Week 6

Labeling and Symbolic Interaction in the Life Course

plan

Today (week 6): Labeling Theories and Diversion

Review Midterm guide

3/2 Gangs, Neighborhoods, and Social Disorganization

MIDTERM EXAMINATION covering material through today
midterm exam format

• default: multiple choice + short essay questions
  – ~40% MC – 20-2 pt. questions (time)
  – Choose 3 of 6 essays (1 or 2; 3 or 4; 5 or 6)
    • Same material as on review sheet, but not every part of every question
• alternatives?
• cut-off time

labeling theories

• Background:
  – Cooley, Mead and symbolic interactionism
    • Who are you?
  – Frank Tannenbaum (1938): The dramatization of evil and “tagging”
• Assumptions
  – Cultural relativism: no “core values” or universals; rules develop out of interaction
  – Labels affect behavior: Being caught and publicly labeled changes future behavior.
  – Power affects rulemaking and enforcement

concepts

• Primary and Secondary Deviance (E. Lemert 1951)
  – Primary deviance: original act of nonconformity
  – Secondary deviance: results from label and identity
• Rule creators/moral entrepreneurs (H. Becker 1963)
  – create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders
• Deviant careers
Rios on “Hyperlabeling”

- Youth are hypercriminalized by law enforcement, but communities are also underpoliced. How?
  - Spatial demarcation (p. 56)
  - Anderson’s “Code of street” – aggressive preemptive attacks
- P. 52: all in study saw selves as “inherently criminal” - part of persona
  - Tyrell making “conscious choice” and calculations, given alternatives (p.50-51)
  - P. 58 Jose – publicly identified as criminal at 8; milk story p. 59

sequence or career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule Making</th>
<th>Rule-Breaking Behavior</th>
<th>Official Label</th>
<th>Delinquent Self-image</th>
<th>More Delinquency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

policy - diversion

- 4 Ds: diversion, decriminalization, due process, and deinstitutionalization
  - If justice system “like quicksand,” divert at door
  - Net widening? Radical non-intervention or alternate programming?
  - Often used for status offenses and property crimes
- Wilson & Hoge 2013 meta-analysis of 73 diversion progs (15k diverted; 19k controls)
  - Lower recidivism for diverted in 60 of 73 programs
  - Average recidivism of 33% diversion; 41% controls
  - Effects weaker in most rigorous designs (.93 v. .6) and published work (publication bias?)
  - Sum: “more effective than traditional processing and considerably cheaper” (p. 514)
Mears et al., 2016
juvenile court diversion

• Help, Harm, or Both? Program quality varies
  – Benefits: lower costs
  – Costs: net-widening
    • Incentives for private vendors
    • We can “divert” into alternative program, rather than let go
  – “Civil citation” & police initiated diversion
    – Police directly processing and sanctioning

• Challenges
  – Defining diversion (dismiss, informal, formal progs)
  – Unclear theory and logic behind activities
  – Inconsistent use across groups (race, sex...)
  – Measurement and evaluation

• “Great promise...yet to be fulfilled”

lessons

• “Radical nonintervention” “works” as well or as poorly as “treatment” in national evaluation
• Diversion can be extended to (nonviolent?) non-status offenders
• [But...] Diversion is “treatment without trial;” “alternative encapsulation” and net-widening.

critique

• Incomplete (Becker 1973)
• Explaining primary deviance
• Social construction sometimes exaggerated (“crime doesn't exist”)
• Emphasis on formal labels
• Research evidence spotty – little “independent” effect of label
extensions - Matsueda

- Symbolic interactionism (Matsueda 1992): DA+SI+ (informal) labeling
  - Role-taking: project oneself into the role of others and imagine how they see you, the situation, and possible actions
  - Reflected appraisals: how you perceive others to see you (parents, friends, and teachers)
- Findings
  1. Parental appraisals & prior delinquency predict reflected appraisals
  2. Reflected appraisal as rule-violator increases future delinquency
  3. Reflected appraisals “mediate” effects of parental appraisals, prior delinquency, & background

deviance & adulthood (massoglia/uggen 2010)

