I'm not a robot



```
Labelling theory was developed by Howard Becker and is most associated with the sociology of deviance. It is applied to education in relation to teachers applying labels on their pupils in terms of their ability, potential or behaviour. These labels can be positive or negative and can result in a self-fulfilling prophecy. Labelling is seen as an internal
factor that could explain differential achievement in schools by class, ethnicity or gender. In 1938, Robert K. Merton published an important article titled "Social Structure and Anomie." Merton was an American sociologist who proposed that crime is the result of our social structure. He did not believe that people committed crime because of their
personal background. Instead, he argued that the causes of crime lie in the way in which our society is set up. This is the basis of his anomie or strain theory. Anomie and Strain Theory according to Merton According to Merton
and then decide whether it's worth it to go ahead and commit a crime or not. Rational choice theory is not interested in examining how certain psychological causes for crime, like how people's criminal friends draw them into crime.
Instead, ...Read MoreSymbolic interactionism is about how people as well as objects and events around them. For example, they see a crowd of people protesting, they speak with someone face to face, they hear about a
new event, or they are working with a coworker on a project. The point of symbolic interactionism is that people do not observe these situations ...Read MoreDifferential association theory was formulated by Edwin Sutherland. In 1939, he published an important book named "Principles of Criminology" in which he described the theory. In a nutshell,
the theory of differential association says that offenders commit crime because they have learned it from other people in intimate, personal groups. Criminal Behavior, including criminal behavior, are ...Read MoreLabeling theory focuses on how other people's opinions can
influence the way we think about ourselves. More specifically, labeling theory says that when other people see and define us as criminal, that's exactly what we become. We change our self-concept to fit what other people think of us, and if they give us the label of a criminal, we will ultimately behave according to that label. In other words, we will
become offenders because other people say that we are ...Read MoreRoutine activities theory is a theory that tries to explain why crime happens. It is very well-known in the fields of criminology and sociology and was originally developed by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson. In 1979, they published a now famous article where they proposed the
central idea of the theory. Routine Activities Theory: Definition and Meaning So what does routine activities theory is based on the idea that offenders make ...Read MoreThis post and accompanying video discuss psychopathy, what it is, and how it relates to the case of convicted serial killer Aileen Wuornos. I also go
through the psychopathy test PCL-R (Psychopathy Checklist Revised), which is a checklist Revised), which is a checklist Revised by psychologist Robert Hare. What is Psychopathy? The term "psychopathy checklist Revised), which is a checklist Revised and used often in the popular media. Think, for example of the movie "American Psychopathy" is fairly widespread and used often in the popular media. Think, for example of the movie "American Psychopathy" is fairly widespread and used often in the popular media.
and accompanying video give a concise overview of the Big Five personality traits model. The Big Five factor theory of personality traits In everyday life, and when
we look at other people, we often characterize them in certain ways: Some people are extroverted and ...Read MoreCesare Lombroso was born in 1835 in Verona in Italy. He was an Italian doctor who did research and wrote on a variety of topics, for example mental diseases, scientific ways to study corpses, and brain pathology. But his most
important work, and certainly the work that he's best known for today, is the book "The Criminal Man" ("L'Uomo delinquente"). Criminal Man", first published in 1876, Lombroso developed ...Read MoreA recent terrorism background report brings answers to critical questions about
terrorism. Terrorism has a long history, but the last 15 to 20 years, especially after the attacks at the Twin Towers in New York, have seen a lot of questions about the nature of terrorism and about the
people who are involved in it: Who are ...Read More ADHDAnxiety Disorders DepressionLPediatrics Substance Abuse Disorders The labelling theory is one of the most fundamental methods of determining the nature of a crime. Therefore, its comprehension is essential for people seeking in-depth information in various subjects, like criminology and
sociology. The post will cover all you need to understand the intriguing labelling theory. An overview of the labelling theory According to advocates of the labelling theory and interactive process that involves both deviants and non-deviants. It is a collection of features that is inherent in people or groups. To understand the nature
of deviant conduct, they believe there is a need to understand why certain individuals are branded as deviant in the first place. In most cases, this designation is generally thwarted by those who embody the power of law or those who can impose the law on regular people. Thus, labels that designate deviance represent society's power system. The
influence on labelling theory The following sociologists and their publications were influenced by the labelling theory, which was predicated on criminal or deviant. Suicide by Émile
Durkheim What is deemed a crime and delinquency, according to Émile, is that which offends society rather than that which just violates penal rules. George Herbert Mead, Herbert Blumer, Charles Horton Cooley, W.I. Thomas, John Dewey, and others contributed to the contemporary labelling theory, with Howard Becker being the most notable. It
emphasizes society's response to the criminals' actions. According to the labelling theory, society's reaction to these acts decides whether or not they should be labelled as deviant. The labelling theory, and the control theory. Howard
Becker: Labelling theory Howard Becker is a prominent sociologist based in the US who wrote "Outsiders" in 1963 on the Sociology of Deviance. He claimed that "deviant" is more likely a social groupings, with the most powerful controlling the society.
Therefore, they had set the standards for what is deviance and defined who qualifies as a deviant to the criminal justice system. In his book, Howard also talked about "Moral Panics," where he believes media, hearsay, or folklore have exaggerated modest events to generate a menace or inspire fear among the people when there is nothing to worry
about. Examples of labelling theory Same-sex marriage Andrew and James are two young men who have fallen in love and want to marry. They will have no trouble getting marriage is allowed there. It is not regarded as a deviant role for them to be in a same-sex marriage. The community they reside
in is likely to accept and respect their marriage as if it were any other. Change the setting to Barbados; however, they will be arrested with "Buggery or Unnatural and Indecent Acts" and sentenced to life in jail. They will be arrested with "Buggery or Unnatural and Indecent Acts" and sentenced to life in jail. They will be arrested with "Buggery or Unnatural and Indecent Acts" and sentenced to life in jail. They will be arrested with "Buggery or Unnatural and Indecent Acts" and sentenced to life in jail.
acute anxiety and knows about marijuana's medical qualities. So, she goes out and buys some medicinal marijuana for herself. She will have no trouble acquiring and consuming medicinal marijuana if she resides in Illinois, where this is lawful and decriminalized. It will not be considered deviant conduct by those around her. However, if Ashley
resides in Wyoming, where marijuana usage is prohibited, either for medical or recreational purposes, others will view her acquisition and consumption as deviant because her acquisition and consumption as devia
dramaturgy, individuals utilize impression management to fulfil their role in society. Individuals, according to Goffman, are actors, and society is the theatre. When an actor deviates from their role, this is known as deviance. It's characterized as actions that aren't part of society's typical activities. A person passes between two stages of social
deviation, according to Erwin Lemert's "Societal Reaction." When a person does not conform to social standards or does a deviant by the public due to their aberrant
behaviour, this is known as secondary deviance. In this case, on the other hand, a person's self-concept starts to shift. This label will be a part of their character, and they will need to bear it for the rest of their lives. The labelling theory states that when society classifies someone as deviant, they fall prey to their deviant nature. When somebody is
called a "criminal," he begins to see himself as one and is more inclined to engage in illegal activities. The labelling theory states that no action is inherently illegal; no action can always be illegal. Therefore, such an idea is generally used to describe or explain deviant or criminal behaviour. What makes an
action or behaviour deviant? The individuals decide this in positions of authority to categorize such actions as illegal or unlawful through legislation. The understanding of those who enforce such laws, like the judiciary and the police, is crucial. According to the labelling theory, an action is branded deviant based on societal interpretation of the crime
rather than being inherent like people. Labelling theory; Limitations Those who oppose the labelling theory claim that it: Ignores socialisation disparities Ignores socialisation disparities Ignores socialisation disparities Ignores socialisation disparities.
its significance in recent times, resulting in a more accepting attitude toward people with mental illnesses among relatives, colleagues, and workplaces. Walter Gove noted that sociologists have long argued about using labelling theory vs psychiatric approaches to describe mental illness. It stemmed from their failure to factor in the latest
developments in psychiatry, according to his paper "Labelling Theory's Explanation of Mental Illness: An Update of Recent Evidence." Even if labelling theorists say that individuals categorized as "mentally ill" are not any different from those who aren't, data reveals that heredity plays a major role and distinguishes them, according to Gove. Labelling
theory and criminology, and sociology. In the labelling theory, social sciences serve a vital role. For instance, some people believe that juvenile delinquency results from negative associations attached to circumstances or words that are generally viewed positively. For a non-deviant adolescent, "home" will remind him of family and affection. However,
if the adolescent had a strained family relationship, the word "home" would take on a whole different meaning. This interactionist viewpoint helps criminologists to understand an individual's behaviours and reactions. The pros and cons of the labelling theory.
Pros: Supporters of the idea point to the following advantages: It makes it easy to understand deviant behaviour. In this sense, the labelling theory works great to enhance the strength of society. They are contributing to the development of accurate forecasts. A person with a criminal record, for example, would not be able to serve on a jury and also
be disqualified from voting in many jurisdictions. When searching for a job, he must disclose. The person has to bear the burden of being branded a criminal for the rest of his life. Recidivism, or the likelihood of tagged persons committing a crime again, can be predicted with the help of the labelling theory. Creating a more empathetic atmosphere for
disabled individuals. Labelling theory research helps to develop empathy for the mentally ill, people who are not only stigmatized but also fighting diseases. Advocacy initiatives will benefit from better communication. For example, when there is a societal concern for the tagged person, the issue may be discovered and handled more easily. Cons: Theorem
following are some of the cons of the labelling theory: It cannot be said that labelling causes people to become deviant. Although it was popular in the 60s and 70s, the labelling theory started to lose momentum as empirical research showed conflicting results. Not everyone who engages in aberrant behaviour is classified as such. For example, when
each state's labelling approaches vary based on the legislation made in that region. Additional References to look at in the labelling theory conclusion Howard Becker is known as the inventor of the contemporary labelling theory states that no action is inherently criminal but stems from what is
Secondary deviation, it is natural for society to label them as such until their self-perception catches up. The labelling theory suggests that no act is inherently criminal but is a product of the communal outlook and government legislation. Howard Becker is credited to be the father of the contemporary labelling theory. Apart from its numerous uses,
labelling theory is mostly used in criminology and sociology. Total Assignment HelpIncase, you are looking for an opportunity to work from home and earn big money. Total Assignment help Online service available in 9 countries. Our
local operations span across Australia, US, UK, South east Asia and the Middle East. With extensive experience in academic writing, Total assignment help has a strong track record delivering quality writing at a nominal price that meet the unique needs of students in our local markets. We have specialized network of highly trained writers, who cannot be a strong track record delivering quality writing at a nominal price that meet the unique needs of students in our local markets. We have specialized network of highly trained writers, who cannot be a strong track record delivering quality writing at a nominal price that meet the unique needs of students in our local markets.
provide best possible assignment help solution for all your needs. Next time you are looking for assignment help, make sure to give us a try. Get the best Assignment help from leading experts from the field of academics with assured onetime, 100% plagiarism free and top Quality delivery. Order Now scoresvideos Labeling theory is a theory to
understand deviance in the society, this theory is focused more on trying to understand how people react to behavior that happens around them and label it as 'deviant' or 'nondeviant'. This theory was given by Howard Becker who tried to understand, not in the causes behind the deviant behavior but rather which behavior was considered 'deviant'.
and what impact it had on the individual engaging in that behavior. Thus he said that no behavior was intrinsically deviant, the society or the group put the label of 'deviant' on the behavior is carried out, this may also include the location
of the person, e.g. the consumption of beef or even the acquiring of beef is considered to be normal and legal and there is no ban against it, in this case the consumption of beef may become a 'deviant' act for which
there may be consequences, but in the US it is not. Thus the action is carried out plays a great role in labeling the action. Furthermore, we may view them through that judgment. Once labeled deviant it becomes hard to get rid
of the label due to the fact that it becomes a part of our master status and thus influences the way people behave with those who have been labeled as deviant. Moreover, it also affects the way we view our selves and thus influences the way people behave with those who have been labeled as deviant. Moreover, it also affects the way we view our selves and has an impact on the self-identity, our self-concept, this is due to the fact that we often shape our opinions about our selves based on
how others are viewing us. We carry this label with us everywhere, for e.g. if one stole money from someone else's bank account or indulged in identity fraud and was caught and an official report was filed against him and he had to spend some time in prison, this person will now be labeled as deviant. When further this person goes to apply for a job
they will have to mention it in his application and will be judged to a large extent based on the same. There are two kinds of deviance that are recognized; primary and secondary. These become important to understand as they were given as an extension of Howard's theory by Edwin Lemert. Primary deviance refers to those acts which receive a little
reaction from the society and do not have long term consequences, e.g. when while playing cricket a child may break a window or a vase. Secondary deviance, on the other hand, refers to acts that are labeled by the society as deviant and attached to one's identity thus affecting one's self-concept. What is labeled as deviant depends on the legal forces
of the society and the law that the society entails, thus what is labeled as deviant will differ from society through our work and contributions. If you are interested in joining us, please check our 'About' page for more information Share — copy and
redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licenser cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the licenser terms. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and
indicate if changes were made . You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or
technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits. You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitsions necessary for
your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material. Labeling theory is a sociological theory of deviance that focuses on the process by which some people are labeled deviant by others and thus take on deviant identities. Introduction to Labeling Theory suggests which some people are labeled deviant by others and thus take on deviant identities. Introduction to Labeling Theory suggests which some people are labeled deviant by others and thus take on deviant identities.
that deviance is not inherent in an act but results from the labels others attach to the behavior. It shifts the focus from the individual's actions to the reactions of society. The theory emphasizes the significance of society from the individual's actions to the reaction in the development of deviant identity. Origins of Labeling Theory Early Foundations Labeling theory emerged in the
1960s as part of the symbolic interactionism framework. Symbolic interactionism explores how people create and interpret symbols in social interactions. Sociologists like Howard Becker and Edwin Lemert were pivotal in developing labeling theory. They argued that the reactions of others, rather than the actions themselves, play a crucial role in
defining what is considered deviant. Key Contributors Howard Becker: In his seminal work, "Outsiders" (1963), Becker argued that deviance by making rules, and those who break these rules are labeled as outsiders. Edwin Lemert: Lemert distinguished between primary and
secondary deviance. Primary deviance refers to minor, infrequent acts that do not impact an individual's self-concept. Secondary deviance occurs when a person begins to adopt and act according to the deviant label assigned to them. Core Concepts of Labeling Theory The Process of Labeling theory posits that the process of labeling involves
several steps: Rule Creation: Society establishes norms and rules that define acceptable behavior. Detection: Some individuals engage in behavior that violates these rules. Labeling: Society labels these individuals engage in behavior. Detection: The labeled individuals may face social stigma, discrimination, and exclusion.
