attitudes towards deviance [measured as negative attitudes towards deviance or prosocial attitudes], peer involvement [measured as positive peer involvement], exposure to delinquent peers, and an index of exposure to delinquent peers [created by combining peer involvement with exposure to delinquent peers]. (p. 393)

Positive peer involvement and prosocial attitudes were negatively related to both total and petty deviant behaviors among both males and females in the sample, while exposure to delinquent peers was positively related to both measures of deviant behavior among both groups. Interestingly, there were no differences in the effects of the differential association/social learning variables across gender, suggesting that the theory is generalizable and not unique to male or female respondents.

In one of the more impressive and truly international inquiries, Antonaccio and her colleagues (2011) have tested several theories including social learning theory in three key cities in three European countries that have “exhibited widely publicized actions to preserve their unique national cultural patterns” (p. 1203). The cities were Athens, Greece; Nizhni Novgorod, Russia; and Lviv, Ukraine. In an effort to maintain causal order in a cross-sectional study, the researchers asked questions about the likelihood of committing violent and property crimes in the future and about past experiences reinforcing violent behavior and property crime (via social learning theory). They argue that using projected offending has been found to be as valid as using self-reports of prior deviant behaviors and comes as close to maintaining the causal ordering of the model as one can get with a cross-sectional design.

Under the supervision of the research team, trained local interviewers conducted face-to-face interviews with individuals from randomly selected households in Athens ($n = 400$), Lviv ($n = 500$), and Nizhni Novgorod ($n = 500$). In analyses of the data set as a whole (merging data from the three cities), they found that reinforcement was significantly associated with projections of both violent behavior and property crimes after controlling for a number of other variables. Indeed, reinforcement
was the strongest predictor across models. Similarly, when the analyses were disaggregated by city (analyzed separately), the social learning measure of reinforcement was positively related to both property and violent crime projections. Again, in virtually all of the models, reinforcement was the strongest predictor.

Differential association/social learning theories have also been tested in Asian countries. Kim and her colleagues (Kim et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2013), for example, have provided at least two tests of social learning theory in South Korea, both focused on substance use. In the first study they analyzed data from the Korea Youth Panel Survey, which was a longitudinal study of two cohorts (second graders and junior high students) beginning in 2003 (Kim et al., 2013). They used the first two waves of data collected in 2003 and 2004. There was only minor attrition from the study (<10%), resulting in 3,188 student respondents. Substance use, the dependent variable, was measured with self-reported items indicating how often they had drunk alcohol or smoked cigarettes in the past year. Three concepts emerged that were most clearly derived from social learning theory: (1) a differential peer association measure based on six items indicating how many of their close friends engaged in delinquent activities, (2) differential association intensity indicated by a single item indicating how important one’s reputation with deviant peers was, and (3) peer substance use measured with two items indicating how many close friends used tobacco and how many used alcohol. Interestingly, in a multivariate model, substance use was unrelated to substance use by peers and peer delinquency, but it was positively related to deviant peer intensity increasing the odds of using substances by 21%. In this carefully collected data from a nationally represented sample of young South Koreans, we find only modest support for social learning theory. In fact, controls for parental attachment and supervision, usually associated with social control/bond theory, were more powerful predictors of substance abuse.

The second study (Kim et al., 2013) was more ambitious theoretically and empirically. In this study Kim and colleagues attempted to test Akers’ full social structure social learning model to predict alcohol use. The data came from a self-report study of high school students in Busan, South Korea, a large metropolitan area in the southeast tip of the Korean Peninsula. Data were collected from just over 1,000 high school students. The data analyses clearly show support for the standard social learning theory. Kim and colleagues (2013, p. 908) found that alcohol use increases when students:

1. Have a greater proportion of peers who use alcohol
2. Have fathers who use alcohol
3. Have definitions favorable to alcohol use
4. Have a greater chance of imitating use of alcohol by behavioral models

Furthermore, they found that, consistent with Akers’ SSSL theory, the effects of several of the structural-level variables, significant when only they were in the model, were mediated by the social learning variables. Specifically, the effects of population size, residential mobility, type of school, and religiosity were explained by social learning variables. Even the strong gender effect, which remains significant in the final model, is largely explained by the social learning variables. Given the more rigorous measurement of the key constructs and analyses conducted in the previous study, we believe the evidence lends considerable support for Akers’ SSSL theory.
A Global Perspective on Social Disorganization Theory

Social disorganization theory is clearly an American-born theory, rooted in the Chicago School of Sociology. Indeed, stemming from the original theoretical and empirical work by Shaw and McKay (1942/1969) in the early 1900s, work in this tradition continues to the present day (e.g., Sampson, 2012). Of course, the theory has been tested in other major U.S. cities, such as New York, Chicago, and St. Louis, among others. The theory was originally developed to explain neighborhood variation in delinquency and crime across relatively small macro units, but there is clearly reason to believe that the same general structural characteristics (i.e., economic deprivation, population instability, and racial/ethnic heterogeneity) may operate at other levels to explain various forms of crime and deviance. For example, social disorganization theory has also been applied to schools, cities, and states within the United States. There is also reason to believe that social disorganization is a general macro-level theory of crime that can be applied to other countries and across nations that vary in levels of informal social control.

