The Handbook of
Social Control

Edited by **Mathieu Deflem**

WILEY Blackwell

The Handbook of Social Control

Wiley Handbooks in Criminology and Criminal Justice

Series Editor: Charles F. Wellford, University of Maryland College Park.

The handbooks in this series will be comprehensive, academic reference works on leading topics in criminology and criminal justice.

The Handbook of Law and Society
Edited by Austin Sarat and Patricia Ewick

The Handbook of Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice
Edited by Marvin D. Krohn and Jodi Lane

The Handbook of Deviance
Edited by Erich Goode

The Handbook of Gangs
Edited by Scott H. Decker and David C. Pyrooz

The Handbook of Criminological Theory
Edited by Alex R. Piquero

The Handbook of Drugs and Society
Edited by Henry H. Brownstein

The Handbook of Social Control
Edited by Mathieu Deflem

The Handbook of Social Control

Edited by

Mathieu Deflem

WILEY Blackwell

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Kiyoshi Abe received his Ph.D. from the University of Tokyo. He is a professor in the Graduate School of Sociology at Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan. He has published widely on surveillance and policing. His work has appeared in English, including an article in the journal *Theory, Culture & Society* (2009) and a chapter in the edited volume *Surveilling and Securing the Olympics: From Tokyo 1960 to London 2012* (Palgrave, 2016).

Bruce A. Arrigo is Professor of Criminology, Law, and Society in the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology and Professor of Public Policy at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. His scholarship examines several human-justice controversies and social-welfare issues at the intersection of law, health, and politics; theory, culture, and society; and disorder, crime, and punishment. He is an elected fellow of both the American Psychological Association and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.

Brittany Arsiniega holds a J.D. from the School of Law and is a Ph.D. student in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy program at the University of California, Berkeley. Her research explores the intersection of criminal law and immigration, examining the role that local law-enforcement actors play in enforcing federal immigration law. She is currently conducting dissertation fieldwork on the policing of undocumented persons in rural areas.

Heather Y. Bersot is an Adjunct Lecturer in the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her areas of research include ethics and the law, correctional mental health, and solitary confinement. Her peer-reviewed articles have appeared in journals including the *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology* and *Critical Criminology: An International Journal.*

Kristie R. Blevins is a Professor in the School of Justice Studies at Eastern Kentucky University. She received her Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from the University of Cincinnati. Her research interests include crime prevention, corrections, and the occupational reactions of criminal justice employees. Her recent work can be found in outlets such as the *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Deviant Behavior*, and *International Journal of Police Science and Management*.

Sherry Cable is Professor of Sociology at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Her primary interests are environmental conflicts and environmental inequalities. She is the author of *Sustainable Failures: Environmental Policy and Democracy in a Petro-Dependent World* (Temple University Press, 2012). Her recent articles include "Risk Society and Contested Illness: The Case of Nuclear Weapons Workers," with Tom Shriver and Tamara Mix, in the *American Sociological Review*, for which they received the 2011 Allan Schnaiberg Outstanding Publication Award from the American Sociological Association.

Bradley Campbell is an associate professor in the Sociology Department at California State University, Los Angeles. He is the author of a number of works dealing with moral conflict, including *The Geometry of Genocide* (University of Virginia Press, 2015) and *The Rise of Victimhood Culture* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), coauthored with Jason Manning.

Nicolas Carrier is Associate Professor of Criminology, Sociology and Legal Studies at Carleton University.

John Casey is a professor in the Marxe School of Public and International Affairs at Baruch College, City University of New York. From 1999 to 2008, he was a senior lecturer at the Australian Graduate School of Policing. Prior to his academic career, he held executive positions in government and nonprofits in Australia, Spain, and the USA. He is the author of *The Nonprofit World: Civil Society and Rise of the Nonprofit Sector* (Lynne Rienner, 2016).

Brooke B. Chambers is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Sociology at the University of Minnesota. Her research addresses the aftermath of genocide. She has visited Rwanda twice to engage in ethnographic research and conduct in-depth interviews. Her dissertation addresses the intergenerational transmission of knowledge about and memory of the genocide, especially the engagement of young Rwandans with memorial sites and commemorative events. She has interned at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Stephen Chicoine is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of South Carolina. He teaches Introduction to Sociology, Deviant Behavior, and Collective Behavior. His main research interests include subcultures, terrorism, and the social implications of the Internet. His doctoral dissertation involves a sociological study of terrorist subcultures.