Internalization: Over time, the labeled individuals might internalize the deviant label, leading to secondary deviance. Primary and Secondary Deviance Primary and Secondary Deviance. This is the initial act of rule-breaking. It is usually minor and does not result in the individual being labeled as deviant. For example, a teenager might skip school once, but this
action might not affect their identity. Secondary Deviance: This occurs when an individual accepts the deviant behavior. For instance, if the teenager who skipped school is labeled a "truant" and treated as such, they might adopt this identity and continues to engage in deviant behavior. For instance, if the teenager who skipped school is labeled a "truant" and treated as such, they might adopt this identity and continue to skip school regularly. Master Status A master status and treated as such, they might adopt this identity and continues to engage in deviant behavior.
is a label that becomes the primary identifying characteristic of an individual. For example, being labeled as a "criminal" can overshadow all other aspects of a person's identify. This can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy where the individual continues to engage in criminal behavior because they believe it is expected of them. Implications of Labeling
Theory Impact on Individuals Labeling can have profound effects on individuals' lives. It can lead to: Stigmatization: Labeled individuals might face social rejection and exclusion. Self-fulfilling Prophecy: They might internalize the deviant label and act accordingly. Limited Opportunities: Labeled individuals might find it difficult to access education
employment, and other opportunities. Impact on Society Labeling theory also highlights the role of power in the creation and enforcement of labels. Those in positions of authority, such as lawmakers, police, and educators, have the power to define and label deviant behavior. This can lead to: Social Inequality: Marginalized groups might be
disproportionately labeled as deviant. Criminal Justice System: Policies and perpetuate cycles of deviance, it has faced several criticisms of Labeling Theory While labeling theory provides valuable insights into the social construction of deviance, it has faced several criticisms: Overemphasis or
Labels: Critics argue that the theory focuses too much on labels and not enough on the underlying causes of deviant labels. Determinism: Some critics suggest that labeling theory is overly deterministic, implying that once labeled,
individuals inevitably adopt deviant identities. Conclusion Labeling theory offers a unique perspective on deviance by highlighting the importance of societal reactions and life paths. Understanding labeling theory can help us develop
more compassionate and equitable approaches to addressing deviance in society. References and Further Reading [Sociology Glossary] Modification History File Created: 04/19/2024 Last Modified: 06/05/2024 This work is licensed under an Open Educational Resource-Quality Master Source (OER-QMS) License. Sociological theory This article
needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources: "Labeling theory" - news · newspapers · books · scholar · JSTOR (March 2023) (Learn how and when to remove this message) A brief representation of the idea behind
labeling theory Labeling theory posits that self-identity and the behavior of individuals may be determined or influenced by the terms used to describe or classify them. It is associated with the concepts of self-fulfilling prophecy and stereotyping. Labeling theory holds that deviance is not inherent in an act, but instead focuses on the tendency of
majorities to negatively label minorities or those seen as deviant from standard cultural norms.[1][2] The theory was prominent during the 1960s and 1970s, and some modified versions of the theory have developed and are still currently popular. Stigma is defined as a powerfully negative label that changes a person's self-concept and social identity
[3] Labeling theory is closely related to social-construction and symbolic-interaction analysis. [3] Labeling theory was developed by sociologists during the 1960s. Howard Saul Becker's book Outsiders was extremely influential in the development of this theory and its rise to popularity. Labeling theory is also connected to other fields besides crime.
 For instance there is the labeling theory that corresponds to homosexuality. Alfred Kinsey and his colleagues were the main advocates in separating the difference between the role of a "homosexual" and the acts one does. An example is the idea that males performing feminine acts would imply that they are homosexual. Thomas J. Scheff states that
labeling also plays a part with the "mentally ill". The label does not refer to criminal but rather acts that are not socially accepted due to mental disorders. One of the founders of social interactionism, George Herbert Mead, focused on the internal processes of how the mind constructs one's self-image. In Mind, Self & Society (1934),[4] he showed howed
infants come to know persons first and only later come to know things. According to Mead, thought is both a social and pragmatic process, based on the model of two persons discussing how to solve a problem. Mead's central concept is the self, the part of an individual's personality composed of self-awareness and self-image.[5] Frank Tannenbaum
first introduced the idea of "tagging."[6] Kerry Townsend (2001) writes about the revolution in criminology caused by Tannenbaum's theoretical model, known as the 'dramatization of evil' or labeling theory, surfaces in the mid- to late-thirties. At this time, the 'New Deal' legislation had not defeated the woes of
the Great Depression, and, although dwindling, immigration into the United States continued.[7] The social climate was one of disillusionment with the government. The class structure was one of cultural isolationism; cultural relativity had not yet taken hold. 'The persistence of the class structure, despite the welfare reforms and controls over big
business, was unmistakable.'[7]:117 "One of the central tenets of the theory is to encourage the end of labeling process. In the words of Frank Tannenbaum, 'the way out is through diversion programs. The growth of the theory and its current application, both practical and
theoretical, provide a solid foundation for continued popularity."[8] Tannenbaum discusses criminal behavior, with a focus on those who commit crimes professional, financially motivated, vagrants, unintentional, mentally ill, and professional.[9] Frank Tannenbaum's explanation of
Labeling Theory highlighted the negative consequences of police interactions with children which argues that arresting youth leads to a "dramatization of evil". His research indicated that youth being arrested and labeled as criminals shapes their self-perception to fit that label.[10][1] Edwin M. Lemert was an influential American sociologist and
criminologist known for his contributions to labeling theory and the study of social deviance—primary deviance being minor, initial acts of rule-breaking that don't alter self-identity, and secondary deviance occurring when an individual internalizes the deviant label imposed by
society, leading to further deviant behavior. Lemert's work emphasized how societal reactions to deviance can reinforce and escalate it, shaping an individual's identity as deviant. Lemert's popular books, such as "Social Pathology" (1951) and "Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control" (1967), have had a lasting impact on criminology.
and sociology.[11] Edwin Lemert writes: "His acts are repeated and organized subjectively and transformed into active roles and become the social criteria for assigning status....When a person begins to employ his deviant behavior or a role based on it as a means of defense, attack, or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the
consequent societal reaction to him, his deviation is secondary."[12]: 75-6 While it was Lemert who introduced the key concepts of labeling theory, it was Howard Becker who became their successor. He first began describing the process of how a person adopts a deviation is secondary."
the identity formation of marijuana smokers. This study was the basis of his Outsiders published in 1963. This work became the manifesto of the labeling theory movement among sociologists. In his opening, Becker writes:"...social groups create deviance by making rules whose infraction creates deviance, and by applying those rules to particular
people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by other of rules and sanctions to an 'offender.' The deviant is one to whom that label has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label."[13]:9While society
uses the stigmatic label to justify its condemnation, the deviant motives leading to the devi
were also subjected to a barrage of criticism, most of it blaming him for neglecting the influence of other biological, genetic effects and personal responsibility. In a later 1973 edition of his work, he answered his critics. He wrote that sociologists, while dedicated to studying society, are often careful not to look too closely. Instead, he wrote: "I prefer
to think of what we study as collective action. People act, as Mead and Blumer have made clearest, together. They do with an eye on what they do with an eye on what others, just as each of them likewise adjusts his own developing actions to what he
sees and expects others to do."[13]: 26 Francis Cullen reported in 1984 that Becker was probably too generous with his critics. After 20 years, Becker's views, far from being supplanted, have been corrected and absorbed into an expanded "structuring perspective."[14]: 130 In The Colonizer and the Colonized (1965), Albert Memmi described the deep
psychological effects of the social stigma created by the domination of one group by another. He wrote: The longer the oppression lasts, the more profoundly it affects him (the oppressed). It ends by becoming so familiar to him that he believes it is part of his own constitution, that he accepts it and could not imagine his recovery from it. This
acceptance is the crowning point of oppression.[15]:321-2In Dominated Man (1968), Memmi turned his attention of stigmatic labeling: it justifies the exploitation of stigmatic labeling: it justifies the exploitation of stigmatic labeling: it justifies the exploitation of the victim. He wrote: Why does the accuse in order to justify himself? Because he feels guilty toward his victim. Because he
feels that his attitude and his behavior are essentially unjust and fraudulent.... Proof? In almost every case, the punishment has already been inflicted. The victim of racism is already living under the weight of disgrace and oppression.... In order to justify such punishment and misfortune, a process of rationalization is set in motion, by which to explain
the ghetto and colonial exploitation.[16]: 191-3 Central to stigmatic labeling is the attribution of an inherent fault: It is as if one says, "There must be something wrong with these people. Otherwise, why would we treat them so badly?" Perhaps the most important contributor to labeling theory was Erving Goffman, President of the American
Sociological Association (ASA), and one of America's most cited sociologists. His most important contribution to labeling theory, however, was Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity published in 1963.[20] The
modern nation state's heightened demand for normalcy. Today's stigmas are the result not so much of ancient or religious prohibitions, but of a new demand for normalcy. "The notion of the 'normal human being' may have its source in the medical approach to humanity, or in the tendency of large-scale bureaucratic organizations such as the nation
state, to treat all members in some respects as equal. Whatever its origins, it seems to provide the basic imagery through which laymen currently conceive themselves."[20]:7 Living in a divided world, deviants split their worlds into: (1) forbidden places where discovery means exposure and danger; (2) places where people of that kind are painfully
tolerated; and (3) places where one's kind is exposed without need to dissimulate or conceal.[20]:81 Dealing with others is fraught with great complexity and ambiguity: "When normals and stigmatized do in fact enter one another's immediate presence, especially when they attempt to maintain a joint conversational encounter, there occurs one of the
primal scenes of sociology; for, in many cases, these moments will be the ones when the causes and effects of stigma will be directly confronted by both sides."[20]:13 "What are unthinking routines for normals can become management problems for the discreditable.... The person with a secret failing, then, must be alive to the social situation as a
 scanner of possibilities, and is therefore likely to be alienated from the simpler world in which those around them apparently dwell."[20]:88 Society's demands are filled with contradictions:On the one hand, a stigmatized person may be told that he is no different from others. On the other hand, he must declare his status as "a resident alien who
stands for his group. "[20]: 108 "One has to convey the impression that the burden of the stigma is not too heavy yet keep himself at the required distance. "A phantom acceptance is allowed to provide the base for a phantom normalcy." [20]: 7 Familiarity need not reduce contempt. In spite of the common belief that openness and exposure will decrease
stereotypes and repression, the opposite is true: "Thus, whether we interact with strangers or intimates, we will still find that the fingertips of society have reached bluntly into the contact, even here putting us in our place." [20]:53 In On Becoming Deviant (1969), sociologist David Matza[21] gives the most vivid and graphic account of the process of
adopting a deviant role. The acts of authorities in outlawing a proscribed behavior can have two effects, keeping most out of the behavior, but also offering new opportunities for creating deviant identities. He says the concept of "affinity" does little to explain the dedication to the behavior. "Instead, it may be regarded as a natural biographical
tendency born of personal and social circumstances that suggests but hardly compels a direction or movement."[21]:93 What gives force to that movement is the development of a new identity:"To be cast as a thief, as a prostitute, or more generally, a deviant, is to further compound and hasten the process of becoming that very thing."[21]:157 "In
shocked discovery, the subject now concretely understands that there are serious people who really go around building their lives around his activities—stopping him, correcting him, devoted to him. They keep records on the course of his life, even develop theories on how he got that way.... Pressed by such a display, the subject may begin to add
meaning and gravity to his deviant activities. But he may do so in a way not especially intended by agents of the state. "[21]:163-4 "The meaningful issue of identity is whether this activities can stand for me, or be regarded as proper indications of my being. I have done a theft, been signified a thief. am I a thief? To answer
affirmatively, we must be able to conceive a special relationship between being and doing—a unity capable of being indicated. That building of meaning has a notable quality."[21]:165-70 Criminology and penology Theory Anomie Biosocial criminology Broken windows Collective efficacy Crime analysis Criminalization Differential association Deviance
 Expressive function of law Labeling theory Psychopathy Rational choice Risk and actuarial criminology Social control Social learning Strain Subculture Symbolic interactionism Victimology Secondary victimisation Victimology Secondary victimisation Victimology Secondary victimisation Victimology Social control Social learning Strain Subculture Symbolic interactionism Victimology Secondary victimisation Victimology Victimolog
 International Juvenile Organized Political Public-order State State-corporate Transnational Victimless War Methods Comparative Profiling Ethnography Uniform Crime Reports Crime mapping reform sentencing Crime statistics Positivist school Qualitative Quantitative BJS NIBRS Penology Crime prevention Corrections Denunciation Deterrence
Incapacitation Sentence Trial Prison Prisoner Solitary confinement Punishment Rehabilitation Recidivism Zero tolerance Criminal justice Participatory Restorative Prisoner abuse Prisoner Solitary confinement Punishment Rehabilitation Recidivism Zero tolerance Criminal justice Participatory Restorative Retributive Rights Schools Anarchist Chicago Classical
Conflict Critical Environmental Feminist Integrative Italian Law and order Marxist Neo-classical Populist Positivist Postmodernist Realism Left Right Subfields American Anthropological Biosocial criminology Conflict Cri
Browse Index Journals Organizations People vte As an application of phenomenology, the theory hypothesizes that the labels (such as "criminal" or "felon") promote deviant behavior, becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy, i.e. an individual who is
labeled has little choice but to conform to the essential meaning of that judgment. Consequently, labeling theory postulates that it is possible to prevent social deviance via a limited social shaming reaction in "labelers" and replacing moral indignation with tolerance. Emphasis is placed on the rehabilitation of offenders through an alteration of their
labels. Related prevention policies include client empowerment schemes, mediation, victim-offender forgiveness ceremonies (restorative justice), restitution, reparation, and alternatives to prison programs involving diversion. Labeling theory has been accused of promoting impractical policy implications, and criticized for failing to
explain society's most serious offenses. [22] The social construction of deviant behavior plays an important role in the labeling process that occurs in society. This process involves not only the labeling of criminally deviant behavior, which is behavior that does not fit socially constructed norms, but also labeling that which reflects stereotyped or
stigmatized behavior of the "mentally ill". In 1961 Thomas Szasz, in The Myth of Mental Illness, asked, "Who defines whom as troublesome or mentally sick?... [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other word imposes reality on the
Scheff in Being Mentally Ill challenged common perceptions of mental illness by claiming that mental illness on those who exhibit them.
Certain expectations are then placed on these individuals and, over time, they unconsciously change their behavior to fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder, they are simply fulfilled because the "mentally ill" believe
they are supposed to act a certain way so, over time, come to do so.[24] Scheff's theory had many critics, most notably waiter Gove who consistently argued against Scheff with an almost opposite theory; he believed that society has no influence at all on "mental lliness". Instead, any societal perceptions of the "mentally ill" come about as a direct
result of these people's behaviors. Most sociologists' views of labeling and mental illness have fallen somewhere between the extremes of Gove and Scheff. On the other hand, it is almost impossible to deny, given both common sense and research findings, that society's negative perceptions of "crazy" people has had some effect on them. It seems that
realistically, labeling can accentuate and prolong the issues termed "mental illness", but it is rarely the full cause. [25] Many other studies have been conducted in this general vein. To provide a few examples, several studies have been conducted in this general vein. To provide a few examples, several studies have been conducted in this general vein.
as a drug addict, ex-convict, or prostitute (for example: Brand & Claiborn 1976). Additionally, Page's 1977 study found that self declared "ex-mental patients" are much less likely to be offered apartment leases or hired for jobs. Clearly, these studies and the dozens of others like them serve to demonstrate that labeling can have a very real and very
large effect on the mentally ill. However, labeling someone with a mental illness in her article, "Sociological Approaches to Mental Illness". Working off Thomas Scheff's (1966) theory, Thoits claims that people who are
labeled as mentally ill are stereotypically portrayed as unpredictable, dangerous, and unable to care for themselves. She also claims that "people who are labeled as deviant and treated as deviant become deviant." [26]: 134 This statement can be broken down into two processes, one that involves the effects of self-labeling and the other differential
treatment from society based on the individual's label. Therefore, if society sees mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill but has been labeled as such, could become mentally ill. Proponents of hard labeling, as opposed to soft labeling, believe that mental illness does
not exist, but is merely deviance from norms of the social order, causing people to believe in mental illness. They view them as socially constructed illnesses and psychotic disorders. [27]: 361-76 The application of labeling theory to homosexuality has been extremely controversial. It was Alfred Kinsey and his colleagues who pointed out the big
discrepancy between the behavior and the role attached to it.[28] They had observed the often negative consequences of labeling and repeatedly condemned labeling people as homosexual: It is amazing to observe how many psychologists and psychiatrists have accepted this sort of propaganda, and have come to believe that homosexual males and
females are discretely different from persons who respond to natural stimuli. Instead of using these terms as substantives which stand for persons, or of the stimuli to which an individual erotically responds.... It would clarify our
thinking if the terms could be dropped completely out of our vocabulary. [28]: 616-7 Males do not represent two discrete populations, heterosexual and homosexual.... Only the human mind invents categories and tries to force facts into pigeonholes. The living world is a continuum in each and every one of its aspects. [28]: 639 The classification of
sexual behavior as masturbatory, heterosexual, or homosexual, is, therefore, unfortunate if it suggests that only different types of persons seek out or accept each kind of sexual activity. There is nothing known in the anatomy or physiology of sexual response and organized that only different types of persons seek out or accept each kind of sexual activity. There is nothing known in the anatomy or physiology of sexual response and organized that only different types of persons seek out or accept each kind of sexual activity.