Recently, several efforts to test the theory at the neighborhood level in other countries have been published, and it appears that social disorganization has the potential to explain levels of deviant behavior outside the United States. In the next section, we describe studies that focus on neighborhood-level analyses across cities outside the United States.

Tests of Social Disorganization in Cities Outside the United States

Breetzke (2010) argues that South Africa provides an excellent setting to test social disorganization theory. He states that

the recent political history of South Africa is inherently intertwined with social disorganization and community fragmentation. While a few examples may exist elsewhere, no other country in the world has endured such a direct and sustained attack on the social fabric of its society through state laws and policies aimed at enforcing and accentuating spatio-social segmentation. (p. 447)

To test social disorganization theory in this context, Breetzke collected data in the city of Tshwane, one of the six largest metropolitan areas in South Africa. The level of analysis was the census-defined “suburb,” with the number of households in each suburb ranging from 150–300.

Three years of violent crime data (2001–2003), including “murder, attempted murder, sexual offenses assault with the intent to cause grievous bodily harm and common assault,” was culled from the Crime and Information Analysis Centre (Breetzke, 2010, p. 448). Address-based data were geocoded and aggregated to the suburb level. These were matched with other 2001 census measures, including ethnic heterogeneity, socioeconomic deprivation, family disruption, and residential mobility (Breetzke, 2010, p. 448). Several of these variables were quite different in nature from those found in the United States or had potentially different meanings from our understanding in the West. For example, in addition to unemployment (a common measure used in tests of social disorganization theory in the United States), the measure of socioeconomic disadvantage included “type of dwelling, source of water, toilet facilities, refuse or rubbish removal, and energy or fuel for lighting, heating and cooking” (Breetzke, 2010, p. 448). These items are largely irrelevant in industrialized developed
nations and were specifically designed by the Nation’s Development Program (2003) to assess socio-
economic development in South Africa. Interestingly, given the heterogeneous nature of the country,
there was plenty of room to measure various forms of racial and ethnic heterogeneity (as the country
has four official racial groups and nine distinct ethnic groups) and linguistic heterogeneity (as the
country has eleven official languages). The authors chose to focus simply on the percentage black,
given the history of apartheid that segregated “Black African, Colored, Asian, or Indian” individuals
who were viewed as nonwhites (Breetzke, 2010, p. 448).

Results were mixed. On the one hand, consistent with social disorganization theory both measures
of socioeconomic deprivation (unemployment and the deprivation index) were statistically and posi-
tively related to rates of violent crime. Similarly, residential mobility (the percentage of the population
that had moved in the past 5 years) was positively related to the rate of violent crime. However, the
percentage of the suburb characterized as black or nonwhite actually trended in a negative direction
and was not statistically significant. This was also the case for the percentage of female-headed house-
holds. The race finding is particularly interesting given the history of South Africa and its policy of total
segregation. One would think with this shift in policy that desegregated communities would have
higher violent crime rates. There may be something statistically odd going on here, but not enough
information was provided on the distribution of this variable to comment further. However, given the
heterogeneous nature of the country, more work should look at finer measures of racial/ethnic and
linguistic heterogeneity.

The fact that the percentage of households headed by women was unrelated to violent crime
might be explained by the measurement of the variable. Black South Africans often work far from the
home and are gone for long periods of time, even though their household census designation is in
the home. Thus, because two of the empirical inconsistencies with social disorganization theory may
have to do with poor measurement and statistical anomalies, we suggest that the bulk of the evidence
supports the predictive ability of social disorganization, at least across suburbs of Tshwane, South
Africa.

Moving to Asia, Zhang and colleagues (2007) studied household burglary victimization across
neighborhoods in Tianjin, China. The results were interesting, and while somewhat different from what
researchers have found in the West, in some ways still supportive of social disorganization theory. First,
inconsistent with social disorganization theory, poverty was unrelated to burglary, and residential sta-
bility was positively associated with burglary. The former may have something to do with the lack of
attractive targets in impoverished neighborhoods cancelling out the safer but wealthier neighborhoods.
The latter seems somewhat intractable given the various possibilities. Alternatively, collective efficacy
was, as expected, negatively associated with burglary, as was the presence of formal agents of social
control (the visibility of the police). The perceived effectiveness of neighborhood mediation groups was
not a significant predictor of burglary, but this may reflect the amount of mediation going on. That is,
if there are many problems, there may be more information to base judgment on (though mediation
may appear less effective because there are many problems), but, when there are few disputes, there is
little to base judgment on. Given these concerns, perceptions of mediation groups may not be the best
indicator of the semi-public control the researchers wanted to measure. These finding are supportive of
newer versions of social disorganization theory that focus on collective efficacy (social cohesion and
informal social control) and social control from the public sector (i.e., the police).

As mentioned, social disorganization theory has mostly been tested in the United States and
mostly in urban areas. While a few empirical tests of social disorganization theory in rural areas of
the United States have been conducted and have supported the theory (Barnett & Mencken, 2002; Osgood & Chambers, 2000), not much has been done outside the country. However, Jobes and his colleagues (2004) provided one such test in New South Wales, Australia. They obtained crime data from the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and census data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics for 123 local geographic areas. These are the smallest “municipal” units defined by the census and include on average less than 50,000 residents. Crime data included rates of assault, breaking and entering, malicious damage to property, and motor vehicle theft. The researchers collected 19 different measures from the census that fell under five dimensions of social disorganization theory: (1) low socioeconomic status (e.g., unemployment, poverty); (2) residential instability (e.g., living at a different address, living in own home); (3) ethnic heterogeneity (e.g., proportion indigenous); (4) family disruptions (e.g., divorce, sole parent); and (5) population size and density.