James J. Chriss is a professor in the Department of Criminology, Anthropology, and Sociology at Cleveland State University. He received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Pennsylvania in 1994. His most recent books are *Social Control: An Introduction*, 2nd edn. (Polity, 2013), *Beyond Community Policing: From Early American Beginnings to the 21st Century* (Routledge, 2013), *Confronting Gouldner: Sociology and Political Activism* (Haymarket, 2017), and *Law and Society: A Sociological Approach* (Sage, forthcoming).

Toycia Collins is a doctoral student at Sam Houston State University. She received her M.S. in criminal justice from Wayne State University. Her research interests include police organizational structure, police practices to prevent and reduce crime, and crime analysis in the Caribbean.

Robert D. Crutchfield is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Sociology at the University of Washington. His research is on labor markets and crime, and race, ethnicity, and the criminal justice system. He is a fellow of the American Society of Criminology and a winner of the University of Washington Distinguished Teaching Award.

Mathieu Deflem is Professor of Sociology at the University of South Carolina. His research and teaching interests concern a variety of aspects and dimensions of social control, including international police cooperation, surveillance, censorship, and law. He has authored four books, including *The Policing of Terrorism* (Routledge, 2010) and *Sociology of Law* (Cambridge, 2008).

Alexander C. Diener is an Associate Professor of Geography at the University of Kansas. His research engages geopolitics, borders, mobility, and urban landscape change. He has authored several books, including *One Homeland or Two?* (Stanford University Press, 2009), and co-edited several more, including *From Socialist to Post-Socialist Cities: Cultural Politics of Architecture, Urban Planning, and Identity in Eurasia* (Routledge, 2014). He has held research fellowships at the Woodrow Wilson Center, George Washington University, and Harvard University.

April D. Fernandes is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at North Carolina State University. Her research focuses on the employment, health, and housing consequences of misdemeanor criminal-justice contact, with an eye toward the racial and ethnic disparities that exist within these systems of control.

Joshua Hagen is Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Northern State University. His research includes borders, geopolitics, and nationalism, most notably in the coauthored books *Borders: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2012) and *Borderlines and Borderlands: Political Oddities at the Edge of the Nation-State* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2010). He has received awards from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Fulbright Scholar Program, German Academic Exchange Service, Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, and Gerda Henkel Foundation.

Samantha Hauptman is Department Chair and Associate Professor of Criminal Justice in the Department of Sociology, Criminal Justice, and Women's Studies at the University of South Carolina Upstate. She teaches a broad range of classes and has a variety of research interests, including immigration, criminal/social deviance, social control, and globalization. In addition to publishing several book chapters and articles, she is the author of *The Criminalization of Immigration: The Post 9/11 Moral Panic* (LFB Scholarly Publishing, 2013).

Steven Hutchinson teaches in the Department of Criminology and the Department of Law at Birkbeck College, University of London. His research deploys Foucauldian epistemologies and covers areas including policing, intelligence, risk, and security. He recently co-edited a special issue of the *British Journal of Criminology*, which explored interdisciplinary approaches to the study of security.

Roy F. Janisch was born and raised on the Lake Traverse Reservation in South Dakota. He attended the University of South Dakota, obtaining a B.S. in Criminal Justice/Psychology, then a Master of Public Administration. He has worked as a law-enforcement specialist, management analyst, and federal criminal investigator. He obtained his Ph.D. from Arizona State University, and is currently Associate Professor/Coordinator of Justice Studies at Pittsburg State University. In 2016–17, he was a Fulbright Scholar at Vancouver Island University.

Michael J. Jenkins is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Scranton. He is coauthor with John Casey and Harry Dammer of the 2nd edition

of *Policing the World: The Practice of International and Transnational Policing* (Carolina Academic Press, 2018). He has also authored *Police Leaders in the New Community Problem-Solving Era* (Carolina Academic Press, 2014).

Paul Kaplan is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice in the School of Public Affairs at San Diego State University and the former President of the Western Society of Criminology (2013–14). He received his PhD in Criminology, Law, and Society from the University of California, Irvine in 2007. Prior to entering academics, Dr. Kaplan worked as a mitigation investigator on capital cases. His primary research areas are capital punishment and cultural criminology, but he also works on projects involving socio-legal theory and comparative law. His work has appeared in journals such as the *Law & Society Review*, *Theoretical Criminology*, and *Law & Social Inquiry*, and he is the author of *Murder Stories: Ideological Narratives in Capital Punishment* (Lexington Books, 2012). He is the co-creator of the Art | Crime Archive: www.artcrimearchive.net.

Charles F. Klahm IV is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice at Wayne State University. He received a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from the University of Cincinnati.