446 In regard to sexual behavior, it has been possible to maintain this dichotomy only by placing all persons who are exclusively heterosexual in a heterosexual in a heterosexual category and all persons who have any amount of experience with their own sex, even including those with the slightest experience, in a homosexual category.... The attempt to maintain a
simple dichotomy on these matters exposes the traditional biases which are likely to enter whenever the heterosexual or homosexual representation of an individual is involved. [28]: 468-9 Erving Goffman's Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity distinguished between the behavior and the role assigned to it: The term "homosexual" is
generally used to refer to anyone who engages in overt sexual practices with a member of his own sex, the practice being called "homosexuality." This usage appears to be based on a medical and legal frame of reference and provides much too broad and heterogenous a categorization for use here. I refer only to individuals who participate in a special
community of understanding wherein members of one's own sex are defined as the most desirable sexual objects, and sociability is energetically organized around the pursuit and entertainment of these objects. [20]:143-4 Labeling theory was also applied to homosexuality by Evelyn Hooker [29][30][31] and by Leznoff and Westley (1956), who
published the first sociological study of the gay community.[32] Erving Goffman and Howard Becker used the lives of gay-identified persons in their theories of labeling and interactionism. Simon and Gagnon likewise wrote: "It is necessary to move away from the obsessive concern with the sexuality of the individual, and attempt to see the homosexual
in terms of the broader attachments that he must make to live in the world around him."[33]:179 British sociologist Mary McIntosh reflected the enthusiasm of Europeans for labeling theory in her 1968 study, "The Homosexual Role:"[34]"The vantage-point of comparative sociology enables us to see that the conception of homosexuality as a condition
is, itself, a possible object of study. This conception and the behavior it supports operate as a form of social control in a society in which homosexuality is condemned.... It is interesting to notice that homosexuality as a condition. For just as the rigid categorization deters people from
drifting into deviancy, so it appears to foreclose on the possibility of drifting back into normalcy and thus removes the element of anxious choice. It appears to justify the deviancy can thus be seen as legitimate for him and he can continue in
it without rejecting the norm of society. "Sara Fein and Elaine M. Nuehring (1981) were among the many who supported the application of labeling theory to homosexuality. They saw the gay role functioning as a "master status" around which other roles become organized. This brings a whole new set of problems and restrictions: Placement in a social
category constituting a master status prohibits individuals from choosing the extent of their involvement in various categories. Members of the stigmatized group lose the opportunity to establish their own personal characteristic.... For
example, newly self-acknowledged homosexual individuals cannot take for granted that they share the world with others who hold congruent interpreted in light of their stigma. [35]Perhaps the strongest proponent of labeling theory was Edward Sagarin. In his
book, Deviants and Deviance, he wrote, "There are no homosexuals, transvestites, chemical addicts, suicidogenics, delinquents, criminals, or other such entities, in the gay community. Sagarin had written some gay novels under the
pseudonym of Donald Webster Cory. According to reports, he later abandoned his gay identity and began promoting an interactionist view of homosexuality. [37]: 150 A number of authors adopted a modified, non-deviant, labeling theory. They rejected the stigmatic function of the gay role, but found it useful in describing the process of coming out and began promoting an interactionist view of homosexuality.
reconciling one's homosexual experiences with the social role. Their works includes: Homosexuals and the Military (1971);[38] "Commitment, Adjustment, and Significant Others" (1973);[40] Male Homosexuals experiences with the social role. Their works includes: Homosexual Identity: Commitment, Adjustment, and Significant Others" (1973);[38] "Homosexual Identity: Commitment, Adjustment, and Significant Others" (1973);[38] "Homosexual Identity: Commitment, Adjustment, and Significant Others" (1974);[38] "Homosexual Identity: Commitment, Adjustment, and Significant Others" (1974);[38] "Homosexual Identity: Commitment, Adjustment, Adjustmen
Gay World (1974);[42] "Components of Sexual Identity" (1977);[43] Homosexual Identity (1978);[45] "Homosexual Identity Formation: A Theoretical Model" (1979, Cass identity model);[46] "Becoming Homosexual: A
model of Gay Identity Acquisition" (1979);[47] Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women (1981);[48] and "Development in Stages of the Coming Out Process" (1982).[49] Barry Adam (1976) took those authors to task for ignoring the force of the oppression in creating identities and their inferiorizing effects. Drawing upon the works of
Albert Memmi, Adam showed how gay-identified persons, like Jews and blacks, internalize the hatred to justify their limitations: A certain romantic liberalism runs through the literature, evident from attempts to paper over or discount the very real problems of
inferiorization. Some researchers seem bent on 'rescuing' their subjects from 'defamation' by ignoring the problems of defeatism and complicit self-destruction. Avoidance of dispiriting reflection upon the day-to-day practice of dominated and magically relieve their
plight. Careful observation has been sacrificed to the 'power of positive thinking.'[50]: 5-6 Strong defense of labeling theory also arose within the gay community. Dan Slater of the Los Angeles Homosexual Information Center said, "There is no such thing as a homosexual lifestyle. There is no such thing as gay pride or anything like that. Homosexuality
is simply based on the sex act. Gay consciousness and all the rest are separatist and defeatist attitudes going back to centuries-old and out-moded conceptions that homosexuals are, indeed, different from other people, "[51] In a later article. Slater (1971) stated the gay movement was going in the wrong direction: Is it the purpose of the movement to
try to assert sexual rights for everyone or create a political and social cult out of homosexuality? ... Persons who perform homosexuality? ... Persons who perform homosexuality just as much as they resent
the centuries-old attempt to organize their lives around heterosexuality.[52]William DuBay (1967) describes gay identity as one strategy for dealing with society's oppression.[37] It solves some problems but creates many more, replacing a closet of secrecy with one of gay identity. A better strategy, he suggests, is to reject the label and live as if the
oppression did not exist. Quoting Goffman, [20]: 122 he writes, "But of course what is a good adjustment for the individual can be an even better one for society." DuBay contends that the attempt to define homosexuality as a class of persons to be protected against discrimination as defined in the statutes has not reduced the oppression. The goal of
the movement instead should be to gain acceptance of homosexual relationships as useful and productive for both society and the family. The movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the movement has lost the high moveme
of children, astrologers, dancers, chanters, minstrels, jesters, artists, shamans, sacred warriors and judges, seers, healers, weavers of tales and magic."[37]: 9 DuBay refers to the "gay trajectory," in which a person first wraps himself in the gay role, organizing his personality and his life around sexual behavior. He might flee from his family and home
town to a large gay center. There, the bedeviling force of the stigma will introduce him to more excessive modes of deviance such as promiscuity, prostitution, alcoholism, and drugs. Many resist such temptations and try to normalize their life, but the fast lanes of gay society are littered with the casualties of gay identity. Some come to reject the label
entirely. "Accomplishing the forbidden, they are neither gay nor straight. Again learning to choose, they develop the ability to make the ban ambiguous, taking responsibility and refusing explanations of their behaviors." [37]: 143 John Henry Mackay (1985) writes about a gay hustler in Berlin adopting such a solution: "What was self-evident, natural,
and not the least sick did not require an excuse through an explanation.... It was love just like any other love. Whoever could not or would not accept it as love was mistaken."[53] Bruce Link and colleagues (1989) had conducted several studies, taking
place in 1987, 1989, and 1997, Link advanced a "modified labeling theory" indicating that expectations of labeling can have a large negative effect, that these expectations often cause patients to withdraw from society, and that those labeled as having a mental disorder are constantly being rejected from society in seemingly minor ways but that,
when taken as a whole, all of these small slights can drastically alter their self concepts. They come to both anticipate and perceive negative societal reactions to them, and this potentially damages their quality of life.[54] Modified labeling theory has been described as a "sophisticated social-psychological model of 'why labels matter.'" In 2000, results
from a prospective two-year study of patients discharged from a mental hospital (in the context of deinstitutionalization) showed that stigma was a powerful and persistent force in their lives, and that experiences of social rejection were a persistent source of social stress. Efforts to cope with labels, such as not telling anyone, educating people about
mental distress/disorder, withdrawing from stigmatizing situations, could result in further social isolation and reinforce negative self-concepts. Sometimes an identity as a low self-esteem minority in society would be accepted. The stigma was associated with diminished motivation and ability to "make it in mainstream society" and with "a state of
social and psychological vulnerability to prolonged and recurrent problems". There was an up and down pattern in self-esteem, however, and it was suggested that, rather than simply gradual erosion of self-worth and increasing self-deprecating tendencies, people were sometimes managing, but struggling, to maintain consistent feelings of self-worth.
Ultimately, "a cadre of patients had developed an entrenched, negative view of themselves, and their experiences of rejection appear to be a key element in the construction of these self-related feelings" and "hostile neighbourhoods may not only affect their self-concept but may also ultimately impact the patient's mental health status and how
successful they are."[55] Psychology portal Society portal Society
(2009). "Labeling Theory". Handbook on Crime and Deviance. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research. pp. 187-207. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-0245-0_10. ISBN 978-1-4419-0245-0_10. ISBN 9
8525.1972.tb00828.x. ISSN 0038-0253. JSTOR 4105518. Retrieved 8 October 2024. ^ a b Macionis, John, and Linda Gerber. 2010. Sociology (7th ed.). London: Pearson Education Canada. ^ Mead, George H. (1934). Mind, Self & Society. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press. p. 107. Retrieved 23 April 2024. ^ Macionis, John J. 2012.
Sociology (14th ed.). Boston: Pearson. ISBN 978-0-205-11671-3. ^ O'Grady, William. 2011. Crime in Canadian Context. Ontario: Oxford University Press. ^ a b Sumner, C. 1994. The Sociology of Deviance: an Obituary. New York: Continuum Publishing. ^ Townsend, Kerry. 2001. "Frank Tannenbaum: 'Dramatization of Evil'." Florida State University.
Archived from the original on 2009-04-26. Retrieved 2010-05-29. A Barmaki, Reza (2017-12-26). "On the Origin of "Labeling" Theory in Criminology: Frank Tannenbaum and the Chicago School of Sociology". Deviant Behavior. 40 (2): 256-271. doi:10.1080/01639625.2017.1420491. ISSN 0163-9625. A Smith, Meghan L.; Hoven, Christina W.; Cheslack-
Postava, Keely; Musa, George J.; Wicks, Judith; McReynolds, Larkin; Bresnahan, Michaeline; Link, Bruce G. (2022-02-14). "Arrest history, stigma, and self-esteem: a modified labeling theory approach to understanding how arrests impact lives". Social Psychiatry and Psychiatry a
```

```
ISSN 0933-7954. PMID 35157092. ^ a b Rosenburg, Michael (2010). "Encyclopedia of Criminological Theory". SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/9781412959193.n151. ^ Lemert, Edwin M. 1951. Social Pathology. New York: Mcgraw-Hill. ^ a b c Becker, Howard. 1973 [1963]. Outsiders. New York: Free Press. ^ Cullen, Francis. 1984. Rethinking
Crime and Deviance Theory. Totowa, NJ: Bowman and Allanheld. ^ Memmi, Albert. 1965. The Colonized. New York: Orion Press. ^ Goffman, Erving. 1974.
Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ^ a b c d e f q h i j Goffman, Erving. 1963. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall. ^ a b c d e Matza, David. 1969. On Becoming Deviant. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. ^ Vito, Gennaro F.,
Jeffery R. Maahs, and Ronald M. Holmes. 2006. Criminology: Theory, Research And Policy (2nd ed.). Sudbury: Jones & Bartlett. Szasz, Thomas J. 1984. Being Mentally Ill (2nd ed.). Piscataway: Aldine Transaction. Gove, Walter R. (1975). Labelling of Deviance:
Evaluating a Perspective. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc. ^ Thoits, Peggy A. 1999. "Sociological approaches to mental illness." Pp. 121-138 in A Handbook for the Study of Mental Health: Social Contexts, Theories, and Systems, edited by A. V. Horwitz & T. L. Scheid. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-56763-3. ^ Link, Bruce
G., and Jo C. Phelan. 1999. "The Labelling Theory of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling. "A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (III): The Consequences of Labeling." A Handbook for the Study of Mental Disorder (III): The Consequences of Labeling.
Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. ^ Hooker, Evelyn. 1956. "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior of Homosexuals." Journal of Psychology 42(2): 217-25. doi:10.1080/00223980.1956.9713035. ^ Hooker, Evelyn. 1958. "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach." Journal of Projective Techniques 22(1): 33-54. doi:10.1080/08853126.1958.10380822
 . PMID 13514724. ^{\circ} Hooker, Evelyn. 1967. Final Report of the Task Force on Homosexuality. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health. ^{\circ} Leznoff, M., and W. A. Westley. 1956. "The Homosexuality. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health. ^{\circ} Leznoff, M., and W. A. Westley. 1956. "The Homosexuality." Social Problems 3(4): 257-63. doi:10.2307/798680. ^{\circ} Simon, W., and J. H. Gagnon. 1967. "Homosexuality." The
 Formulation of a Psychological Perspective." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 8(3): 177-85. doi:10.2307/2948372. JSTOR 2948372. JSTOR 800003. ^ Fein, Sara, and Elain M. Nuehring. 1981. "Intrapsychic Effects of Stigma: a
process of Breakdown and Reconstruction of Social Reality." Journal of Homosexuality 7(1):4-6. doi:10.1300/j082v07n01 02. ^ Sagarin, Edward. 1975. Deviants and Deviance. New York: Praeger. ^ a b c d DuBay, W. 1967. Gay Identity: The Self Under Ban. Jefferson, NC: McFarland. ^ Williams, Colin J., and Martin Weinberg. 1971. Homosexuals and
the Military. New York: Harper and Row. ^ Dank, Barry. 1971. "Coming Out in the Gay World." Psychiatry 34(2):180-97. doi:10.1080/00332747.1971.11023666. ^ Hammersmith, Sue K., and Martin Weinberg. 1973. "Homosexual Identity." Sociometry 36(1):56-79. doi:10.2307/2786282. JSTOR 2786282. PMID 4710474. ^ Weinberg, Martin, and Colin
J. Williams. 1974. Male Homosexuals. New York: Oxford University Press. ^ Warren, Carol A. B. 1974. Identity and Community in the Gay World. New York: Wiley-Interscience. ^ Shively, Michael G., and John DeCecco. 1977. "Components of Sexual Identity." Journal of Homosexualsty 3(1):41-8. doi:10.1300/j082v03n01_04. PMID 591712. ^ Bell, Alan,
and Martin Weinberg. 1978. Homosexualities: a Study of Diversity Among Men and Women. New York: Simon & Schuster. ^ Weinberg, Thomas. 1978. "On 'Doing' and 'Being' Gay: Sexual Behavior and Homosexual Identity." Journal of Homosexualities: a Study of Diversity Among Men and Women. New York: Simon & Schuster. ^ Weinberg, Thomas. 1978. "On 'Doing' and 'Being' Gay: Sexual Behavior and Homosexual Identity."
Formation: A Theoretical Model." Journal of Homosexual: A model of Gay Identity 4(3):219-35. doi:10.1300/j082v04n03_01. PMID 264126. Troiden, Richard. 1979. "Becoming Homosexual: A model of Gay Identity Acquisition." Psychiatry 4(4):362-73. doi:10.1080/00332747.1979.11024039. PMID 504515. Bell, Alan, Weinberg, Martin S., and Sue Kiefer Hammersmith
1981. Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press. ^ Coleman, Eli. 1982. "Developmental Stages of the Coming Out Process." American Behavioral Scientist 25(4):469-82. doi:10.1177/000276482025004009. ^ Adam, Barry. 1978. The Survival of Domination. New York: Elsevier. ^ Leopold, A.