Across dimensions of crime the social disorganization variables explained a good deal of the variation—between 20 and 45% across models. This is similar to analyses conducted in rural areas in the United States, suggesting that not only is the theory generalizable, its ability to explain variation is about the same across these two countries. Dimensions of social disorganization particularly predictive of the various crimes included measures of ethnic heterogeneity, residential instability, and family disruption.

Another study in Australia, though not directly testing social disorganization theory per se, does offer some insight on the predictors of indigenous violence among the Australian Aboriginals. Using the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Survey (NATSIS), Snowball and Weatherburn (2008) examined a number of theoretical explanations to assess violence among Aboriginals. This is a large survey, not specifically designed to test any one theory, but several items pertained to social disorganization. Given what was available, and based on social disorganization theory, the authors expected that “violent victimisation would be higher amongst Indigenous Australians who:

- Are not socially involved in their communities
- Are sole parents
- Have high rates of geographic mobility (as measured by the number of times they moved house
- Are member or have relatives who are member of the stolen generation” (p. 222)

With the exception of the first expectation, the results were largely supportive of social disorganization theory. In contrast to the researchers’ expectations, Aboriginals who were involved in their communities were actually more likely to be victimized than those who were more socially isolated. This may have to do with the different environmental and social settings those in the community find themselves in. Alternatively, the odds of a sole parent being victimized were 39% higher than those with a partner, and the odds of members of the stolen generation (or having relatives who were members) being victimized were 71% higher than others. Finally, each additional geographic move increased the odds of being victimized by 33%. Although this is an individual-level examination of a macro-level theory, the data seem to support social disorganization theory. Taken in total, we find significant support for social disorganization theory outside the United States and across several countries.

Cross-National Tests of Institutional Anomie Theory

In trying to understand the high rates of crime in the United States, Messner and Rosenfeld (2007) argued that societies that value economic institutions (e.g., capitalism and the accumulation of wealth) over
non-economic institutions (e.g., education, the family) will have higher rates of crime. Several studies have examined their theory by analyzing subnational macro social units within the United States, including counties (Maume & Lee, 2003) and states (Chamlin & Cochran, 1995). Some support for the theory has been found.

A few studies have begun to investigate the merits of the theory using cross-national tests, which would seem to be the most appropriate test of the theory as it was originally developed to explain the high rates of crime in the United States relative to other nations. Messner and Rosenfield (1997) provided the first empirical test of their theory by linking it with the concept of decommodification—the movement away from pure market economies to ones that provide political institutions (such as the welfare state) to protect individuals from the harsh realities of pure capitalism. They argue that “a greater degree of decommodification indicates a lower level of economic dominance in this particular institutional interrelationship” (p. 1397). They created a measure of decommodification that reflects “the ease of access to welfare benefits, their income-replacement value, and the expansiveness of coverage across different statuses and circumstances” (pp. 1398–1399) across 45 nations. These nations varied widely, ranging from developed nations such as the United States and Japan to developing nations such as El Salvador and Sri Lanka. Messner and Rosenfield found support for their hypothesis that countries that have moved away from a pure market economy have lower homicide rates.

Savolainen (2002) extends this work by suggesting that a more “critical test of the institutional anomie theory should estimate the moderating effect of the institutional context on the relationship between economic inequality and serious crime, preferably at the cross-national level of analysis” (p. 1026). That is, other institutions should affect the strength of the relationship between economic inequality and crime. He found not only a direct effect of decommodification on homicide rates, but also an interaction effect with measures of income inequality. Savolainen (2000) concludes that “nations that protect their citizens from the vicissitudes of market forces appear to be immune to the homicidal effects of economic inequality” (p. 1021).

Cochran and Bjerregaard (2012) provide the most recent cross-national test of institutional anomie theory with a new complex measure of structural anomie based on measures of economic freedom, wealth, and income inequality. Controlling for measures of other social institutions, such as the family (divorce rates), the polity (lack of voter turnout), and educational spending, they found that their measure of structural anomie was a robust predictor of both the homicide rate and rates of theft. Taken together, this emerging line of research suggests relatively strong support for institutional anomie theory in a cross-national setting.