- "Symbolic Interactionism" – DA & label
  - Age norms & delinquency; “measuring up” as adult
  - Seeing yourself as an adult
- Labeling question: Must you “settle down” to attain adult status
  - Stand shoulder-to-shoulder with fellow citizens
  - Relative conception – work & family transitions still expected of adults
  - From “hell-raiser to family man” or woman
- Subjective adulthood as collective adherence to domain-specific roles
  - Behavioral and labeling effects

hypotheses

1. Desistance will covary with other behavioral markers of adulthood. (S&L)
2. People feel less like adults while engaged in activities defined as conforming. (SI)
3. Recent arrestees will be less likely to feel “on time” in attaining behavioral markers of adulthood than non-arrestees. (LA)
4. Recent arrestees will be less likely to “feel like an adult most of the time” than non-arrestees.
5. People who think they commit less crime than others their age will feel more like adults than people who think they commit more crime than others their age. (DU)
6. People who think they commit less crime than they did 5 years ago will feel more like adults than people who think they commit as much or more crime as they did 5 years ago. (SI)
**design**

- **Data: Youth Development Study**
  - Longitudinal survey of St. Paul public school cohort
  - Age 30-31; 75% white; 43% male
  - 45% married, 55% had children by 2002

- **Estimation**
  - Latent class analysis for H1 [skip today]
  - Simple static-score logistic regression (controls for prior levels of dependent variable (adult status))

\[
\log \left[ \frac{P(Adult_{2002}=1)}{P(Adult_{2002}=0)} \right] = a + \beta_{\text{Arrest}_{2000-2002}} + \beta_{\text{Adult}_{1990}} + \ldots + \beta_{\text{Marker}_{2002}}
\]

---

**H2: Do 30 year olds feel like adults while engaged in conforming or deviant activities?**

---

**H3: Logistic regression estimates of effect of arrest in the past 3 years on feeling “on time” in each domain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Have Kids</th>
<th>Complete Education</th>
<th>Got a Job</th>
<th>Financially Independent</th>
<th>Start a Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>.639**</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.017***</td>
<td>-.608**</td>
<td>-.511**</td>
<td>-.720**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.472**</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td>1.117**</td>
<td>1.210**</td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>.766**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.10  ** p<.05
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### Hypotheses on Desistance

1. **YES**: Desistance will covary with other behavioral markers of adulthood. (S&L)
2. **YES**: People feel less like adults while engaged in activities defined as deviant and more like adults when engaged in activities defined as conforming. (SI)
3. **YES**: Recent arrestees will be less likely to feel “on time” in attaining behavioral markers of adulthood than non-arrestees. (LA)
4. **YES**: Recent arrestees will be less likely to “feel like an adult most of the time” than non-arrestees. (LA)
5. **MAYBE**: People who think they commit less crime than others their age will feel more like adults than people who think they commit more crime than others their age. (DU)
6. **YES**: People who think they commit less crime than they did 5 years ago will feel more like adults than people who think they commit as much or more crime as they did 5 years ago. (SI)

### Table 1: Arrest and Subjective Adult Status - Logistic Regression Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>-1.58**</td>
<td>-1.52**</td>
<td>-1.40**</td>
<td>-1.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=arrest in 2000-02)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=male)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-2.87**</td>
<td>-2.87**</td>
<td>-2.87**</td>
<td>-2.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=White)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=married)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary degree</td>
<td>-2.56**</td>
<td>-2.56**</td>
<td>-2.56**</td>
<td>-2.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=post-secondary)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficiency</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=SS)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-2.93**</td>
<td>-2.93**</td>
<td>-2.93**</td>
<td>-2.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Children)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>-2.76**</td>
<td>-2.76**</td>
<td>-2.76**</td>
<td>-2.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Voting)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior adult status (1999)</td>
<td>2.22**</td>
<td>2.22**</td>
<td>2.22**</td>
<td>2.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Intercept)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.10**, **p<.05**