 1975. "The Angry Men; Broadsides from the H. I. C." In Touch. p. 26. ^{\circ} Slater, Don. 1972. No politically radical group or country has shown the Homosexual Community 8(7):28-29. ^{\circ} Mackay, John Henry. 1985. The Hustler. Boston:
Alyson Publications. ^ a b Link, Bruce G., Francis T. Cullen, Elmer Struening, Patrick E. Shrout, and Bruce P. Dohrenwend. 1989. "A modified labeling theory approach to mental disorders: An empirical assessment." American Sociological Review 54(3):400-23. doi:10.2307/2095613. JSTOR 2095613. ^ Wright, E. R., W. P. Gronfein, and T. J. Owens
2000. "Deinstitutionalization, social rejection, and the self-esteem of former mental patients." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 41(1):68-90. doi:10.2307/2676361. JSTOR 2676361. PMID 10750323. Adam, B. (1978). The Survival of Domination. New York: Elsevier. ISBN 9780444990471. Becker, H. (1973) [1963]. Outsiders. New York: Free Press
Formation: A Theoretical Model". Journal of Homosexuality. 4 (3): 219-235. doi:10.1300/j082v04n03_01. PMID 264126. Coleman, E. (1982). "Developmental Stages of the Coming Out Process". American Behavioral Scientist. 25 (4): 469-482. doi:10.1177/000276482025004009. S2CID 45606395. Cullen, F. (1984). Rethinking Crime and Deviance
Theory. Totowa, NJ: Bowman and Allanheld. ISBN 9780865980730. Dank, B. (1971). "Coming Out in the Gay World". Psychiatry. 34 (2): 180-197. doi:10.1080/00332747.1971.11023666. PMID 5553891. DuBay, W. (1967). "Gay Identity: The Self Under Ban. Jefferson, NC: McFarland. Fein, S.; Nuehring, Elaine M. (1981). "Intrapsychic Effects of Stigma
a process of Breakdown and Reconstruction of Social Reality". Journal of Homosexuality. 7 (1): 4-6. doi:10.1300/j082v07n01_02. PMID 7345115. Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall.
Goffman, E. (1974). Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Goffman, E. (1975). Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating a Perspective. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc. Hammersmith, S. K.; Weinberg, M. (1973). "Homosexua
Identity". Sociometry. 36 (1): 56-79. doi:10.2307/2786282. JSTOR 2786282. PMID 4710474. Hooker, E. (1956). "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior of Homosexuals". Journal of Psychology. 42 (2): 217-225. doi:10.1080/00223980.1956.9713035. Hooker, E. (1958). "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach". Journal of Projective Techniques. 22 (1): 217-225. doi:10.1080/00223980.1956.9713035.
33-54. doi:10.1080/08853126.1958.10380822. PMID 13514724. Hooker, E. (1967). Final Report of the Task Force on Homosexuality. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Kinsey, A. C.; Pomeroy, W. P.; Martin, C. E.; Gebhard, P. H. (1953). Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saund
W. P.; Martin, C. E. (1948). Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. Lemert, E. M. (1951). Social Pathology. New York: Mcgraw-Hill. Leopold, A. (1975). "The Homosexual Community". Social Problems. 3 (4): 257-263.
doi:10.2307/798680. JSTOR 798680. Link, Bruce G.; Cullen, Francis T.; Struening, Elmer; Shrout, Patrick E.; Dohrenwend, Bruce G.; Phelan, Jo C. (1999). "A Modified Labeling Theory Approach to Mental Disorders: An Empirical Assessment". American Sociological Review. 54 (3): 400-423. doi:10.2307/2095613. JSTOR 2095613. Link, Bruce G.; Phelan, Jo C. (1999).
"The Labelling Theory of Mental Disorder (II): The Consequences of Labeling". A Handbook for the Study of Mental Health: Sociology (14th ed.). Boston: Pearson. ISBN 978-0-205-11671-3. Macionis, J.; Gerber, L. (2010). Sociology (7th ed.).
Mackay, J. H. (1985). The Hustler. Boston: Alyson Publications. ISBN 9780932870582. Matza, D. (1969). On Becoming Deviant. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. McIntosh, Mary (1968). "The Homosexual Role". Social Problems. 16 (2): 182–192. doi:10.2307/800003. JSTOR 800003. Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press. Memmi, A. (1965). The Colonizer and the Colonizer. (1975). Deviants and Deviance. New
York: Praeger. ISBN 9780275503307. Scheff, Thomas J. (1984). Being Mentally Ill (2nd ed.). Piscataway: Aldine Transaction. Shively, M. G.; DeCecco, J. (1977). "Components of Sexual Identity". Journal of Homosexuality: The Formulation of a
Psychological Perspective". Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 8 (3): 177-85. doi:10.2307/2948372. JSTOR 2948372. PMID 6073201. Slater, D. (1972). "No politically radical group or country has shown the slightest inclination to be more tolerant of homosexual behavior than middle class America". Vector: A Voice for the Homosexual Community
8 (7): 28-29. Sumner, C. (1994). The Sociology of Deviance: an Obituary. New York: Continuum Publishing. Tannenbaum, F. (1938). Crime and Community. London and New York: Columbia University Press. Thoits, Peggy A. (1999). "Sociological approaches to mental illness". In Allan V. Horwitz & Teresa L. Scheid (ed.). A Handbook for the Study of
Mental Health: Social Contexts, Theories, and Systems. Cambridge University Press. pp. 121-138. ISBN 978-0-521-56763-3. Troiden, T. (1979). "Becoming Homosexual: A model of Gay Identity Acquisition". Psychiatry. 42 (4): 362-373. doi:10.1080/00332747.1979.11024039. PMID 504515. Vito, Gennaro F.; Maahs, Jeffery R.; Holmes, Ronald M.
(2006). Criminology: Theory, Research And Policy (2nd ed.). Sudbury: Jones & Bartlett. Warren, C. A. B. (1974). Identity and Community in the Gay World. New York: Wiley-Interscience. ISBN 9780471921127. Weinberg, T. (1978). "On 'Doing' and 'Being' Gay: Sexual Behavior and Homosexual Male Self-Identity". Journal of Homosexuality. 14 (2): 143-
168. doi:10.1300/j082v04n02 02. PMID 739145. Weinberg, M.; Williams, C. (1974). Male Homosexuals. New York: Oxford University Press. Williams, C.; Weinberg, M. (1971). Homosexuals and the Military. New York: Harper and Row. Wright, E. R.; Gronfein, W. P.; Owens, T. J. (2000). "Deinstitutionalization, Social Rejection, and the Self-Esteem of
Former Mental Patients". Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 41 (1): 68-90. doi:10.2307/2676361. JSTOR 2676361. PMID 10750323. Retrieved from "In fields such as sociology and criminology, labeling theory is an important approach that helps to understand the nature of a crime. Would you like to get a profound knowledge of labeling theory? If
yes, then take a look at this blog post. For your better comprehension, here, we have shared a labeling theory, people develop identities and behaviors based on the labels that others give them. The sociology of crime has a strong
 association with this idea because it recommends that calling someone illegally deviant may have negative effects on behavior. For example, labeling someone as a criminal may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which in turn may lead to greater unfavorable treatment from others, which is the greater unfavorable treatment from others, which is the greater unfavorable treatment from others, which is the greater unfavorable treatment from others are greater unfavorable treatment from others.
During the 1960s, Sociologist Howard Becker played a major role in flourishing the idea of labeling theory. But its fundamental concepts trace back to the work of French sociologist George Herbert Mead. His theory states that the social
construction of the self as a process involves interactions with others. A few other researchers who contributed to the creation and study of labeling theory are David Matza, Frank Tannenbaum, Albert Memmi, Edwin Lement, and Erving Goffman. To learn about the theories of these scholars, continue reading this blog. In this section, let us learn the
definition of labeling theory, the works that influenced the labeling theory, and some comprehensive labeling theory examples. The label theory proponents view deviants and non-deviants and non-deviants rather than as a set of characteristics that are inherent in people or groups. According to them, we need to
identify why certain people are labeled as deviant to comprehend the original nature of deviant to comprehend the authority to apply the clear guidelines of conventional morality to others or who stand in for the authority of the law play a crucial role in providing labels. Moreover, labels that signify different categories of
deviation are therefore an expression of the power dynamics inside society. What was the Influence of the Labeling Theory? As per the criminological literature, the following sociologists and their works influenced the labeling theory? As per the criminological literature, the following sociologists and their works influenced the labeling theory?
into a criminal if he is described as one. "Suicide" by Emile Durkheim According to Emile, crimes and delinquencies are defined by how they offend society, not just by breaking the law. Later, George Herbert Mead, John Dewey, W.I. Thomas, Charles Horton Cooley, Herbert Blumer, and others worked on the modern labeling theory. But out of all the
scholars, Howard Becker played a significant role in the development of the modern labeling theory, whether or not a conduct qualifies as deviant depends on how society views it. Labeling theory is classified alongside control theory, whether or not a conduct qualifies as deviant depends on how society views it. Labeling theory is classified alongside control theory, whether or not a conduct qualifies as deviant depends on how society views it.
differential association, and symbolic interactionism. Howard Becker's Labeling Theory In 1963 American sociologist Howard Becker discussed the Sociology of Deviance in his work "Outsiders." He contends that being "deviant" is not inherent in a person; rather it was present inside the society. According to Howard, society is classified into social
groups, and individuals in positions of authority rule over these groups. As a result, they are the ones who are in charge of defining what constitutes a deviant. In his work, Howard also talked about "Moral Panics," or little instances that are exaggerated by the media,
through rumors, or folklore to give the impression that something is threatening when it is not. Labeling Theory Examples Here, let us look at some examples of labeling theory. Example 1: Marijuana Jenifer suffers from acute anxiety and is aware of marijuana's medical qualities. So she decides to get some medical marijuana. She will have no trouble
getting and consuming medical marijuana if she resides in Illinois, where it is legal. Even the folks around will not think of her behavior as a bad thing. However, people will view Jenifer's purchase and use of marijuana as deviant conduct if she lives in Wyoming, where it is unlawful to use the drug, whether for therapeutic or non-medical purposes.
Since her behavior goes against social norms, they will label her as a deviant. Example 2: Same-Sex Marriage Ron and Ben are two men who love each other and wish to marry. As same-sex marriage is permitted in Massachusetts, they won't have any trouble obtaining a marriage license if they reside there. Even their neighborhood will not view the
same-sex pair as a deviant role. Their community will probably encourage and treat their marriage like any other. On the other hand, Ron and Ben will face life in prison and punishment for "Buggery or Unnatural and Indecent Acts" if they reside in Barbados. Furthermore, their community will hate them as "deviants." What Does the
Labeling Theory Say About Deviance? According to Erving Goffman considers each person to be a performer, and society to be the stage. Deviance occurs when an actor unexpectedly acts out of character. It is described as behaviors that deviate from
the norms of society. According to Erwin Lemert's "Societal Reaction," a person's social deviation progresses through two phases: Primary Deviance When someone behaves in a deviant manner or breaks social norms, it is considered primary deviation. However, there are no long-term effects, and the person's self-perception remains unchanged. The
person's self-perception also gradually shifts. This label will serve as their "Master Status" or main persona. According to the labeling theory, a person gives in to their deviant identity when they are stigmatized as such by society. Significance of the Labeling Theory According to the labeling theory, no action is essentially illegal, which means that no
action is ever criminal. For this reason, this theory is frequently used to understand criminal behavior or those who are labeled as deviants. What constitutes a deviant act? Through the creation of the authorities who enact those laws, such
as the police and courts. According to this theory, deviation is the outcome of how society interprets criminality rather than an individual's or group's character. Mental Illness and Labeling Theory In recent events, individual's or group's character. Mental Illness and Labeling Theory In recent events, individual's or group's character.
members, friends, and employers toward the labeled individual who suffers from mental problems. Walter Gove's paper "Labeling Theory's Explanation of Mental Illness: An Update of Recent Evidence" began with sociologists' failure to account for psychiatric developments, resulting in a dispute between the use of labeling theory to describe mental
illness against its psychiatric definition. Gove further states that even if labeling theorists say that persons who have the label "mentally ill" are not distinguishable from those who are not, research reveals that there is a hereditary component that differentiates them. Also read: Top Criminology Dissertation Ideas To Consider Labeling Theory in
Criminology and Sociology Social sciences play a major role in labeling theory. For instance, some may explain juvenile delinquency as the result of negative connotations attached to events or words that are normally viewed positively. To a non-deviant adolescent, the word "home" might represent warmth and family. However, if the juvenile has a
strained relationship with his family, the term "home" takes on a completely other meaning. This interactionist viewpoint aids criminologists in comprehending the behaviors and responses of a person. Current Limitations of the Labeling Theory Those who oppose the labeling theory claim that it Ignores socialization differences Disregard differences
in opportunities Fails to put attitudes aside Criticism of the Labeling Theory Those who embrace the labeling theory view its advantages as follows: Makes the deviant behavior more understandable and in turn
strengthens the structure of society. Assists in making accurate predictions Develops a comprehensive environment for people with impairments Improves communication for advocacy efforts Disadvantages of the Labeling Theory There is no empirical evidence that labeling causes more
deviation. Despite its popularity in the 1960s and 1970s, the labeling theory began to erode as a result of mixed empirical research outcomes. Not everyone who engages in deviant behavior is labeled as such. For example, labeling opinions vary from state to state based on regulations enacted in that location. Additional References Listed below are
some notable works from other sociologists, criminologists, criminologists, and researchers about the labeling theory Crime and Community by Frank Tannenbaum (1938) Social Pathology, New York (8th edition) by J.B. Lippincott (1970) Human
Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control (second edition) by Edwin Lemert (1972) Labeling Theory and Criminology: An Assessment by Charles Wellford (1975) Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs by Paul Willis (1977) Criminology, London: OUP Oxford by Stephen Jones (2009) Punished: Policing the Lives of
Black and Latino Boys by Victor Rios (2011) Without Class: Girls, Race and Women Identity by Julie Bettie (2014) Conclusion Hopefully, by now, you will have gained a basic understanding of labeling theory. According to labeling theory, people may behave as per interactionism and others' expectations of how to perform their roles in society. If
individuals behave abnormally and experience both Primary and Secondary deviance, society will categorize them as such until their self-perception aligns with that label. For students pursuing a degree in sociology or criminology, labeling theory is a good assignment topic. In case, you experience trouble with writing your academic paper on labeling
theory, feel free to contact us. Labeling theory focuses on how other people see and define us as criminal, that's exactly what we become. We change our self-concept to fit what other people think of us, and if they give us the label
of a criminal, we will ultimately behave according to that label. In other words, we will become offenders because other people say that we are offenders because other people say that we are offenders. Labeling theory has a rich tradition in criminology and several criminologists have contributed to it. That means that the theory, or the perspective as some call it, can be a little complicated. So
we'll first break it down into several building blocks. And after that, I'll sum up the labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph. Credits: Bart Christiaanse, Unsplash First, one of the basic ideas behind labeling process in a graph.
the way in which society classifies a certain behavior that determines if it's a crime. So if society says that a certain behavior is a crime. So how does this work? Labeling theorists argue that it is the powerful parties in society, particularly the upper and middle class, that determine what crime and deviance is. They are the
ones who create the rules. The upper and middle class want to benefit from the law and they use the criminal justice system (so the police, courts, corrections etc.) to enforce the rules by punishing the people who are not powerful. Howard Becker, an important labeling theorist, called these people, so the ones who create the rules and the ones who are not powerful.
enforce the rules "moral entrepreneurs". By setting the rules for what jeople are allowed and not allowed to do, so setting the rules for what is a crime and what is not a crime, the powerful people in society determine what deviance is. So an act or behavior in itself is not deviant. It's breaking the rules of the powerful that is deviance, and this is an
important building block in labeling theory. The middle and upper class act as "moral entrepreneurs" according to Howard Becker A second important building block in labeling theory. The middle and upper class act as "moral entrepreneurs" according to Howard Becker A second important building block in labeling theory.