Critical Collective Framing Theory and the Genocide in Darfur

While much of the sociological research to date has focused on what leads up to genocide (Gurr & Harff, 1994; Horowitz, 2001); the problem of defining genocide (Chirot & Edwards, 2003); typologies of genocide (Chirot & McCauley, 2006); and the disputed scales of genocide (Hagan et al., 2006), Hagan and Rymond-Richmond (2008) examined the genocide in Darfur from the perspective of critical collective framing theory. Their focus was on “the dehumanizing racial motivations and intentions that explain how a government mobilizes and collaborates in the ideological dehumanization and criminal victimization of a racial group” (p. 876). They found that, indeed, there was an emergence of collective racial motivation and intent with respect to the killings in Darfur that was indicated through the use of racial epithets preceding and during attacks.
This dehumanization process placed black African groups in Darfur outside a bounded universe of moral obligation and left them vulnerable to targeted genocidal victimization. Treatment of groups as dehumanized and contemptible makes them vulnerable to displacement and destruction. We found compelling evidence that collective processes of racial motivation and intent influenced the severity of victimization across settlements, above and beyond this influence at the individual level, and that this collective frame mediated the concentration of attacks on densely settled areas and particular African groups. (Hagan & Rymond-Richmond, 2008, p. 895)

In other words, by framing a group as subhuman (deviant), it makes this group vulnerable to violence in general, and, in the case of Darfur, genocide in particular.

**RECENT STUDY IN DEVIANCE**

**The Cycle of Violence in Spain**


Does violence breed violence? Is there a cycle of violence, or an intergenerational transmission of violence? That is, do parents teach violence to their children through their own use of violence? Many have linked the empirical correlation between parental deviant behavior, including violence, and children’s deviant behavior to social learning theory. Parents may model the behavior and children imitate it. Children may see parental violence work—that is, the parent gets what he or she wants through the use of violence, and this produces an anticipated reinforcement effect that encourages violence. In examining risk factors for child-to-parent violence (CPV), Izaskun Ibabe, Joana Jaureguizar and Peter Bentler studied this link among 485 young male and female children in the Basque Country of Spain. The found interparental violence and parent-to-child violence to be strong predictors of CPV among this sample, suggesting that parents may model violent behavior, reinforce violence as a means of achieving desired outcomes, and, in the end, bring about the cycle of violence.

**Social Control in Global Context**

Discussing social control in global context is a daunting task. Just as there are many, many types of deviant acts depending on the cultural context, there are many different and varied reactions to human behaviors and statuses. Rather than attempt to give a comprehensive overview of the extreme differences in both informal and social control across the globe—a herculean, if not impossible task—in this section, we offer a few examples of how perceived deviance is responded to in different cultural settings. We chose these few examples to illustrate that the systems in America are
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culturally specific and are not necessarily the best or only way to react to deviance. Our hope is that your curiosity will be sparked by these differences and you will pause to question and research social control as you continue your education.

When we think about social control, what often comes to mind is the reaction to an act—it might be a criminal act, a social faux pas, or the violation of a society's unwritten rules that trigger a reaction from the community. If you think back to what you learned about labeling theory (Chapter 8), however, you will recall sometimes people are punished, oppressed, and sanctioned purely because of who they are. The following examples take two master statuses—that of being a woman and that of identifying as gay or as a gay rights activist—and show how simply existing within those statuses can lead to deadly consequences in some parts of the world.

Social Control of Girls and Women

The book *Half the Sky*, written by husband and wife journalist team Nicholas D. Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn (2009), vividly documents the oppression and control of women and girls across the globe. The authors focus their book on three particular kinds of abuse: “sex trafficking and forced prostitution; gender based violence, including honor killings and mass rape; and maternal mortality, which still needlessly claims one woman a minute” (p. xxi).

Kristof and WuDunn tell stories of young girls in Cambodia, Nepal, Thailand, and Malaysia who were kidnapped, raped, and sold into brothels where they were regularly drugged, beaten, and forced to live as prostitutes and/or modern-day slaves. Girls who were brave enough and risked their lives to escape found no help from local police, who sent them back to the brothels (p. 7).

The authors go on to report on many different kinds of punishments and threats that women endure in other nations. Women perceived to be “loose” or “bad” in Pakistan had their faces destroyed by acid or had their noses cut off as a form of punishment (p. 75). Girls in Iraq were killed by family and religious leaders if it was believed they lost their virginity before marriage (p. 82). In Darfur, militia gang-raped and mutilated women from African tribes, and the Sudanese government responded by punishing women who reported the rapes or sought medical attention (p. 83). In the Congo, rape was used as a terror tactic to control civilian populations; Congolese militia raped women with sticks or knives and were known to fire their guns into women’s and girls’ vaginas (p. 84). A teenage soldier in Congo explained that rape was routine, saying if he and his fellow soldiers saw girls, it was their right to rape and violate them (p. 86).

As terrifying as it may be, some girls living in restrictive and punitive cultures take great risks to fight for better lives. Malala Yousafzai, a Pakistani schoolgirl, received widespread attention—both positive and negative—when she began speaking out against Taliban oppression when she was only 11 years old. She began her individual form of resistance by writing her thoughts and experiences in a blog using a pseudonym to protect her identity; gradually, she became a more public figure and made media appearances advocating for education for girls. When she was just 14 years old, Malala was targeted and shot in the head and neck by a Taliban gunman while on the school bus home. In part because of her public persona and status as a martyr, she was fortunate enough to get specialized medical care and recover from her wounds.
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Yousafzai was targeted by the Taliban and nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize as a teenager for her courage in advocating for education for girls in Pakistan.