Gary Kleck is the Emeritus David J. Bordua Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida State University. His research has focused on the topics of the impact of firearms and gun control on violence, deterrence, crime control, and violence. He has served on National Research Council committees and the US Sentencing Commission's Drugs-Violence Task Force, and has advised the National Academy of Sciences Panel on the Understanding and Prevention of Violence.

Johann Koehler is a student in the J.D./Ph.D. program in Jurisprudence and Social Policy at the University of California, Berkeley. He draws on the sociology of knowledge, critical criminology, and law and society to explore the origins, applications, and limitations of evidence-based criminology. Selected recent work appears in *Criminology*, the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, and *Psychology, Crime, and Law*. He received the 2016 Young Scholar Award from the European Society of Criminology.

Stéphane Leman-Langlois is Professor of Criminology at Laval University in Quebec City, Canada. He holds the Canada Research Chair on Surveillance and the Social Construction of Risk. He is Director of the Terrorism and Counterterrorism Research Group and of the Centre on International Security at Laval University. He is also co-investigator on the Big Data Surveillance Project at Queen's University in Kingston, Canada. He edited *Technocrime: Policing and Surveillance* (Routledge, 2012).

Jason Manning is an associate professor at West Virginia University's Department of Sociology and Anthropology. His work focuses on moral conflict, and he has published several papers on suicide as a way of handling conflict, as well as articles examining changing moral cultures on college campuses. *The Rise of Victimhood Culture* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), which he coauthored with Bradley Campbell, deals with this latter topic.

Laura McKendy is a Ph.D. candidate at Carleton University. Her doctoral research explores the experiences of provincially incarcerated men and women in the Ontario context, with a particular focus on the pains of jail imprisonment, the collective and individual ways prisoners adapt to and resist the qualities of institutional life, and the sociological factors that mediate jail experiences.

Robert F. Meier is a professor at the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska Omaha. He is the author or editor of 24 books (both original and revised editions) and over 80 articles appearing in professional journals, book chapters, and technical reports. He is a consultant for the National Science Foundation, National Research Council, and National Institute of Justice. He was elected Vice President of the American Society of Criminology in 2004–05.

Holly Ventura Miller is an Associate Professor of Criminology at the University of North Florida, a former National Institute of Justice W.E.B. DuBois Fellow, and Past President of the Southern Criminal Justice Association. Her research interests include correctional policy, immigration and crime, and program evaluation. She has had recent articles in the *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Prison Journal*, and *Criminology & Public Policy*. She is editor, along with Anthony Peguero, of the *Routledge Handbook on Immigration and Crime* (Routledge, 2018).

Calvin Morrill is Stephan A. Riesenfeld Professor of Law, Professor of Sociology, and Associate Dean for Jurisprudence and Social Policy/Legal Studies in the School of Law at the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author of *The Executive Way: Conflict Management in Corporations* (University of Chicago Press, 1995) and coauthor of *Navigating Conflict: How Youth Handle Trouble in a High-Poverty School* (University of Chicago Press, 2018). His current research explores the interplay of law, economic and social entrepreneurship, and civic engagement across the life course in marginalized populations.

Massimiliano Mulone is an associate professor at the School of Criminology, University of Montreal, and a researcher at the International Center of Comparative Criminology. Working in the field of policing and security studies, his main research focus is the commodification of security – how policing and security are progressively being transformed into a consumer good – and its consequences for the governance of security. Other topics of interest include the policing of protest and the control of police deviance.

Pat O'Malley is Distinguished Professor in the College of Arts and Social Sciences at the Australian National University. Since the early 1990s, most of his research has focused on risk as a framework for governance, especially in relation to criminal justice, insurance, and illicit drug use. Over the past decade, the pivotal place of money sanctions in civil and criminal justice has become another major focus.

Justin Piché is an associate professor in the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa and co-editor of the *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* (www.jpp.org).

Rose Ricciardelli is a professor at Memorial University of Newfoundland. She is Associate Director of the Canadian Institute for Public Safety Research and Treatment, leading research on institutional and community corrections. Her research centers on penal living and community re-entry for federally incarcerated men in Canada, evolving understandings of gender, vulnerabilities, risk, and experiences and issues within different facets of the criminal justice system.

Anna S. Rogers is a doctoral student in the Department of Sociology at the University of South Carolina. She teaches courses in Introductory Sociology and Visual Sociology. Writing her dissertation on the stigmatization and control of self-professed "witches" in contemporary culture, she specializes in sociological questions of deviance and social control, popular culture, and gender.