different stages, as defined by Edwin Lemert, one of the early labeling theorists. The first stage is called primary deviance. According to labeling theory, primary deviance is something that is deviant, like perhaps stealing or
destroying something. Often, these acts are not noticed by others and no harm comes from them, or at least, that how labeling theorists are not really interested in these acts are not noticed by others and why people engage in them. What they're interested in is what happens when people are caught doing something that's against the law
Most people are not caught when they're violating the law in this way but some are. And when they're caught, like being arrested by the police, the process of labeling, namely of defining a person as criminal, begins. Frank Tannenbaum, another important labeling theorist, has called this process the "dramatization of evil," A person is tagged as
delinquent or bad. So at this stage, it's not just the act that is labeled criminal, it's the person him- or herself who is labeled criminal, it's the person him- or herself who is labeled criminal, it's the person him- or herself who is labeled. People start to behave differently towards him or her; he or she is singled out, given a label, and rejected by society. An important note to make here is that according to labeling theorists, it is usually the lower-class people, like
those who are unemployed and poorly educated, who are being charged and prosecuted, not so much because of what they did, because many people are being labeled, which in turn of course reinforces the low status in society that they already
had. So this is how primary deviance is seen in labeling theory. Labeling can lead to stigmatization, which in turn people can internalize The labeling process then leads to a second step, namely secondary deviance. What happens in this step is that the people who have been labeled delinquent start to self-identify with that label. In other words, they
that if the government intervenes in the lives of offenders, for example by arresting them, they will only make things worse. This process of stigmatization can have lasting effects on people's self-identity, and a sort of chain reaction starts happening. The people who have been labelled and stigmatized start hanging out more with other delinquents
who approve of each other's behavior. This is the final stage in the criminal career: they become outsiders, isolated from society, and hostile towards law-abiding citizens, which in turn leads to what is called "deviance amplification", meaning more deviance. Credits: Niu Niu, Unsplash So let's sum up the labeling process in a quick graph. In short,
when someone is caught committing a primary act of deviance, this triggers a sequence of events, namely being labeled negatively by society, which can then lead to more deviance ("deviance amplification"). If this continues, the offender may internalize the label and conform to it, which then leads to secondary deviance. Caught for primary deviance
(formal intervention) -> labeling -> deviance amplification -> internalizing label -> secondary deviance Summary of the labeling process Labeling theory was popular in the 1960s, especially in the US, which may not be a surprise because in that period, there were many people who believed that government intervention in general was negative. They
felt that the government could not be trusted, for example regarding the war in Vietnam and civil rights. During the past couple of decades, labeling theory has not received as much attention. One of the reasons for that is that research has not always been supportive of it. For example, research has not found that everyone who is labeled criminal
also starts to see themselves as such. Labeling theory has also received criticism because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people start committing crime because it doesn't explain why people continue to commit crime, so secondary deviance. Nevertheless, labeling theory has received a lot of attention and is
quite different from other criminological theories are mainly concerned with why people start committing crime in the life of offenders and how this can lead to more offending. A
recent overview of labeling theory can be found here: Bernburg, J. G. (2019). Labeling theory. In Handbook on crime and deviance (pp. 179-196). Springer, Cham. Labeling theory is a sociological framework that explores the significance of societal reaction to individuals and behaviors, and how such reactions contribute to the formation of deviant
identities and actions. Initially developed in the mid-20th century, this theory has become a cornerstone in understanding crime, deviance, and social control. It posits that deviance is not inherent in an act but is the result of the social response to that act. Through the process of labelling, individuals may come to identify themselves in terms of the
label assigned to them, which can perpetuate the very behaviors that led to the label. This theory challenges traditional views of deviance and criminality by focusing on the power dynamics and social processes that influence perceptions of deviance and criminality by focusing on the power dynamics and social processes that influence perceptions of deviance.
social interactions and meanings in shaping individual behavior. The groundwork for labelling theory was laid by scholars such as Charles Horton Cooley, George Herbert Mead, and Herbert Blumer, who examined how self-identity and behavior are influenced by social interactions. Cooley's concept of the "looking-glass self" suggested that individuals behavior.
form their self-concepts based on how they perceive others see them. Mead's work on the social self and the development of the self through social processes also provided a foundation for understanding the impact of societal reactions on individual identity. Edwin Lemert is often credited with formalizing labelling theory. In his seminal work, "Social
Pathology" (1951), Lemert distinguished between primary and secondary deviance refers to initial acts of rule-breaking, which may not result in a deviant identity. These acts can be varied and are often minor. Secondary deviance elicits a strong societal reaction, leading to stigmatization
and the adoption of a deviant identity. Lemert argued that it is the societal reaction and subsequent labelling that play a crucial role in transforming primary deviance into secondary deviance is not a quality of the act but a
consequence of the application of rules and sanctions by others. He famously stated, "Deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender.'" Becker explored how social groups create deviance by making rules and applying them to certain people, thereby
labelling them as outsiders. This process of labelling can lead to the internalization of the deviant behavior. Labelling theory emphasizes the role of social reaction in the construction of deviants, instead, they become deviant when society labels them as such
Erving Goffman in his work "Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity" (1963). Stigma refers to the negative labels and stereotypes that society attaches to certain individuals or groups. This stigmatization can profoundly affect an individual's self-identity and social interactions. When individuals are labelled as deviant, they may
internalize this label and begin to see themselves through the lens of the deviant identity, leading to a self-fulfilling prophecy where they continue to engage in deviant behaviors. Definition: The Labeling Theory is a sociological perspective that suggests individuals are labeled or categorized by society based on their behavior, appearance, or other
attributes. According to this theory, these labels can significantly shape an individual's self-identity and subsequent behavior, often leading to a self-fulfilling prophecy. Key Aspects of Labeling Theory 1. Social Construction of Deviance: The Labeling Theory emphasizes that deviance is not inherent in behavior, but rather it is socially constructed
through the process of labeling. Societal reactions and the application of labels determine what is considered deviant or criminal. 2. Primary and Secondary Deviance refers to the initial act of deviating from social norms, while secondary Deviance refers to the initial act of deviating from social norms, while secondary Deviance refers to the initial act of deviating from social norms, while secondary Deviance refers to the initial act of deviating from social norms.
deviant behavior as a result of societal reactions and expectations. 3. Self-Fulfilling Prophecy: Labeling Theory posits that individuals often fulfill the expectations and roles associated with the labels given to them. For example, if someone is consistently labeled as a troublemaker, they may internalize this label and behave accordingly, perpetuating
the belief. 4. Stigmatization: Labeling can lead to the stigmatization of individuals or groups, resulting in negative societal reactions, opportunities, and self-perception. 5. Labeling and Crime: Labeling Theory examines how the criminal
justice system labels individuals as criminals, and how this labeling can result in a cycle of criminal behavior. It suggests that being labeled as a criminal activities are individual's chances of reintegrating into society, leading to further involvement in criminal activities. If it is permissible, it can be said that writing assignments during college days are
one of the most feared tasks which a student is asked to do. There is no doubt that most of the assignments have a complex nature and create unwanted pressure on the students. Despite this, students get to work on several assignments have a complex nature and create unwanted pressure on the students.
writing and understanding assignment problems. Such students get stuck while writing their assignments and have no clue where to go and whom to ask for help. Academic assignment help from someone, things will become much more manageable. But
the problem before the student arises when his peers are not ready to help him, or they also find the assignment complex. The problem becomes even more intense when his peers are not ready to help him, or they also find the assignment complex. The problem becomes even more intense when his peers are not ready to help him, or they also find the assignment complex. The problem becomes even more intense when his peers are not ready to help him, or they also find the assignment and with whose help? Well, not to boast of our quality, but it is a fact that in
such situations, a student can contact totalassignment.com, and we can help him in completing his assignment despite the severity. In the above section, only a single reason has been discussed for students asking for example, the
reasons may include prior work to be finished as per the schedule, other urgent assignments to be submitted, or you have less time to finish the work, etc. If we say that Total Assignment Help can get you an A+ grade, would you believe that? In all probability, the answer will be a no. But before making an opinion about our services, we would
request you to ask your peers and friends about the quality of our assignments. It is not easy to get an A+ grade once enrolled in a university, as writing assignments with superficial content can only lead to average grades. If you are looking for easy to get an A+ grade once enrolled in a university, as writing assignments with superficial content can only lead to average grades. If you are looking for easy to get an A+ grade once enrolled in a university, as writing assignments with superficial content can only lead to average grades.
a higher grade, you need to put in a lot of effort to solve the assignment problem. You should understand the assignment writing and produce work expected from a student. You should understand the assignment requirement and why it is essential to solving it as per the stated guidelines. In most cases, it is difficult for students and learn all the details of assignment requirement and why it is essential to solving it as per the stated guidelines. In most cases, it is difficult for students and learn all the details of assignment requirement and why it is essential to solving it as per the stated guidelines. In most cases, it is difficult for students and learn all the details of assignment requirement and why it is essential to solving it as per the stated guidelines.
to produce an assignment as per their professors' expectations. This was the ultimate reason we started our assignment help services online. Our chosen assignment help services online. Our chosen assignment help services online.
assignment delivered gives you peace of mind and satisfaction and gets you the A+ grade you have been looking for for a long time. We have been extending our services in UK for a long time, thereby helping thousands of students get the grades they had never dreamed of getting while writing themselves. Connect with us today if you want to
experience the joy of getting the assignment written from Total Assignments is not an easy task and involves a lot of time. If you get stuck in solving one of the questions, you will have to sit back for hours until you find
a solution, or there may be a case where you leave the question. It is unknown to the professor that you do not know how to solve the problem assignment. There are other reasons as well that can waste the students' time. One of the foremost reasons behind the wastage of time is when a student does not know how to write the assignment. The
reason may be the nearing deadline of the assignment you do not know. In such a situation, if you think of reading materials and coursework on the assignment topic, then it is likely that you will end up missing your assignment. So, why waste
achieve the grades you look for from any assignment. The assignment are completed within the timeline provided by the students taking our services to check the assignment and match it with
requirements before submitting it at the university. It helps check the quality and completeness of an assignment helper has become much easier if placing an assignment order with the assignment writing company is simple to understand.
Unfortunately, the easy steps to place an order cannot be found in all the assignment service providers, and therefore it becomes difficult to choose the best assignment helper. You need to search for a service provider who can help instantly in times of need. Thankfully, the steps to hire an assignment helper at total signment helper. You need to search for a service provider who can help instantly in times of need. Thankfully, the steps to hire an assignment helper at total signment helper at total signment.
compared to our competitors, and a student can come to us for kinds of requests. In addition, writing assignments with our experienced and professionals assignment helpers, you need to let us know the subject to which the assignment belongs
Then, the online customer care personnel will help you with a detailed list of subject matter experts who are qualified enough to perform the task. The process of order placements will not cost you an hour; it can be done within a few minutes if you have everything ready at your end. The things you need include details of the assignment task, word
count, timeline, and payment details. Then, when you have chosen the assignment helper gets down to working on the
sense of satisfaction. It motivates us to work hard and meet the requests of all the students coming for help from our assignment helpers. We search for qualified experts who are masters in their disciplines, guaranteeing quality. A student can sit back and relax and wait for the assignment delivery. Labeling theory suggests that people act based on
the labels others give them. Labeling theory is important for understanding criminal behavior as it focuses on societal definitions of deviance. Once labeled as deviant, people face stigma making it hard to change how others label them. This theory
is most commonly associated with the sociology of crime since labeling someone unlawfully deviant can lead to poor conduct. Describing someone as a criminal, for example, can cause others to treat the person more negatively, and, in turn, the individual acts out. The idea of labeling theory flourished in American sociology during the 1960s, thanks
in large part to sociologist Howard Becker. However, its core ideas can be traced back to the work of founding French sociologist Emile Durkheim. American sociologist Emile Durkheim. American sociologist Emile Durkheim. American sociologist Emile Durkheim.
Edwin Lemert, Albert Memmi, Erving Goffman, and David Matza played roles in the development and criminal behavior. It begins with the assumption that no act is intrinsically criminal. Definitions of criminality are established
by those in power through the formulation of laws and the interpretation of those laws by police, courts, and correctional institutions. Deviance is therefore not a set of characteristics of individuals or groups but a process of interaction between deviants and the context in which criminality is interpreted. Police, judges, and educators
are the individuals tasked with enforcing standards of normalcy and labeling certain behaviors as deviant in nature. By applying labels to people and creating categories of deviance, these officials reinforce society's power structure. Often, the wealthy define deviancy for the poor, men for women, older people for younger people, and racial or ethnic
majority groups for minorities. In other words, society's dominant groups create and apply deviant labels to subordinate groups. Many children, for example, break windows, steal fruit from other people's trees, climb into neighbors' yards, or skip school. In affluent neighbors' yards, or skip scho
behavior. But in poor areas, similar conduct might be viewed as signs of juvenile delinquency. This suggests that class plays an important role in labeling. Race is also a factor in labeling theory. Research shows that schools discipline Black children more frequently and harshly than white children despite a lack of evidence suggesting that the former
misbehave more often than the latter. Similarly, police kill Black people at far higher rates than white people of color as deviant, it is extremely difficult to
Even if labeled individuals do not commit any more crimes, they must forever live with the consequences of being formally deemed a wrongdoer. Critics of labeling theory argue that it ignores factors—such as differences in socialization, attitudes, and opportunities—that lead to deviant acts. They also assert that it's not entirely certain whether
labeling increases deviancy. Ex-cons might end up back in prison because they have formed connections to other offenders; these ties raise the odds that they will be exposed to additional opportunities to commit crimes. In all likelihood, both labeling and increased contact with the criminal population contribute to recidivism. Crime and
Community by Frank Tannenbaum (1938)Outsiders by Howard Becker (1963)The Colonizer and the Colonizer and the Colonizer and Social Problems and Soc
Black and Latino Boys by Victor Rios (2011) Without Class: Girls, Race and Women Identity by Julie Bettie (2014) Labeling Theory, primarily developed by sociologists like Howard Becker and Edwin Lement, posits that deviance is not inherent in any act but is a result of the social response to that act. The theory shifts focus from the act itself to the
societal reactions and labels imposed on individuals. It suggests that being labeled as "deviant" can lead individuals to internalize this label, influencing their self-identity and potentially leading to further deviant behavior. This perspective has profound implications for understanding crime, mental health, education, and various other social
phenomena. Labeling Theory asserts that deviance and conformity are not inherent qualities of individuals or actions but are instead the outcomes of the labels that society attaches to them. According to a self-fulfilling prophecy where the
individual continues to engage in deviant behavior because society expects it. Deviance as a Social Construct: Deviance of Labels such as "criminal," "mentally ill," or "truant" carry significant weight and influence how individuals perceive
themselves and how others perceive them. Focus on Reactions: The theory emphasizes the role of societal reactions, such as stigmatization and marginalization, in shaping deviant behavior. Labeling Theory emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as a response to earlier theories that focused primarily on the causes of deviance, such as biological or
psychological explanations. Sociologists like Howard Becker, Edwin Lemert, and Erving Goffman were instrumental in developing the theory, drawing on symbolic interactionism to explore how meanings and labels are constructed through social interactions. Howard Becker's "Outsiders" (1963): Becker argued that deviance is a product of social
 interactions and the definitions imposed by others. Edwin Lemert's "Social Pathology" (1951): Lemert introduced the concepts of primary and secondary deviance, highlighting the process of labeling. Erving Goffman's "Stigma" (1963): Goffman explored how individuals cope with social stigma and its impact on their identities. Primary deviance refers
to the initial act of rule-breaking or norm violation that does not result in a deviant identity. These acts are often minor and do not lead to significant social consequences. Example: A student cheating on a test for the first time may be seen as a one-time offender without being labeled as a "cheater." Secondary deviance occurs when individuals
internalize a deviant label and engage in further deviant behavior as a response to societal reactions. Example: If the same student is caught cheating and labeled as a "cheater," they may begin to identify with this label and continue to cheat, reinforcing their deviant identity. The self-fulfilling prophecy in Labeling Theory refers to the process by
which societal expectations lead individuals to act in ways that confirm those expectations. Example: If an employer's original expectation. Master status is a concept introduced by sociologist Everett Hughes, referring to a dominant label that shapes
an individual's identity and interactions. Example: Being labeled as "criminal" can overshadow other aspects of an individual's identity, such as their role as a parent or employee. The criminal justice system is a primary arena where Labeling Theory is applied. The process of arrest, prosecution, and conviction often results in the label of "criminal" can overshadow other aspects of an individual's identity, such as their role as a parent or employee. The criminal justice system is a primary arena where Labeling Theory is applied.