*Source:* ©Claude Truong-Ngoc/Wikimedia Commons.
Malala was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize and won the European Union’s highest human rights honor, the Sakharov Prize, in 2013 at just 16 years old. Her bravery has been lauded by the international press, and she has inspired other young girls to fight against oppression and for education and opportunities. “I Am Malala” became the slogan for a campaign to demand global access to education for children. Malala herself continues to face threats from the Taliban; the goals she risks her life for may seem quite simple to those who grew up in the United States and accept such circumstances as their birthright. In Malala’s words, “I hope that a day will come when the people of Pakistan will be free, they will have their rights, there will be peace, and every girl and every boy will be going to school” (quoted in Williams, 2013).

Social Control of Homosexuality

Although the United States continues grappling with evolving norms and attitudes around the issues of homophobia, the bullying of gay teens, and the legality of gay marriage, simply being gay is not a crime, and threats and cruelty are not formally sanctioned. The same cannot be said in other countries. Homosexuality is illegal in most African countries, and homosexual acts are punishable by 14 years to life in prison in Uganda (Walsh, 2011). The Anti-Homosexuality Bill proposed in Uganda in 2009 included harsh sanctions for anyone engaging in gay sex or protecting the privacy of those who do; the bill featured the following provisions:

- Gays and lesbians convicted of having gay sex would be sentenced, at minimum, to life in prison
- People who test positive for HIV may be executed
- Homosexuals who have sex with a minor, or engage in homosexual sex more than once, may also receive the death penalty
- The bill forbids the “promotion of homosexuality,” which in effect bans organizations working in HIV and AIDS prevention
- Anyone who knew of homosexual activity taking place but did not report it would risk up to three years in prison. (Ahmed, 2009)

The Anti-Homosexuality Bill prompted an international reaction; European nations threatened to cut aid to Uganda if such laws were passed, and the bill was shelved. While the bill was not passed into law, harsh and deadly informal sanctions are still a real threat to gays and gay rights activists in Uganda. A Ugandan tabloid published a front-page story targeting the “top 100 homosexuals,” complete with photographs and addresses of those on the list. David Kato, a gay rights activist, told reporters that he feared for his life after his name was published on the list; he was right to be afraid—within the year, Kato was bludgeoned to death in his home (Walsh, 2011).

Social Control of Crime: Extremes in Prison Conditions Internationally

Scandinavia has long been considered the gold standard in terms of creating and maintaining humane prisons that work to rehabilitate offenders and keep crime and incarceration rates low. Indeed, Scandinavian prisons were designed to be constructive and productive, built on the belief that a prison should not be a place of suffering, fear, and deprivation, but instead should be one of redemption,
Prisons in the United States vary markedly in their quality, and few compare favorably to prisons in Norway or Sweden. Yet there are basic minimum standards for the treatment of prisoners, with codified rules and written documentation that are part of “a culture of audit and control” (Birckbeck, 2011, p. 3180). When documented standards are not met in the United States, litigation is a possibility, and the courts may step in to order changes. Many countries in Latin America and the developing world do not have this type of quality control, and prisons are often overcrowded, unsanitary, and unsafe. Here we offer comparison of prisons in Norway and prisons in Latin America to show these two extremes.

**Norway—The Best Prisons in the World?**

The goal of many Scandinavian prisons is to make life for prisoners as normal as possible. Loss of liberty is the primary punishment. Arne Nilsen, the governor or head of Bastoy prison island, explained how his philosophy that a prison should be “an arena of developing responsibility” was put into practice:

In closed prisons we keep them locked up for some years and then let them back out, not having had any real responsibility for working or cooking. In the law, being sent to prison is nothing to do with putting you in a terrible prison to make you suffer. The punishment is that you lose your freedom. If we treat people like animals when they are in prison they are likely to behave like animals. Here we pay attention to you as human beings. (quoted in James, 2013a)

The Norwegian penal system has no death penalty or life sentences; the maximum sentence that can be handed down in Norway is just 21 years. This maximum sentence can be extended only if the inmate is deemed to be an imminent threat to society (Sutter, 2012). With this sentencing structure, Norwegian society is forced to confront the fact that most prisoners, however heinous their crimes, will one day be released back into society (Hernu, 2011). In fact, more than 89% of Norway’s sentences are for less than one year of confinement, as compared to U.S. federal prisons where only 2% of sentences are for one year or less (Sutter, 2012).

Two examples—one of a closed prison and one of a more open and transitional prison—help to show Norway’s commitment to rehabilitating and reintegrating all of its offenders, even those who have committed very serious crimes. Inmates may still suffer the pains of imprisonment (as discussed in Chapter 11), but they can gain skills, maintain contact with their families, and practice responsible and conforming living even while incarcerated.

Halden is Norway’s most secure prison and its second largest, holding about 250 men. While Halden does have a 20-foot cement wall around the perimeter, life inside is meant to mimic a small village. Prison cells in Halden are similar to dorm rooms and have windows, adjoining bathrooms, and flat-screen televisions. There is a two-bedroom house on the prison grounds where prisoners can host their families overnight. There are jogging trails, sports fields, and a recording studio (Adams, 2010).

Bastoy prison island in Norway looks virtually nothing like an American prison. While it might be compared to Alcatraz due to its location on a 1-square mile island, Bastoy operates under a much different philosophy. Bastoy offers prisoners trust and responsibility, giving them the chance to become educated, learn new skills, work at varying jobs around the island, grocery shop and cook meals, live...
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machine-gun, hand-grenades and two mortars. A similar number died in a riot at El Rodeo, another Venezuelan prison, last year, which saw gang bosses hold out against thousands of national-guard troops for almost a month.