### Table 2: Reference Group Desistance, Subjective Desistance, and Subjective Adult Status - Logistic Regression Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Desistance</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Reference Group)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Desistance</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Subjective Desistance)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.49**</td>
<td>-1.49**</td>
<td>-1.49**</td>
<td>-1.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=arrest in 2000-02)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Male)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=White)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Married)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Educational Attainment)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Self-Sufficiency)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Children)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Voting)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior adult status (1999)</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Intercept)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.10**, **p<.05**, **p<.01**, **p<.001**

### Note

For the full results, please refer to the original study by Chris Ugen.
other extensions

- Braithwaite: content of label
  - Stigmatizing vs. reintegrative shaming
  - Restorative justice: welcome back into family, community
- Life Course (Hagan, Sampson & Laub, Moffitt)
  - Formal labels affect life chances (work and family) which, in turn, affect delinquency
- Labeling “insights” prevailed but not as a comprehensive theory

Lecture 6b:

Labels, gang intro
begin review

gangs

- Start as we did in defining "juvenile delinquency."
  - What are we talking about?
  - What is the police perspective?
    The sociologist’s perspective? The gang member’s perspective?
- Your definitions vs. "classic" definitions
produce a gang definition

- Include diverse distinctive gang behavior (but exclude the U of M football team)
- Start with a list of characteristics that you think all gangs share
  - Behaviors and activities
  - Attitudes and beliefs
  - Leadership
  - Patterns of social interaction
  - Legal and/or illegal activities
  - Demographics: age, sex, urban residence, income, etc.
- Then formalize your definition, write it on a sheet of paper, and hand it in with the names of all group members

classic definitions - thrasher

- F. Thrasher (1927): A gang is an interstitial group, originally formed spontaneously, and then integrated through conflict. It is characterized by the following types of behavior: meeting face to face, milling, movement through space as a unit, conflict, and planning. The result of this collective behavior is the development of tradition, unreflective internal structure, esprit de corps, solidarity, morale, group awareness, and attachment to local territory.
- Elements
  - form in "cracks" of social fabric
  - face-to-face interaction
  - conflict gives common enemies: "men are closest to their brothers when they join in stoning others"
- Critique: too inclusive, fits football teams

classic definitions - miller

- W. Miller (1982): A youth gang is a self-formed association of peers, bound together by mutual interests, with identifiable leadership, well-developed lines of authority, and other organizational features, who act in concert to achieve a specific purpose which generally includes the conduct of illegal activity and control over a particular territory, facility, or type of enterprise.
- Elements
  - some level of organization
  - identifiable leaders
  - territory
  - recurrent associations
  - specific purpose
  - illegal activity
Esbensen/NYGS definition

- **Finn Esbensen** – Youth Gang has:
  - 3 or more members
  - Shared identity (name, colors, symbols)
  - Limited age range (12-24)
  - Some permanence and degree of organization
  - Illegal activity
  - [association with geographic area]

scale?

- 2015 National Gang Intelligence Ctr (USDOJ)
  - Estimates ~30,000 US gangs (2012 report)
  - ~850,000 active gang members (precision?)
  - 88% are in nbhd-based street gangs, 9.5% prison gangs, 2.5% outlaw motorcycle gangs (OMG)
  - Tie to extremist groups, military and government
  - Most are active on Facebook, Youtube, Instagram, & Twitter (less so on Snapchat, Google+, Flickr, WhatsApp, kik)
- Thornberry et al: gang members responsible for large proportion (2/3 in some studies) of serious violent juvenile offenses
  - Most in gangs for relatively short time (< 2 years)
- Blumstein: gangs/guns/crack and youth homicide trends
Percentage of Children 0-17 Reporting Abuse