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VIOLENT CRIME RATES, 1973-2005 (NCVS)

PROPERTY CRIME RATES, 1973-2005 (NCVS)

HOMICIDE RATES, 1900-2002
HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION
BY GENDER & RACE, 2002
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HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION
BY AGE, 2002
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HOMICIDES BY GENDER & RACE
OF VICTIM & OFFENDER, 2002

Female on female 2.4%
Female on male 9.9%
Male on female 22.6%
Male on male 65.1%

Black on white 8.1%
White on black 3.2%
White on white 45.7%

Other 1.4%

LABELING THEORY

- Labeling theory: theory which states that deviance is the consequence of the application of rules and sanctions to an offender; a deviant is an individual to whom the identity “deviant” has been successfully applied
- Two types of deviance
  - Primary deviance: routine instances of norm violation that may or may not result in labeling
  - Secondary deviance: deviance following and resulting from the label
- Reasons why label may lead to deviance
  - 1. Cut off from participation in conventional groups
  - 2. Treatment may produce increasing deviance
  - 3. Labeled person may believe the label
DEVIANCE BY SOC 134 STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underage alcohol purchase</th>
<th>Smoked marijuana</th>
<th>DUI</th>
<th>Drag racing</th>
<th>Driving without license</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Not arrested</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underage alcohol purchase</th>
<th>Smoked marijuana</th>
<th>DUI</th>
<th>Drag racing</th>
<th>Driving without license</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Not arrested</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVIANCE BY SOC 134 STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fake ID</th>
<th>Shoplifting under $20</th>
<th>Shoplifting over $20</th>
<th>Vandalized property</th>
<th>Stole from hotel room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Not arrested</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE SAINTS AND THE ROUGHNECKS

- Participant observation study by William Chambliss
- Shows role of class in labeling
- Saints
  - Eight white, upper-middle class boys
  - Constantly occupied with truancy, drinking, theft & vandalism
  - Never arrested
- Roughnecks
  - Six white, lower class boys
  - Engaged in fighting, drinking and theft; less delinquent overall
  - Constantly in trouble with police & community
THE SAINTS AND THE ROUGHNECKS

- Why were the Saints and Roughnecks treated differently?
  - Visibility: Saints owned their own cars and were able to leave town
  - Demeanor: Saints were apologetic and penitent; Roughnecks hostile and disdainful
  - Bias: Community is biased against type of delinquency committed by Roughnecks
  - The delinquent label reinforced the Roughneck's delinquency
  - Predictions about boys' futures were correct
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