A fire begun during a fight between inmates at San Miguel prison in Santiago, Chile’s capital, in December 2010 killed 81 prisoners and injured 15. Survivors said a group of inmates used a homemade flame-thrower, fashioned from a hosepipe and a gas canister, to set fire to a mattress barricade erected by a rival group in their barred cell. San Miguel was not a high-security jail, and the victims of the worst prison fire in Chile’s history were all serving sentences of five years or less, for crimes such as pirating DVDs and burglary. (© The Economist Newspaper Limited, London [06 May 2014].)

Lurigancho, Peru’s largest prison, is considered to be one of the world’s most dangerous. The inmates essentially run the institution while corrupt and outnumbered guards regularly accept bribes from both inmates and visitors alike. Inmates with resources can purchase food, drugs, nice clothing, conjugal visits, and influence over their fellow inmates. Those without resources are left to try to eke out a miserable existence within the prison’s walls.

In Venezuela, penal confinement is prescribed for all felony convictions, and there is no possibility of sentencing to probation. While there are more avenues for parole and early release from prison (Birkbeck, 2011) than in the United States, inmates’ time served in prison may turn into a de facto death penalty: Venezuela had more than 500 prison deaths in 2011. Prisons in Latin America do have the potential benefit of more permissive visiting policies. In Mexico and Bolivia, for example, families and children may actually live in the prisons with their incarcerated parent(s) for an extended period of time. Visits are much less regimented and allow for significant mingling with members of the outside community, helping to ease the social isolation often experienced by prisoners. With the philosophy of internment—where detaining the offenders is the primary goal—what happens inside the facility is irrelevant; inmates must rely on self-government, for better or worse. There is little public scrutiny unless inmates escape or are killed in dramatic circumstances.

Social Control of Mental Illness

Communities both define and react to mental illness in very different ways. In many countries, there is not much of a safety net for those with mental illness. In China, for example, there is no national mental health law, and insurance rarely covers psychiatric care. Even when families and individuals are motivated to seek professional help, there are few educated psychiatrists to care for the population. The New York Times focused attention on a tragic case that illustrates the immensity of the problem:

A Lancet study estimated that roughly 173 million Chinese suffer from a mental disorder. Despite government efforts to expand insurance coverage, a senior Health Ministry official said last June that in recent years, only 45,000 people had been covered for free outpatient treatment and only 7,000 for free inpatient care because they were either dangerous to society or too impoverished to pay.

The dearth of care is most evident when it comes to individuals who commit violent crimes. For example, after Liu Yalin killed and dismembered an elderly couple cutting firewood in a Guangdong Province forest, he was judged to be schizophrenic and released to his brother.
Unable to afford treatment, the brother flew Mr. Liu to the island province of Hainan, in the South China Sea, and abandoned him, a Chinese nongovernment organization, Shenzhen Hengping, said in a recent report.

Last year, the tragedy was multiplied when—left without care or supervision—Mr. Liu killed and dismembered an 8-year-old Hainan girl. (LaFraniere, 2010)

In poor countries, the government returns severely mentally ill people to their families, and the families are generally at a loss as to how to care for them. With few resources, information, or help available in their communities, families must sometimes resort to locking up and shackling relatives who pose a threat to themselves and others.

In Kenya mentally ill family members are tied up daily by their relatives in order to keep them from running away or harming themselves. Family members are consumed with the task of caring for their mentally ill loved ones. They may find themselves entirely alone in their efforts, shunned by the community because of the unpleasant noise and stench. While one-fourth of patients visiting Kenyan hospitals or clinics complain of mental health problems, the Kenyan government spends less than 1% of its health budget on mental health (McKenzie & Formanek, 2011).

Social Control and Reintegration: Restorative Justice

Howard Zehr, one of the early proponents of restorative justice, explains the basic principles of the concept as follows: Crime is a violation of people and of interpersonal relationships; violations create obligations; and the central obligation is to put right the wrongs (Zehr, 2002, p. 19). While he uses an American lens to discuss these principles, Zehr suggests that there are deep roots for the concept in many different cultures, expressed in different languages. He writes, “Many cultures have a word that represents this notion of the centrality of relationships: for the Maori, it is communicated by whakapapa; for the Navajo, hozho; for many Africans, the Bantu word Ubuntu” (Zehr, 2002, pp. 19–20).