being attached to individuals, regardless of the severity of their actions. Case Study: The "War on Drugs" in the United States has led to mass incarcerations, disproportionately affecting minority communities. Individuals labeled as "drug addicts" or "criminals" often face social stigma, limited employment opportunities, and ongoing marginalization
which can perpetuate criminal behavior. In educational contexts, labeling can significantly impact student behavior and academic outcomes. Teachers and administrators may label students based on their performance, behavior, or background. Example: Students labeled as "troublemakers" may experience negative interactions with teachers and
peers, leading to disengagement from school and increased likelihood of dropping out. Labeling Theory also applies to mental health, where individuals diagnosed with schizophrenia may be labeled as "dangerous" or "unpredictable," which can lead to social
exclusion and reluctance to seek help, exacerbating their condition. In criminology, Labeling Theory has been instrumental in understanding the cyclical nature of criminal behavior and recidivism. It emphasizes how societal reactions to crime contribute to ongoing criminality. Application: Restorative justice programs aim to mitigate the negative
effects of labeling by fostering dialogue between offenders and victims, promoting rehabilitation rather than punishment. Labeling in educational settings can influence student self-esteem, motivation, and academic achievement. Educators can use Labeling Theory to create more inclusive and supportive environments. Application: Implementing
positive reinforcement strategies and avoiding negative labels can help improve student outcomes and reduce behavioral issues. Labeling Theory informs approaches to mental health treatment by highlighting the importance of reducing stigma and promoting understanding. Application: Mental health advocacy campaigns focus on educating the
public to dispel myths and reduce the negative labels associated with mental illness. In the workplace, labeling can affect employee morale, productivity, and career progression. Understanding Labeling Theory can help managers foster a more inclusive and supportive work environment. Application: Organizations can implement unbiased
performance evaluations and provide support systems to prevent negative labeling of employees. The media plays a significant role in shaping societal labels and perceptions. Labeling Theory can be applied to analyze media representations and their impact on public opinion. Application: Critical media literacy programs educate individuals to
individuals have little control over their deviant trajectories. This perspective may overlook the capacity for individuals might engage in deviant behavior after being labeled but does not predict who will be labeled or how. Some
critics argue that Labeling Theory is primarily based on Western contexts and may not be universally applicable across different cultures and societies. By focusing on societal reactions, Labeling Theory may neglect the underlying causes of deviance, such as economic disparity, psychological issues, or systemic injustices. Despite its critiques,
Labeling Theory remains a vital framework for understanding deviance and identity formation. Contemporary sociologists continue to refine and expand the theory, integrating insights from intersectionality, postmodernism, and critical theory to address its limitations. Labeling Theory is often combined with other sociological theories to provide a
more comprehensive understanding of deviance. For example, it can be integrated with strain theory to explore how societal pressures and labeling interact to influence behavior. With the rise of digital technology and social media, labeling interact to influence behavior. With the rise of digital technology and social media, labeling interact to influence behavior.
 fresh challenges for applying Labeling Theory. Policy-makers can utilize Labeling Theory to develop more humane and effective approaches to managing deviance. Emphasizing rehabilitation over punishment, reducing stigma, and promoting inclusive practices are key strategies inspired by the theory. No hashtags Course: Criminology Labeling
Theory is a theoretical framework within criminal behavior, rather than the behavior itself, is the primary cause of criminality. Labeling Theory brings forward a different perspective on criminal behavior itself, is the primary cause of criminality. Labeling Theory brings forward a different perspective on criminal behavior itself, is the primary cause of criminality. Labeling Theory brings forward a different perspective on criminal behavior itself, is the primary cause of criminality.
Labeling Theory asserts that criminal behavior gets its energy from society's reaction. This reaction creates a label that sticks to an individual further into criminal activity. It's like a self-fulfilling prophecy: a person behaves in a way that society
expects them to based on the label attached to them. The Implications of Being Labeled a Criminal When society labels an individual as a criminal, it can lead to dire consequences for that person. Negative stereotypes associated with criminals and discrimination emerge. Society sees criminals as dangerous, untrustworthy, and deviant. These
perceptions can result in the person feeling ostracized and excluded from everyday mainstream social life. They may feel that they no longer fit into society's norm and, feeling process often starts with the criminal justice system or law enforcement
However, societal factors can influence this process too. For instance, the individual's race, gender, and economic status can significantly affect how quickly they get labeled as criminals. Research reveals that minority groups, such as Caucasians. This
situation brings about an unequal and biased application of the label "criminal." The Influence of Labeling Theory on Criminal Justice system. It highlights how the system treats individuals and the consequences of labeling. It challenges the common notion of
punishment as the primary solution to criminality. Instead, the theory advocates for more restorative justice practices. These are solutions that focus on addressing the root causes of criminal behavior rather than merely punishing the offenders. Restorative justice practices can include community-based sentencing programs. These programs allow
criminals to serve their sentences within their communities under strict supervision. This approach helps to integrate the offenders back into society and offers them a second chance. Diversion programs are another example. These programs provide alternatives to traditional punitive sentences. They aim to address issues like substance abuse and
mental health problems that might be causing criminal behavior. The Power of Second Chances The understanding of Labeling Theory has led to an increased focus on the importance of giving people second chances. The criminal label should not be permanent; people can change and reintegrate into society. This perspective has brought about a shift
in how we view and treat criminals. It underscores the necessity to avoid stigmatizing labels and provide opportunities for people to start anew. Conclusion Labeling Theory plays a crucial role in understanding why some individuals engage in criminal behavior. It shifts the focus from personal traits or societal pressures, spotlighting instead the
significant role of societal reactions in promoting or deterring crime. Recognizing the influence of societal labels could help develop better strategies to address criminality and foster a more understanding and inclusive society. [Glossary | Last Modified: 05/28/2023 Labeling theory is an approach in the sociology of deviance that focuses on the ways
in which the agents of social control attach stigmatizing stereotypes to particular groups, and the ways in which the stigmatized change their behavior once labeled. Labeling theory is associated with the work of Becker and is a reaction to sociological theories, which examine only the characteristics of the deviants rather than the agencies that
controlled them. Howard Becker's (1963) idea is that deviance is a consequence of external judgments, or labels, that modify the individual's self-concept and change the way others respond to the label corresponds to the label in terms of delinquent
behavior. It has been criticized for ignoring that it is an automatic process. Labeling theory recognizes that labels will vary depending on the culture, time period, and situation. David Rosenhan's study On Being Sane in Insane Places (1973) provides a striking demonstration of the power of
labeling and the importance of context. The premise of Labeling Theory is that, once individuals have been labeled as deviants, they face new problems stemming from their reactions to themselves and others to the stereotypes of someone with the deviant label (Becker, 1963; Bernburg, 2009). Labeling theory stems from the school of symbolic
interactionism, which believes that an individual's sense of self is formed by their interactions with and the labels ascribed to them by other people. Stigma and Discrimination: The Roots of Labeling Theory Sociologists generally agree that deviant labels are also stigmatizing labels (Bernburg, 2009). These sociologists define stigma as a series of
specific, negative perceptions and stereotypes attached to a label (Link and Pelan, 2001), which can be evident in and transmitted by mass media or the everyday interactions people have between themselves. According to Becker (1963), "To be labeled a criminal carries a number of connotations specifying auxiliary traits characteristic of anyone
bearing the label." That is to say, a label of deviance (such as being a criminal) can become one that overtakes one's entire identity. Those with criminal habels are distrusted and disdained widely, and individuals may believe that criminal habels are distrusted and disdained widely, and individuals may believe that criminal habels are distrusted and disdained widely, and individuals may believe that criminals are completely unable to behave morally. Any misbehavior may be explained entirely by how that individual is
labeled as a criminal (Travis, 2002). Lower-class people and those from minority groups are more likely to be involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions, and when those from minority groups are involved in police interventions.
arrested, these individuals face more severe sentences regardless of the seriousness of t
deviance, regardless of whether or not they have been formally labeled as a criminal. This manifests both on the societal and individual levels. African American children, for example, are more likely to be seen as rule-breakers by their parents than their white peers (Matsueda, 1992). Formal and Informal Labeling Labeling theorists specify two types
of categories when investigating the implications of labeling: formal and informal labels. Formal labels are labels. Formal labels are labels are labels are labels are labels are labels are labels.
been suspected of committing a behavior that is established to be deviant (such as breaking the law). However, labels can also be ascribed to someone by groups of people who do not have the official authority to label someone as deviant. For example, the teachers and staff at a school can label a child as a "troublemaker" and treat him as such
(through detention and so forth). These labels are informal (Kavish, Mullins, and Soto, 2016). Labeling and Deviant self-concept, a process of social exclusion, and increased involvement in deviant groups. Deviant self-concept originates from the theory of symbolic
interactionism. In summary, symbolic interactionism is a theory in sociology that argues that society is created and maintained by face-to-face, repeated, meaningful interactions among individuals (Carter and Fuller, 2016). Some sociologists, such as Matsueda (1992), have argued that the concept of self is formed on the basis of their interactions
with other people. These people learn to define what they are and what they are and what they do on the basis of how they see the attitudes of stigma the people around them (Bernburg, 2009). Those labeled as criminals or deviants — experience attitudes of stigma
and negative stereotyping from others. Cooley's concept of the "looking-glass self" states how we perceive ourselves depends in part on how others see us, so if others react to us as deviants experience more social interactions where they are given the
stereotypical expectation of deviance, this can shape that person's self-concept. As a result, the person can see themselves as a deviant labeling is stigmatizing, those with deviant labeling is stigmatizing, those with deviant labeling is stigmatizing. The person can see themselves as a deviant labeling is stigmatizing.
social exclusion among those labeled as deviant: a rejection or devaluation of the deviant person by the community and authorities and secondly, the labeled person can expect rejection and deviantly labeled person can expect rejection and deviantly and defiantly-labeled person by the community and authorities and secondly, the labeled person can expect rejection and deviantly labeled person can expect rejection or deviantly labeled person can expect rejection and deviantly labeled person can
stigmatized to arrange life to avoid them" (Goffman, 1963). Because those with deviant labels can actively avoid interactions with so-called "normals," they can experience smaller social networks and thus fewer opportunities and attempts to find legitimate, satisfying, higher-paying jobs (Link et al., 1989). Other theorists, such as Sampson and Laub
(1990), have examined labeling theory in the context of social bonding theory, Social bonding theory, first developed by Travis Hirschi, asserts that people who have strong attachments to conventional society (Chriss,
2007). Sampson and Laub (1997) argue that being labeled as deviant can have a negative effect on creating ties with those who are non-deviant, inhibiting their social bonding and attachments to conventional society. Labeling can lead to blocked opportunities, such as reduced education and instability in employment, and the weak conventional ties
resulting from this lack of opportunity can create a long-lasting effect on adult criminal behavior. When individuals have little social support from conventional society, they can turn to deviant groups, where having a deviant label is accepted. However, this can create rationalization, attitudes, and opportunities that make involvement in these groups
a risk factor for further deviant behavior (Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera, 2006). This increased involvement in deviant peers. Secondly, labeling can cause a withdrawal from interactions with non-deviant peers, which can result in a deviant self-concept. Thus, those
labeled as deviant would want to seek relationships with those who also have a deviant self-concept. This is summed up by differential associate and interact with deviant people more easily leads to the transference of deviant attitudes and behaviors between those in
the group, leading to further deviance. Early studies about adolescents who have been labeled as deviant show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior show that those adolescents are more likely to have subsequent deviant behavior into early adulthood (Bernburg and Krohn, 2003).
more mixed results. Most studies found a positive correlation between formal labeling and subsequent deviant behavior, and a smaller but still substantial number found no effect (Huizinga and Henry, 2008). Criticism in the 1970s undermined the popularity of labeling theory.
evidence that did exist was methodologically flawed), and critics believed that large portions of labeling research were methodologically flawed to the extent that it offered few conclusions for sociologists. This research was flawed
for several reasons. Firstly, labeling theory research tended to use samples of individuals from biased sources, such as police records. This means that this research tended to ignore the effects of there being no formal reaction to labeling (Bernburg, 2009). The past 20 years have brought significant attempts to
improve the methodology of labeling theory research. Researchers, such as Matsueda (1992), have clarified how labeling leads to deviance, particularly when this labeling is informal, and these findings have been more replicable than those in the past. Examples Domestic Violence In 1981 and 1982, the Minneapolis Police Department conducted an
experiment to determine the effect of arresting domestic violence suspected perpetrators of domestic violence had a deterrent effect. However, when several other cities replicated this experiment, they found that arresting domestic violence
perpetrators actually resulted in significant increases in domestic violence (Dunford, Huizinga, and Elliott, 1990). Noting this discrepancy, Sherman and Smith (1992) aimed to examine the effect of arrest for domestic violence on subsequent arrest for domestic violence on subsequent arrest for domestic violence.
violence, but only in cases where the perpetrator was unemployed. However, when those who were arrested were employed domestic violence suspects have in comparison to those
who are unemployed. Those in economically depressed areas — places where perpetrators were less likely to be able to hold down a job — had less to lose by the conventional social tie of work, and recidivism was higher. Similarly, recidivism was higher among partners in unmarried couples than those in married couples, unrestricted by the
conventional bond of marriage. (Sherman and Smith, 1992). This finding — which implies that formal labeling only increases deviance in specific situations — is consistent with deterrence theory. Deterrence theory states that whether or not someone commits an act of deviance is determined largely by the costs and benefits of committing a crime
versus the threat of punishment. In the case of employed domestic violence suspects, the formal label of "abuser" and a threatened felony conviction may have severely costly implications for the future of their career; however, for those who are unemployed, this threat is less amplified. Delinquency and Adolescent Males Before Matsueda (1992),
researchers saw delinquency in adolescents as a factor of self-esteem, with mixed results. Matsueda looked at adolescent delinquency through the lens of how parents and authorities labeled children and how these labels influenced the perception of self these adolescents have — symbolic interactionism. This research is unique in that it examines
informal labeling — the effects that other people look at an adolescent have on that adolescent have on the behavior. From a theoretical perspective, Matsueda drew on the behavior interactions with others. This is caused by a transaction, where someone
projects themselves into the role of another and sees if the behavior associated with that role suits their situation (Mead, 1934). Those who are labeled as troublemakers take on the role of troublemakers take 
the adolescent like someone who misbehaves, and the adolescent responds in turn by misbehaving again. This approach to delinquency from the perspective of role-taking stems from Briar and Piliavin (1965), who found that boys who are uncommitted to conventional structures for action can be incited into delinquency by other boys. Because these
boys do not consider the reactions of conventional other's roles, present motives for delinquency, and thus act delinquently. For example, Short and Strodtbeck (1965) note that the decision for adolescent boys to
```

```
join a gang fight often originates around the possibility of losing status within the gang. Consistent with labeling theory, children whose parents, and teachers see them as someone who get into trouble or breaks the rules tend to have
higher levels of subsequent delinquency. Many other studies and analyses have supported these findings (Bernburg, 2009). Later, Sampson and Laub (1997) argued that defiant or difficult children can be subject to labeling and subsequent stigma that undermines attachments to "conventional others" — family, school, and peers. This lack of
conventional tires can have a large impact on self-definition and lead to subsequent deviance (Bernburg, 2009). Official Punishment, Peer Rejection, and Labeling in Chinese Youths The consequences of labeling on subsequent deviance (Bernburg, 2009). Official Punishment, Peer Rejection, and Labeling in Chinese Youths The consequences of labeling on subsequent deviance (Bernburg, 2009).
effects of the severity of the official punishment of delinquency on the probability that youths were estranged from parents, relatives, friends, and neighbors in the city of Tianjin, China. In the heavily collectivist, family-centered Chinese culture, those who were labeled as deviant were significantly more likely to be rejected by friends and neighbors
than by parents and relatives (Zhang, 1994a). China is a unique cultural context for examining labeling theory in that, officially, the Chinese Communist Party and discouraged people from discriminating against them. Conversely, however, social controls
agencies made the punishment of delinquents severe and public, with the idea that such punishments created deterrence. In the early 1990s, the Chinese government implicitly encouraged the
masses to widely revile criminals and deviants while officially stating that they aimed to reform delinquent behavior, particularly in adolescents. However, certain peers, as another study from Zhang (1994b) shows, are more likely to reject those labeled as deviant than others. Zhang's study presented Chinese youths with a group of hypothetical
delinquents and found that those who had been punished more severely triggered greater amounts of rejection from youths who had been labeled as deviant. Youths who had been punishment. Because these labeled youths are not
necessarily rejecting other labeled youths, it thus makes sense that deviants provide social support to other deviants. This can replace the role that the conventional groups who have rejected these youths would have otherwise served (Bernburg, 2009). References Becker, H. (1963). Overview of Labelling Theories
www. Hewett, Norfolk. Sch. uk/curric/soc/crime/labelling/diakses pada, 10. Becker, H. (1963). Outsiders-Defining Deviance. In: BECKER, Howard. Outsiders: Studies In The Sociology of Deviance (pp. 179-196): Springer. Bernburg, J. G., & Krohn, M. D. (2003).