Rachel Rogers is a graduate student in the M.S.C.J. program at the University of North Florida in Jacksonville. Currently, she serves as a graduate research assistant in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Her research interests include immigration policy, interactions of marginalized populations with the criminal justice system, and how stigmatization affects these groups post-exposure. She hopes to pursue her Ph.D. in Criminology in order to further her research experiences with marginalized populations both within and outwith the criminal justice system.

Gil Rothschild-Elyassi is a Ph.D. student in Jurisprudence and Social Policy at UC Berkeley, with a designated emphasis in critical theory. He holds an LL.M. from New York University and an LL.B. from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His work, which draws on sociological and critical theory, explores penal practice in the age of data analytics, as well as noncustodial penal strategies for governing communities afflicted by legacies of racial violence.

Ashley T. Rubin is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Toronto. She holds a Ph.D. in Jurisprudence and Social Policy, and specializes in analyzing punishment from historical and sociological perspectives. She is currently completing a book manuscript examining why Eastern State Penitentiary alone retained the Pennsylvania System of long-term solitary confinement despite extensive criticism and great personal cost to the prison's administrators.

Joachim J. Savelsberg is Professor of Sociology and Law and Arsham and Charlotte Ohanessian Chair at the University of Minnesota. His books include *Representing Mass Violence: Conflicting Responses to Human Rights Violations in Darfur* (University of California Press, 2015), *Crime and Human Rights: Criminology of Genocide and Atrocities* (Sage, 2010), and, with Ryan D. King, *American Memories: Atrocities and the Law* (Russell Sage Foundation, 2011),.

Shelly S. Schaefer is an associate professor in the Department of Criminal Justice and Forensic Science at Hamline University. She received her Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Minnesota. Her research and prior publications focus on juvenile justice policy, the transition to adulthood, and community re-entry after a period of confinement.

Derek M. D. Silva is Assistant Professor of Criminology in the Department of Sociology at King's University College at Western University. He holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of South Carolina. His research examines practices of policing terrorism and radicalization, anti-terrorism law in the West, and political and media rhetoric in the so-called "War on Terror."

Jonathan Simon is Adrian A. Kragen Professor of Law at UC Berkeley. His work includes *Poor Discipline: Parole and the Social Control of the Underclass* (University of Chicago Press, 1993), *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear* (Oxford University Press, 2009), *Mass Incarceration on Trial: A Remarkable Court Decision and the Future of Prisons in America* (The New Press, 2016), and, with Richard Sparks, *The SAGE Handbook of Punishment and Society* (SAGE Publications, 2012).

A. Javier Treviño is Professor of Sociology at Wheaton College. He is the author and editor of several books, including *The Sociology of Law: Classical and Contemporary*

Perspectives (St. Martin's Press, 1996), *Talcott Parsons on Law and the Legal System* (Cambridge Scholars Press, 2008), and *C. Wright Mills and the Cuban Revolution: An Exercise in the Art of Sociological Imagination* (University of North Carolina Press, 2017). He is also Visiting Professor at the University of Innsbruck, Austria.

Kevin Walby is Associate Professor and Chancellor's Research Chair, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Winnipeg. He is co-editor of the *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* (www.jpp.org).

James P. Walsh is an assistant professor in the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology. In addition to surveillance, his research focuses on crime and media, globalization, and border security and migration policing.

James J. Willis is Associate Professor of Criminology, Law, and Society at George Mason University. His interests include police technology, organizational reform, and street-level decision-making. His current research focuses on the effects of different technologies on police organization structure and practice. Along with his coauthors, in 2008 he was awarded the Law and Society Association's article prize for research using different theoretical perspectives to explain Compstat's implementation in three police departments.

Introduction: Social Control Today

Mathieu Deflem

The concept of social control has a long history in the social sciences, dating back to the very earliest days of the institutionalization of the discipline of sociology. In an earlier volume of this series of Wiley handbooks that concerned the concept and area of deviance (Goode, 2015), I provided a comprehensive overview of social control, along with a review of its main theoretical perspectives and areas of empirical research (Deflem, 2015). It will suffice in this Introduction to first briefly summarize from that work. I will then, more importantly, situate the chapters of this handbook in that context to provide a general overview to this volume as a more or less coherent collective.