After spending a decade studying restorative justice, primarily in South Australia, Kathleen Daly found that there is little empirical evidence as to what actually happens in youth justice conferences and how participants feel about the process and outcomes. Daly argues that there is a complex definition and meaning of restorative justice:

Restorative justice is not easily defined because it encompasses a variety of practices at different stages of the criminal process, including diversion from court prosecution, actions taken in parallel with court decisions, and meetings between victims and offenders at any stage of the criminal process (for example, arrest, pre-sentencing, and prison release). For virtually all legal contexts involving individual criminal matters, restorative justice processes have only been applied to those offenders who have admitted to an offence; as such, it deals with the penalty phase of the criminal process for admitted offenders, not the fact-finding phase. Restorative justice is used not only in adult and juvenile criminal matters, but also in a range of civil matters, including family welfare and child protection, and disputes in schools and workplace settings. (Daly, 2002, p. 57)

New Zealand’s youth justice system, which emphasizes diversion, family involvement, and restorative justice principles, has been a model for other jurisdictions worldwide. From approximately
1990–2010, New Zealand dealt with most youth offenders—nearly 80% of apprehensions—through diversion rather than prosecution (Lynch, 2012). With the use of restorative justice,

the victim of the offence may be part of the process, giving him or her tangible power in the resolution of the offence. True participation by victims (and by the community) can reduce the public appetite for punitiveness. (Lynch, 2012, p. 512)

Similarly, Bazemore (1998) advocates for a variation of restorative justice featuring a system of earned redemption that would allow offenders to earn trust back from the community by making amends to those they harmed.

In Africa, using the ubuntu principle, the goals of justice-making include the restoration of victims, the reintegration of the offender back into the community, and the restoration of relationships and social harmony undermined by the conflict. All stakeholders should have equal access and participation in the conflict resolution process (Elechi, Morris, & Schauer, 2010, p. 73); this process has the power to reinforce the values of the community. Elechi et al. (2010) argue that the African Indigenous Justice System is “an opportunity for the resocialization of community members and the relearning of important African values and principles of restraint, respect, and responsibility” (p. 74), and, further, when communities rely on themselves to solve problems, both individual and collective accountability may be improved as a result (p. 83).

Different cultures and individuals may embrace a wide variety of restorative justice principles and techniques, but what sets these efforts apart from the criminal justice system in the United States is the focus on the reparation of harm and the restoration of the offender rather than on retribution for the harm caused.

**Explaining Deviance in the Streets and Deviance in the Suites: Human Trafficking: Crossing Boundaries and Borders**

We have chosen to discuss human trafficking because it is a deviance that is both big business and found on the streets. While some human trafficking occurs across state or regional lines, a great proportion of it is transnational and global.

Human trafficking is a crime that “recognizes no race, gender, or national boundary” (Zhang, 2010, p. 15) although it is generally visited on the least powerful: children, women, and people of color. According to the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, human trafficking is “the act of recruiting, harboring, transporting, providing, or obtaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sex acts through the use of force, fraud, or coercion” (U.S. Department of State, 2013, p. 29). While most envision that human trafficking means transporting a victim from one country to another, the official definition does not require the victim to be transported:

Human trafficking can include but does not require movement. People may be considered trafficking victims regardless of whether they were born into a state of servitude, were transported to the exploitative situation, previously consented to work for a trafficker, or participated in a crime as a direct result of being trafficked. At the heart of this phenomenon is the
traffickers’ goal of exploiting and enslaving their victims and the myriad coercive and deceptive practices they use to do so. (U.S. Department of State, 2013, p. 29)

Children and adults who are victims of human trafficking are coerced into being soldiers, sold for hard labor or sex, or forced into domestic labor, prostitution, or marriage. Others find themselves working in mines, plantations, or sweatshops (United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Global Trafficking [UN.Gift], 2008). Many initially go with their captors willingly because of promises of a better job or an escape from a hard life, only to be turned into slaves once they arrive at their new destination. These experiences are illustrated by the stories of three trafficking victims below:

Ximena: “When you’re a kid, it’s easy to be deceived. Each Sunday when I walked down from the town, where my mum had a business, they would urge me to go with them, telling me that I would have a really good time, that it was better to go with them than to keep on working. On my 12th birthday, they came back for me. My mum was away at work, so I took the chance and escaped with them. . . . Five months later I regretted being there, but there was no chance of leaving. Besides, they told my mum that I was dead, that they had already killed me.” (UN.Gift, 2008, p. 2)

Luana: “A friend of mine told me that a Spanish group was hiring Brazilian girls to work as dancers on the island of Lanzarote. My friend Marcela and I thought it was a good opportunity to earn money. We didn’t want to continue working as maids. For a short while we only danced. But later they told us there had been too many expenses. And we would have to make some extra money.” (UN.Gift, 2008, p. 5)

Marcela: “We were trapped by criminals and forced into prostitution in order to pay debts for the trip. We had up to 15 clients per night. The use of condoms was the client’s decision, not ours. The criminals kept our passports and had an armed man in front of the ‘disco’ to make sure we never escaped. But a woman helped us. We went to the police and told everything.” (UN.Gift, 2008, p. 5)

According to The United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.Gift, 2008) human trafficking is a billion-dollar industry. The UN acknowledges, however, that our understanding of human trafficking is negligible—there is no broad agreement on how to count individuals that have been trafficked, and therefore the estimates from various organizations often contradict each other. One organization estimates that at least 2.5 million people are victims of human trafficking, with an estimated 130,000 in sub-Saharan countries, 200,000 in countries with economies in transition, 230,000 in the Middle East or Northern Africa, 250,000 in Latin American and the Caribbean, 270,000 in industrialized countries, and over 1.4 million in Asia and the Pacific (International Labour Organization, 2005). A second estimate suggests that at least 800,000 people are smuggled across national borders every year, with millions more trafficked in their own countries (Department of State, 2007). And the nongovernmental organization Free the Slaves estimates that there are between 21 and 30 million people in slavery globally (Free the Slaves, 2013).