Labeling, life chances, and adult crime: The direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. Criminology, 41(4), 1287-1318. Bernburg, J. G., & Rivera, C. J. (2006). Official labeling, criminal embeddedness, and subsequent delinquency: A longitudinal test of labeling theory. Journal of research
in crime and delinquency, 43(1), 67-88. Briar, S., & Piliavin, I. (1965). Delinquency, situational inducements, and commitment to conformity. Soc. Probs., 13, 35. Carter, M. J., & Fuller, C. (2016). Symbols, meaning, and action: The past, present, and future of symbolic interactionism. Current Sociology, 64(6), 931-961. Chiricos, T., Barrick, K., Bales,
W., & Bontrager, S. (2007). The labeling of convicted felons and its consequences for recidivism. Criminology, 45(3), 547-581. Chriss, J. J. (2007). Social control: An introduction: Polity. Dunford, F. W., Huizinga, D., & Elliott, D. S. (1990).
The role of arrest in domestic assault: The Omaha police experiment. Criminology, 28(2), 183-206. Goffman, E. (2018). Stigma and social identity. In Deviance & Liberty (pp. 24-31): Routledge. Huizinga, D., & Henry, K. L. (2008). The effect of arrest and justice system sanctions on subsequent behavior: Findings from longitudinal and other studies. In
The long view of crime: A synthesis of longitudinal research (pp. 220-254): Springer. Kavish, D. R., Mullins, C. W., & Soto, D. A. (2016). Interactionist labeling: Formal and informal labeling: Formal labeling: Form
of a psychiatric label. American Sociological Review, 202-215. Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. Annual review of Sociology, 27(1), 363-385. Matsueda, R. L. (1992). Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquency: Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. American journal of sociology, 97(6), 1577-1611. Mead, G.
H. (1934). Mind, self and society (Vol. 111): Chicago University of Chicago Press. Paternoster, R., & Iovanni, L. (1989). The labeling perspective and delinquency: An elaboration of the theory and an assessment of the evidence. Justice Quarterly, 6(3), 359-394. Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience
of adult social bonds. American Sociological Review, 609-627. Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1995). Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life: Harvard University Press. Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1997). A life-course theory of cumulative disadvantage and the stability of delinquency. Developmental theories of crime and
delinquency, 7, 133-161. Sherman, L. W., Smith, D. A., Schmidt, J. D., & Rogan, D. P. (1992). Crime, punishment, and stake in conformity: Legal and informal control of domestic violence experiment. Short, J. F., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1965)
Group process and gang delinquency: University of Chicago Press Chicago, Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). Principles of criminology: Altamira Press. Travis, J. (2002). Beyond the prison gates: The state of parole in America. Worden, R. E., Shepard, R. L., & Mastrofski, S. D. (1996). On the meaning and measurement of
suspects" demeanor toward the police: A comment on "Demeanor and Arrest". Journal of research in crime and delinquency in Chinese society. Criminal justice and behavior, 21(4), 387-402. Zhang, L., & Messner, S. F. (1994a). The
severity of official punishment for delinquency, 31(4), 416-433. Matsueda, R. L. (1992). Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquency; Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. American journal of sociology, 97(6), 1577-1611. Bernburg
J. G., Krohn, M. D., & Rivera, C. J. (2006). Official labeling theory, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 43(1), 67-88. Bernburg, J. G. Chapter title: Labeling and Secondary Deviance. Introduction Labeling theory posits that self-identity and the behaviour of
individuals may be determined or influenced by the terms used to describe or classify them. It is associated with the concepts of self-fulfilling prophecy and stereotyping. Labelling theory holds that deviance is not inherent in an act, but instead focuses on the tendency of majorities to negatively label minorities or those seen as deviant from standard
cultural norms. The theory was prominent during the 1960s and 1970s, and some modified versions of the theory have developed and are still currently popular. Stigma is defined as a powerfully negative label that changes a person's self-concept and social identity. Labelling theory is closely related to social-construction and symbolic-interaction
analysis. Labelling theory was developed by sociologists during the 1960s. Howard Saul Becker's book Outsiders was extremely influential in the development of this theory and its rise to popularity. Labelling theory is also connected to other fields besides crime. For instance there is the labelling theory that corresponds to homosexuality. Alfred
Kinsey and his colleagues were the main advocates in separating the difference between the role of a "homosexual" and the acts one does. An example is the idea that males performing feminine acts would imply that they are homosexual. Thomas J. Scheff states that labelling also plays a part with the "mentally ill". The label does not refer to criminal
but rather acts that are not socially accepted due to mental disorders. Theoretical Foundations Labelling theory attributes its origins to French sociologist Emile Durkheim found that crime is not so much a violation of a penal code as it is an act that outrages society. He was the first to suggest that deviant
labelling satisfies that function and satisfies society's need to control the behaviour. As a contributor to American Pragmatism and later a member of the Chicago School, George Herbert Mead posited that the self is socially constructed and reconstructed through the interactions which each person has with the community. The labelling theory
suggests that people obtain labels from how others view their tendencies or behaviours. Each individual is aware of how they are judged by others because he or she has attempted many different roles and functions in social interactions of those present. This theoretically builds a subjective conception of the
self, but as others intrude into the reality of that individual's life, this represents "objective" (intersubjective are-evaluation of that conception depending on the authoritativeness of the others' judgment. Family and friends may judge differently from random strangers. More socially representative individuals such as police
officers or judges may be able to make more globally respected judgments. If deviance is a failure to conform to the group, the reaction of the group is to label the person as having offended against their social or moral norms of behaviour. This is the power of the group is to designate breaches of their rules as deviant and
to treat the person differently depending on the seriousness of the breach. The more differential the treatment, the more differential the treatment and the more differential the more d
stigmatic roles, or social stigma. A social role is a set of expectations we have about a behaviour. Social roles are necessary for the organization and functioning of any society or group. We expect the postman, for example, to adhere to certain fixed rules about how he does his job. "Deviance" for a sociologist does not mean morally wrong, but rather
behaviour that is condemned by society. Deviant behaviour can include both criminal and non-criminal activities. Investigators found that deviant roles and the labels attached
to them function as a form of social stigma. Always inherent in the deviant role is the attribution of some form of "pollution" or difference that marks the labelled person as different from others. Society uses these stigmatic roles to them to control and limit deviant behaviour: "If you proceed in this behavior, you will become a member of that group of
people." Whether a breach of a given rule will be stigmatised will depend on the significance of the moral or other tenet it represents. For example, adultery may be considered a breach of an informal rule or it may be criminalised depending on the status of marriage, morality, and religion within the community. In most Western countries, adultery is
not a crime. Attaching the label "adulterer" may have some unfortunate consequences but they are not generally severe. But in some Islamic countries, zina is a crime and proof of extramarital activity may lead to severe consequences for all concerned. Stigma is usually the result of laws enacted against the behaviour. Laws protecting slavery or
outlawing homosexuality, for instance, will over time form deviant roles connected with those behaviours. Those who are assigned those roles will be seen as less human and reliable. Deviant roles are the sources of negative stereotypes, which tend to support society's disapproval of the behaviour. George Herbert Mead One of the founders of social
interactionism, George Herbert Mead, focused on the internal processes of how the mind constructs one's self-image. In Mind, Self, and Society (1934), he showed how infants come to know persons first and only later come to know things. According to Mead, thought is both a social and pragmatic process, based on the model of two persons
discussing how to solve a problem. Mead's central concept is the self, the part of an individual's personality composed of self-awareness and self-image. Our self-image is, in fact, constructed of ideas about what we think others are thinking about us. While we make fun of those who visibly talk to themselves, they have only failed to do what the rest of
us do in keeping the internal conversation to ourselves. Human behaviour, Mead stated, is the result of meanings created by the social interaction of conversation, both real and imaginary. Thomas J. Scheff (1966), professor emeritus of Sociology at UCSB, published the book Being Mentally III: A Sociological Theory. According to
Scheff, society has perceptions about people with mental illness. He stated that everyone in the society learns to use terms like "crazy," "loony," "nuts," and associated them with disturbed behaviours. The media also contributes to this bias
against mentally ill patients by associating them with violent crimes. Scheff believes that mental illness is a label given to a person who has a behaviour which is away from the social norms of the society and is treated as a social deviance in the society. Once a person is given a label of "mentally ill person", they receive a set of uniform responses from
the society, which are generally negative in nature. These responses from the society compel to the person to take the role of being mentally ill person. Chronic mental ill person. Chronic mental illness is thus a social role
and the societal reaction is the most determinant of one's entry into this role as their self-perception. Once the person further reinforces this social role and forces them to take this role as their self-perception. Once the person further reinforces this social role and forces them to take this role as their self-perception.
forced to become a member of a deviant social group. It then becomes difficult for a deviant person to return to their former level of functioning as the status of 'patient' causes unfavourable evaluations by self and by others. Frank Tannenbaum Frank Tannenbaum is considered the grandfather of labelling theory. His Crime and Community (1938),
describing the social interaction involved in crime, is considered a pivotal foundation of modern criminology. While the criminal differs little or not at all from others in the original impulse to first commit a crime, social interaction accounts for continued acts that develop a pattern of interest to sociologists. Tannenbaum first introduced the idea of
 "tagging." While conducting his studies with delinquent youth, he found that a negative tag or label often contributed to further involvement in delinquent activities. This initial tagging may cause the individual to adopt it as part of their identity. The crux of Tannenbaum's argument is that the greater the attention placed on this label, the more likely
the person is to identify themselves as the label. Kerry Townsend (2001) writes about the revolution in criminology caused by Tannenbaum's work: "The roots of Frank Tannenbaum's theoretical model, known as the 'dramatization of evil' or labeling theory, surfaces in the mid- to late-thirties. At this time, the 'New Deal' legislation had not defeated
the woes of the Great Depression, and, although dwindling, immigration into the United States continued.[7] The social climate was one of disillusionment with the government. The class structure was one of disillusionment with the government.
over big business, was unmistakable. [7]:117 The Positivist School of Criminological thought was still dominant, and in many states, the sterilization movement was underway. The emphasis on biological determinism and internal explanations of crime were the preeminent force in the theories of the early thirties. This dominance by the Positivist
School changed in the late thirties with the introduction of conflict and social explanations of crime and criminality." "One of the central tenets of the theory is to encourage the end of labeling process. In the words of Frank Tannenbaum, 'the way out is through a refusal to dramatize the evil", the justice system attempts to do this through diversion
programs. The growth of the theory and its current application, both practical and theoretical, provide a solid foundation for continued popularity." Edwin Lemert Sociologist Edwin Lemert Sociolog
practical demands and consequences. Secondary deviation is the role created to deal with society's condemnation of the behaviour of a person. With other sociologists of his time, Lemert observed a very powerful and subtle force at work
Besides the physical addiction to the drug and all the economic and social disruptions it caused, there was an intensely intellectual process at work concerning one's own identity and the justification for the behaviour: "I do these things because I am this way." There might be certain subjective and personal motives that might first lead a person to
drink or shoplift. But the activity itself tells us little about the person's self-image or its relationship to the activity. Lemert writes: "His acts are repeated and organised subjectively and transformed into active roles and become the social criteria for assigning status....When a person begins to employ his deviant behaviour or a role based on it as a
means of defence, attack, or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the consequent societal reaction to him, his deviation is secondary." Howard Becker While it was Lemert who introduced the key concepts of how a person
adopts a deviant role in a study of dance musicians, with whom he once worked. He later studied the identity formation of marijuana smokers. This study was the basis of his Outsiders published in 1963. This work became the manifesto of the labelling theory movement among sociologists. In his opening, Becker writes: "...social groups create
deviance by making rules whose infraction creates deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by other of rules and sanctions to an 'offender.' The deviant is one to whom that label
has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label." While society uses the stigmatic label to justify its condemnation, the deviant motives leading to the deviant behavior, it is the other way around, the deviant
behavior in time produces the deviant motivation." Becker's immensely popular views were also subjected to a barrage of criticism, most of it blaming him for neglecting the influence of other biological, genetic effects and personal responsibility. In a later 1973 edition of his work, he answered his criticis. He wrote that sociologists, while dedicated to
studying society, are often careful not to look too closely. Instead, he wrote: "I prefer to think of what we study as collective action. People act, as Mead and Blumer have made clearest, together. They do what they do with an eye on what others have done, are doing now, and may do in the future. One tries to fit his own line of action into the actions
of others, just as each of them likewise adjusts his own developing actions to what he sees and expects others to do." Francis Cullen reported in 1984 that Becker was probably too generous with his critics. After 20 years, Becker's views, far from being supplanted, have been corrected and absorbed into an expanded "structuring perspective." Albert
Memmi In The Colonizer and the Colonizer and the Colonized (1965), Albert Memmi described the deep psychological effects of the social stigma created by the domination of one group by another. He wrote: The longer the oppression lasts, the more profoundly it affects him (the oppressed). It ends by becoming so familiar to him that he believes it is part of his own
constitution, that he accepts it and could not imagine his recovery from it. This acceptance is the exploitation or criminalisation of the victim. He wrote: Why does the accuser feel obliged to accuse in order to
justify himself? Because he feels guilty toward his victim. Because he feels that his attitude and his behavior are essentially unjust and fraudulent.... Proof? In almost every case, the punishment has already been inflicted. The victim of racism is already living under the weight of disgrace and oppression.... In order to justify such punishment and
misfortune, a process of rationalization is set in motion, by which to explain the ghetto and colonial exploitation. Central to stigmatic labelling is the attribution of an inherent fault: It is as if one says, "There must be something wrong with these people. Otherwise, why would we treat them so badly?" Erving Goffman Perhaps the most important
contributor to labelling theory was Erving Goffman, President of the American Sociological Association (ASA), and one of A
on the Management of Spoiled Identity published in 1963. Unlike other authors who examined the process of adopting a deviant identity, Goffman explored the ways people managed that identity and controlled information about it. Goffman explored the ways people managed that identity and controlled information about it.
so much of ancient or religious prohibitions, but of a new demand for normalcy: "The notion of the 'normal human being' may have its source in the medical approach to humanity, or in the tendency of large-scale bureaucratic organizations such as the nation state, to treat all members in some respects as equal. Whatever its origins, it seems to
provide the basic imagery through which laymen currently conceive themselves." Living in a divided world, deviants split their worlds into: Forbidden places where people of that kind are painfully tolerated; and Places where one's kind is exposed without need to dissimulate or conceal. Dealing with
 others is fraught with great complexity and ambiguity: "When normals and stigmatized do in fact enter one another's immediate presence, especially when they attempt to maintain a joint conversational encounter, there occurs one of the primal scenes of sociology; for, in many cases, these moments will be the ones when the causes and effects of
stigma will be directly confronted by both sides." "What are unthinking routines for normals can become management problems for the discreditable.... The person with a secret failing, then, must be alive to the social situation as a scanner of possibilities, and is therefore likely to be alienated from the simpler world in which those around them
apparently dwell." Society's demands are filled with contradictions: On the one hand, a stigmatized person may be told that he is no different from others. On the other hand, he must declare his status as "a resident alien who stands for his group." It requires that the stigmatized individual cheerfully and unselfconsciously accept himself as essentially
the same as normals, while at the same time he voluntarily withholds himself from those situations in which normals would find it difficult to give lip service to their similar acceptance of him. "One has to convey the impression that the burden of the stigma is not too heavy yet keep himself at the required distance. "A phantom acceptance is allowed to
provide the base for a phantom normalcy." Familiarity need not reduce contempt. In spite of the common belief that openness and exposure will decrease stereotypes and repression, the opposite is true: "Thus, whether we interact with strangers or intimates, we will still find that the fingertips of society have reached bluntly into the contact, even
here putting us in our place." David Matza In On Becoming Deviant (1969), sociologist David Matza gives the most vivid and graphic account of the process of adopting a deviant role. The acts of authorities in outlawing a proscribed behaviour can have two effects, keeping most out of the behaviour, but also offering new opportunities for creating
deviant identities. He says the concept of "affinity" does little to explain the dedication to the behaviour. "Instead, it may be regarded as a natural biographical tendency born of personal and social circumstances that suggests but hardly compels a direction or movement." What gives force to that movement is the development of a new identity: "To be
cast as a thief, as a prostitute, or more generally, a deviant, is to further compound and hasten the process of becoming that very thing." "In shocked discovery, the subject now concretely understands that there are serious people who really go around building their lives around his activities—stopping him, correcting him, devoted to him. They keep
records on the course of his life, even develop theories on how he got that way.... Pressed by such a display, the subject may begin to add meaning and gravity to his deviant activities. But he may do so in a way not especially intended by agents of the state." "The meaningful issue of identity is whether this activity, or any of my activities can stand for
theory hypothesizes that the labels applied to individuals influence their behaviour, particularly the application of negative or stigmatising labels (such as "criminal" or "felon") promote deviant behaviour, becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy, i.e. an individual who is labelled has little choice but to conform to the essential meaning of that judgment.