The elusive nature of human trafficking is illustrated in the small number of human trafficking incidents that are investigated and confirmed in the United States, in comparison to the estimated number of human trafficking cases that are believed to exist. The U.S. Department of Justice reports that in the United States, just over 2,500 cases were investigated by federally funded human trafficking task forces between 2008 and 2010 (Banks & Kyckelhahn, 2011). And in very few of these cases could law enforcement confirm the victim’s characteristics (see Table 13.2).
### Table 13.1 Victim Characteristics in Cases Confirmed to Be Human Trafficking by High Data Quality Task Forces, by Type of Trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim characteristic</th>
<th>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Sex trafficking</th>
<th>Labour trafficking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 or younger</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–24</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 or older</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Hispanic origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino origin</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian&lt;sup&gt;b, c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b, d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Citizen/U.S. National</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent U.S. resident&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented alien&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified alien&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of victims identified</strong></td>
<td>527</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note*: Analysis restricted to cases opened and observed between January 2008 and June 2010 in high data quality task forces. See definition of high data quality task forces on page 5.

<sup>a</sup>Includes cases of unknown trafficking type.

<sup>b</sup>Excludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

<sup>c</sup>Asian may include Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders or persons of East Asian or Southeast Asian descent.

<sup>d</sup>Includes persons of two or more races.

<sup>e</sup>Permanent residents and qualified aliens are legal residents in the U.S., but do not have citizenship.

<sup>f</sup>Undocumented aliens reside in the U.S. illegally.
While the challenges to eradicate human trafficking are significant, at least they are known and can be addressed. The United Nations suggests that these challenges include the following:

- Lack of knowledge: there are still huge gaps in knowledge even about the extent of human trafficking and modern-day slavery.
- Lack of a national legal framework, policy, and capacity to respond: while human trafficking is acknowledged as a crime, there is little systematic legal response or public policy to address it.
- Limited protection of and assistance to victims: social service and law enforcement agencies need training in order to better identify and respond to victims of human trafficking.
- Limited international cooperation: as probably the best example of deviance or crime that crosses national borders, there is surprisingly less cooperation than one would hope between countries in identifying and stopping human trafficking. (UN.Gift, 2008, p. 1)

Another challenge that has been identified involves the definition of human trafficking. Human trafficking laws in many countries require that the person accused of human trafficking be proven to have “bought or sold” another human being. But the reality is that most human trafficking victims are never bought or sold in the traditional sense. Because no transaction occurs and no money changes hands, the vast majority of human trafficking victims are not acknowledged or protected by such laws. Broadening language in countries that rely on the provision of buying and selling individuals would mean that more offenders would be prosecuted and more victims acknowledged (U.S. Department of State, 2013).

Finally, Zhang (2010) makes five suggestions for public policies to address human trafficking:

- Law enforcement should focus on disruption tactics that make the business of human trafficking harder to sustain.
- Increase the financial cost to the business of human trafficking; a legal outcome should be asset forfeiture for anyone found guilty of human trafficking.
- Law enforcement agencies, medical providers, and social services providers need to be systematically educated on how to recognize trafficking victims.
- Engage in a campaign that increases public awareness of the existence of human trafficking and that reaches victims of trafficking and makes them aware of who they can contact for help.
- Effect an increase in political will measured by resource allocation that will secure and offer long-term solutions to human trafficking.

NOW YOU . . . THINK ABOUT GLOBAL DEVIANCE

It is often easy to pass judgment on other countries for their beliefs and practices, and, in most instances when we are passing judgment, we are implicitly or explicitly defining those practices as deviant. It is your turn to explore and critique these differences.
Conclusion

We hope you have enjoyed this exploration into the many, many forms of deviance and the varied ways that societies first define deviance and then react to such acts or characteristics. While we understand that we may be considered deviant ourselves due to our years focusing on the topic, we find all of this material so fascinating that we have devoted our careers to studying it, researching our favorite theories and subtopics, and writing this textbook to share with you. Whether you choose to join us in a career related to deviance, crime, delinquency, or mental health, or whether you can simply now check this off your list of required classes, we hope that after reading this book you will bring a lingering curiosity and a more complex understanding of the causes and reactions to deviant behavior into all of your future endeavors.

EXERCISES AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Choose a country.
2. Find a practice or behavior that the laws in your chosen country or individuals in the country define as deviant that the United States or individuals in the United States would be less likely to define as deviant.
3. Find a practice or behavior that laws in the United States or individuals in the United States define as deviant that your chosen country or individuals in the country would be less likely to define as deviant.
4. Find a practice or behavior that is defined as deviant in both your chosen country and the United States.
5. Why is it that these practices or behaviors may or may not be defined as deviant? Does it matter who engages in the practice for it to be defined as deviant? Who benefits from these definitions of deviance or nondeviance? Why might this behavior be deviant in one country and not in another?

EXERCISES AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. You are part of a research team that will be studying human trafficking links between China, Mexico, and the United States. Explain the research challenges/issues you will need to be aware of as you plan your study.
2. Choose a country whose prison system has not been discussed in this chapter. Research its forms of social control. Compare and contrast these forms of social control to the U.S. prison system.

KEY TERMS

Decommodification  Human trafficking