Consequently, labelling theory postulates that it is possible to prevent social deviance via a limited social shaming reaction in "labellers" and replacing moral indignation with tolerance. Emphasis is placed on the rehabilitation of offenders through an alteration of their labels. Related prevention policies include client empowerment schemes,
mediation and conciliation, victim-offender forgiveness ceremonies (restorative justice), restitution, reparation, and alternatives to prison programmes involving diversion. Labelling theory has been accused of promoting impractical policy implications, and criticised for failing to explain society's most serious offenses. Some offenses, including the use
of violence, are universally recognised as wrong. Hence, labelling either habitual criminals or those who have caused serious harm as "criminals" is not constructive. Society may use more specific labels such as "murderer" or "rapist" or "child abuser" to demonstrate more clearly after the event the extent of its disapproval, but there is a slightly
mechanical determinism in asserting that the application of a label will invariably modify the behaviour of the functions of the penal system is to reduce recidivism, applying a long-term label may cause prejudice against the offender, resulting in the inability to maintain employment and social relationships. The
"Mentally Ill" The social construction of deviant behaviour plays an important role in the labelling process that occurs in society. This process involves not only the labelling of criminally deviant behaviour, which is behaviour of the
 "mentally ill". In 1961 Thomas Szasz, in The Myth of Mental Illness, asked, "Who defines whom as troublesome or mentally sick?... [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other; [the one] who first seizes the word imposes reality on the other impo
challenged common perceptions of mental illness by claiming that mental illness on those who exhibit them. Certain expectations are then
placed on these individuals and, over time, they unconsciously change their behaviour to fulfil them. Criteria for different mental illnesses are not consistently fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder, they are simply fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder, they are simply fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder, they are simply fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder, they are simply fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder, they are simply fulfilled by those who are diagnosed with them because all of these people suffer from the same disorder.
certain way so, over time, come to do so. Scheff's theory had many critics, most notably Walter Gove who consistently argued against Scheff with an almost opposite theory; he believed that society has no influence at all on "mental illness". Instead, any societal perceptions of the "mentally ill" come about as a direct result of these people's
behaviours. Most sociologists' views of labelling and mental illness have fallen somewhere between the extremes of Gove and Scheff. On the other hand, it is almost impossible to deny, given both common sense and research findings, that society's negative perceptions of "crazy" people has had some effect on them. It seems that, realistically,
labelling can accentuate and prolong the issues termed "mental illness", but it is rarely the full cause. Many other studies have been conducted in this general vein. To provide a few examples, several studies have been conducted in this general vein. To provide a few examples, several studies have been conducted in this general vein. To provide a few examples, several studies have indicated that most people associate being labelled mentally ill as being just as, or even more, stigmatising than being seen as a drug
addict, ex-convict, or prostitute (for example: Brand & Claiborn 1976), Additionally, Page's 1977 study found that self declared "ex-mental patients" are much less likely to be offered apartment leases or hired for jobs, Clearly, these studies and the dozens of others like them serve to demonstrate that labelling can have a very real and very large effect
on the mentally ill. However, labelling has not been proven to be the sole cause of any symptoms of mental illness. Peggy Thoits (1999) discusses the process of labelling someone with a mental illness in her article, "Sociological Approaches to Mental Illness". Working off Thomas Scheff's (1966) theory, Thoits claims that people who are labelled as
mentally ill are stereotypically portrayed as unpredictable, dangerous, and unable to care for themselves. She also claims that "people who are labeled as deviant and treated as deviant become deviant." This statement can be broken down into two processes, one that involves the effects of self-labelling and the other differential treatment from
society based on the individual's label. Therefore, if society sees mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, then a person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable, dangerous and reliant on others, and the person who may not actually be mentally ill individuals as unpredictable.
Labels, while they can be stigmatising, can also lead those who bear them down the road to proper treatment and (hopefully) recovery. If one believes that "being mentally ill" is more than just believing one should fulfill a set of diagnostic criteria (as Scheff would argue; see above), then one would probably also agree that there are some who are
labelled "mentally ill" who need help. It has been claimed that this could not happen if "we" did not have a way to categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although there are actually plenty of approaches to these phenomena that do not use categorise (and therefore label) them, although the property of approaches to the property of approaches to the property of approaches the property of approaches to the 
along different dimensions, and everyone falls at different points on each dimension. Proponents of hard labelling, as opposed to soft labelling, believe that mental illness. They view them as socially constructed illnesses and psychotic disorders. The
"Homosexual" The application of labelling theory to homosexuality has been extremely controversial. It was Alfred Kinsey and his colleagues who pointed out the big discrepancy between the behaviour and the role attached to it. They had observed the often negative consequences of labelling and repeatedly condemned labelling people as
homosexual: It is amazing to observe how many psychologists and females are discretely different from persons who respond to natural stimuli. Instead of using these terms as substantives which stand for persons, or even as adjectives to
describe persons, they may better be used to describe the nature of the overt sexual relations, or of the stimuli to which an individual erotically responds.... It would clarify our thinking if the terms could be dropped completely out of our vocabulary. Males do not represent two discrete populations, heterosexual and homosexual.... Only the human
mind invents categories and tries to force facts into pigeonholes. The living world is a continuum in each and every one of its aspects. The classification of sexual behavior as masturbatory, heterosexual, or homosexual, is, therefore, unfortunate if it suggests that only different types of persons seek out or accept each kind of sexual activity. There is
nothing known in the anatomy or physiology of sexual response and orgasm which distinguishes masturbatory, heterosexual reactions. In regard to sexual behavior, it has been possible to maintain this dichotomy only by placing all persons who have any
amount of experience with their own sex, even including those with the slightest experience, in a homosexual category.... The attempt to maintain a simple dichotomy on these matters exposes the traditional biases which are likely to enter whenever the heterosexual or homosexual classification of an individual is involved. Erving Goffman's Stigma
Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity distinguished between the behaviour and the role assigned to it: The term "homosexual" is generally used to refer to anyone who engages in overt sexual practices with a member of his own sex, the practice being called "homosexuality." This usage appears to be based on a medical and legal frame of
reference and provides much too broad and heterogenous a categorization for use here. I refer only to individuals who participate in a special community of understanding wherein members of one's own sex are defined as the most desirable sexual objects, and sociability is energetically organized around the pursuit and entertainment of these
objects. Labeling theory was also applied to homosexuality by Evelyn Hookerand by Leznoff and Westley (1956), who published the first sociological study of the gay community. Erving Goffman and Howard Becker used the lives of gay-identified persons in their theories of labelling and interactionism. Simon and Gagnon likewise wrote: "It is
necessary to move away from the obsessive concern with the sexuality of the individual, and attempt to see the homosexual in terms of the broader attachments that he must make to live in the world around him." British sociologist Mary McIntosh reflected the enthusiasm of Europeans for labelling theory in her 1968 study, "The Homosexual Role:"
"The vantage-point of comparative sociology enables us to see that the conception of homosexuality as a condition is, itself, a possible object of study. This conception and the behavior it supports operate as a form of social control in a society in which homosexuality is condemned.... It is interesting to notice that homosexuals themselves welcome and
support the notion that homosexuality as a condition. For just as the rigid categorization deters people from drifting back into normalcy and thus removes the element of anxious choice. It appears to justify the deviant behavior of the homosexual as being appropriate for him as a
member of the homosexual category. The deviancy can thus be seen as legitimate for him and he can continue in it without rejecting the norm of society." Sara Fein and Elaine M. Nuehring (1981) were among the many who supported the application of labelling theory to homosexuality. They saw the gay role functioning as a "master status" around
which other roles become organized. This brings a whole new set of problems and restrictions: Placement in a social category constituting a master status prohibits individuals from choosing the extent of their involvement in various categories. Members of the stigmatized group lose the opportunity to establish their own personal system of evaluation
and group membership as well as the ability to arrive at their own ranking of each personal characteristic.... For example, newly self-acknowledged homosexual individuals cannot take for granted that they share the world with others who hold congruent interpretations and assumptions; their behavior and motives, both past and present, will be
interpreted in light of their stigma. Perhaps the strongest proponent of labelling theory was Edward Sagarin. In his book, Deviants and Deviance, he wrote, "There are no homosexuals, transvestites, chemical addicts, suicidogenics, delinquents, criminals, or other such entities, in the sense of people having such identities." Sagarin's position was
roundly condemned by academics in the gay community. Sagarin had written some gay novels under the pseudonym of Donald Webster Cory. According to reports, he later abandoned his gay identity and began promoting an interactionist view of homosexuality. A number of authors adopted a modified, non-deviant, labelling theory. They rejected the
stigmatic function of the gay role, but found it useful in describing the process of coming out and reconciling one's homosexual experiences with the social role. Their works includes: Homosexual sand the Military (1971); Coming Out in the Gay World (1971); Homosexual sand the Military (1971); Oming Out in the Gay World (1971); Homosexual sand the Military (1971); Oming Out in the Gay World (1971); Homosexual sand the Military (1971); Homosexual sand 
Homosexuals: Their Problems and Adaptations (1974); Homosexual Identity (1977); Homosexual Identity (1978); On 'Doing' and 'Being' Gay: Sexual Behavior and Homosexual Identity (1978); Homosexual Identity (1978); Homosexual Identity (1977); Homosexual Identity (1978); On 'Doing' and 'Being' Gay: Sexual Behavior and Homosexual Identity (1978); Homosexual Identity (1
Model (1979, Cass identity model); Becoming Homosexual: A model of Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women (1981); and Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women (1981); and Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development in Gay Identity Acquisition (1979); Sexual Preference: Its Development Iden
inferiorising effects. Drawing upon the works of Albert Memmi, Adam showed how gay-identified persons, like Jews and blacks, internalise the hatred to justify their limitations of life choices. He saw the gravitation towards ghettos was evidence of the self-limitations: A certain romantic liberalism runs through the literature, evident from attempts to
paper over or discount the very real problems of inferiorization. Some researchers seem bent on 'rescuing' their subjects from 'defamation' by ignoring the problems of defeatism and complicit self-destruction. Avoidance of dispiriting reflection upon the day-to-day practice of dominated people appears to spring from a desire to 'enhance' the
reputation of the dominated and magically relieve their plight. Careful observation has been sacrificed to the 'power of positive thinking.' Strong defence of labelling theory also arose within the gay community. Dan Slater of the Los Angeles Homosexual Information Centre said, "There is no such thing as a homosexual lifestyle. There is no such thing
as gay pride or anything like that. Homosexuality is simply based on the sex act. Gay consciousness and all the rest are separatist and defeatist attitudes going back to centuries-old and out-moded conceptions that homosexuals are, indeed, different from other people." In a later article, Slater (1971) stated the gay movement was going in the wrong
direction: Is it the purpose of the movement to try to assert sexual rights for everyone or create a political and social cult out of homosexuality? ... Persons who perform homosexual acts or other non-conforming acts are sexually free. They want they resent the attempt to organize their lives
around homosexuality just as much as they resent the centuries-old attempt to organize their lives around heterosexuality. William DuBay (1967) describes gay identity as one strategy for dealing with society's oppression. It solves some problems but creates many more, replacing a closet of secrecy with one of gay identity. A better strategy, he
suggests, is to reject the label and live as if the oppression did not exist. Quoting Goffman, he writes, "But of course what is a good adjustment for the individual can be an even better one for society." DuBay contends that the attempt to define homosexuality as a class of persons to be protected against discrimination as defined in the statutes has not
reduced the oppression. The goal of the movement instead should be to gain acceptance of homosexual relationships as useful and productive for both society and the family. The movement has lost the high moral ground by sponsoring the "flight from choice" and not taking up the moral issues. "Persons whom we confine to back rooms and bars other
societies have honored as tenders of children, astrologers, dancers, chanters, minstrels, jesters, artists, shamans, sacred warriors and judges, seers, healers, weavers of tales and magic." DuBay refers to the "gay trajectory," in which a person first wraps himself in the gay role, organising his personality and his life around sexual behaviour. He might
flee from his family and home town to a large gay centre. There, the bedevilling force of the stigma will introduce him to more excessive modes of deviance such as promiscuity, prostitution, alcoholism, and drugs. Many resist such temptations and try to normalise their life, but the fast lanes of gay society are littered with the casualties of gay identity
Some come to reject the label entirely. "Accomplishing the forbidden, they are neither gay nor straight. Again learning to choose, they develop the ability to make the ban ambiguous, taking responsibility and refusing explanations of their behaviors." John Henry Mackay (1985) writes about a gay hustler in Berlin adopting such a solution: "What was
self-evident, natural, and not the least sick did not require an excuse through an explanation.... It was love just like any other love. Whoever could not reject the "gay label" for reasons other than shame or negative connotations. They do not reject their homosexuality. It is "gay" as an
adjective they reject. Writer Alan Bennett and fashion icon André Leon Talley reject being labelled as a gay writer, a gay fashion designer. These men are openly gay, but believe when gay is used as an adjective, the label confines them. Modified Labelling Theory Bruce Link and colleagues (1989) had conducted several studies which point to the
influence that labelling can have on mental patients. Through these studies, taking place in 1987, 1989, and 1997, Link advanced a "modified labelling theory" indicating that expectations of labelling can have a large negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory" indicating that expectations of labelling theory" indicating that expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that these expectations of labelling theory are negative effect, that the negative effect effect effects are negative effect.
disorder are constantly being rejected from society in seemingly minor ways but that, when taken as a whole, all of these small slights can drastically alter their self concepts. They come to both anticipate and perceive negative societal reactions to them, and this potentially damages their quality of life. Modified labelling theory has been described as
a "sophisticated social-psychological model of 'why labels matter.'" In 2000, results from a prospective two-year study of patients discharged from a mental hospital (in the context of deinstitutionalisation) showed that stigma was a powerful and persistent force in their lives, and that experiences of social rejection were a persistent source of social
stress. Efforts to cope with labels, such as not telling anyone, educating people about mental distress/disorder, withdrawing from stigmatising situations, could result in further social isolation and reinforce negative self-concepts. Sometimes an identity as a low self-esteem minority in society would be accepted. The stigma was associated with
diminished motivation and ability to "make it in mainstream society" and with "a state of social and psychological vulnerability to prolonged and recurrent problems". There was an up and down pattern in self-esteem, however, and it was suggested that, rather than simply gradual erosion of self-worth and increasing self-deprecating tendencies,
people were sometimes managing, but struggling, to maintain consistent feelings of self-worth. Ultimately, "a cadre of patients had developed an entrenched, negative view of themselves, and their experiences of rejection appear to be a key element in the construction of these self-related feelings" and "hostile neighbourhoods may not only affect
their self-concept but may also ultimately impact the patient's mental health status and how successful they are." In order to continue enjoying our site, we ask that you confirm your identity as a human. Thank you very much for your cooperation
```