Perspectives of Social Control

When the concept of social control was introduced in the late 19th century, it was defined in terms of the whole of institutions that provided the foundations of social order in modern societies characterized by increasing levels of individualism and diversity (Carrier, 2006; Deflem, 2015; Martindale, 1978; Meier, 1982). This notion of social control as the foundation of social order in modern societies was most famously developed from an institutional viewpoint by Edward A. Ross (1926), and found a micro-theoretical expression in the work of George H. Mead (1934). Since those early days, however, social control has come to be conceived more specifically in terms of the control of norm violations, including informal norms in relatively small social settings, as well as more and more highly formalized norms in large-scale societies. To this day, the term "social control" has multiple connotations, ranging from very broad concepts of social order (Gibbs, 1994; Janowitz, 1975) to very specific understandings within a particular theoretical tradition (Black, 1997; Cohen, 1985). Yet, for the purposes of this volume, the chapters will show, the emphasis is primarily on social control in relation to deviance and/or crime. Such a criminological understanding, however, does not prevent an informed perspective of social control within a broader – both social and sociological – context.

In view of the theoretical differentiation in sociological thinking, it is instructive to distinguish between at least three relevant conceptions of social control in terms of deviance and/or crime (Deflem, 2015). First, in sociological crime-causation theories, primary attention goes to the causes of crime, with a related focus on social control as a functional response to crime. Second, crime-construction theories devote central attention to social control as criminalization in a broader process of the labeling of deviance. Third, conflict-sociological perspectives build on the constructionist viewpoint to articulate social control as part of a broader study (and critique) of society. From these various theoretical perspectives, social control provides a central framework from which social scientists, especially in criminology and sociology, can study institutions and practices involved with the control of crime and/or deviance (Chriss, 2013; Cohen, 1985; Garland, 2001; Melossi, 1990; Pfohl, 2009).

The delineated understanding of social control in terms of crime and/or deviance is by far the most widespread manner in which the concept is used today. On occasion, the term is also applied to other social behavior of a more or less problematic quality, such as illness and poverty, in order to contemplate on the social-control functions of institutions such as medicine and charity (van Leeuwen, 2000). Yet, the center of attention in studies of social control mostly rests with the control of crime and deviance at multiple levels of analysis, ranging from the level of the interaction order to the macro-level of multiple institutions involved with the administration of law, policing, and punishment. Recently, the sociological study of social control has especially focused on the influence of technological advances in crime control, typically under the heading of a new field of so-called "surveillance studies," and has additionally centered attention on the influence of processes of globalization, such as the response to international terrorism. It is within this intellectual tradition that the chapters in this volume demonstrate the rich heritage of the major relevant perspectives of social control to provide an overview of the most important theories and dimensions of social control today.

An Overview of the Chapters

Within the suggested context, the present *Handbook of Social Control* provides an overview and discussion of selected perspectives and dimensions of social control today. The volume includes 32 chapters on various aspects of social control, divided over seven thematic parts: Theories and Perspectives; Institutions and Organizations; Criminal Justice; Law Enforcement and Policing; Punishment and Prison; Surveillance; and Globalization. The chapters reflect the theoretical and methodological diversity that exists in the study of social control, and are thematically diverse within the scope of the volume.

Part I, Theories and Perspectives, contains several chapters clarifying the most salient theoretical and conceptual issues involved with the social-scientific study of social control. These chapters trace the development of the concept and its place in sociology and criminology, and devote attention to specific conceptualizations and perspectives of social control from a variety of approaches and theoretical frameworks. James J. Chriss does a great job of tracing the intellectual journey of the concept in American sociology, while Robert Meier unravels the connections between deviance, social control, and criminalization. Expanding on the notion of social control in more specific theoretical contexts, Javier Treviño elucidates the conception of law as social control since E. A. Ross, while Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning explain the more contemporary understanding of social

control from the viewpoint of (Donald Black's) pure sociology, and Steven Hutchinson and Pat O'Malley do the same in terms of (Michel Foucault's) twin notions of discipline and governmentality.

Part II, Institutions and Organizations, considers the various societal organizations and agencies that, at multiple levels of governance, are involved with the planning and execution of social-control mechanisms for a variety of objectives. At the upper level of societal organization, the modern state takes a central place, but at lower levels, a host of intermediate institutions engage in social-control practices as well. This part focuses on multiple contexts among them, including organizations, psychiatric-care institutions, juvenile justice, and social movements. Focusing on social control in organizations, Calvin Morrill and Brittany Arsiniega show the role of social control as both a dependent and an independent variable in organizational research. Focusing on two special domains in which control is exercised, Bruce Arrigo and Heather Bersot unravel some of the dynamics of psychiatric control, while Shelly Shaefer untangles the web of juvenile justice. Sherry Cable offers a useful concluding reflection to this part by focusing on the role of social control in relation and, usually, in opposition to social movements of various kinds.

It is important that this handbook is conceived as a social-science work on social control, rather than a criminal justice administration book focused on technical issues of professional expertise. But it would be absurd to leave out relevant contemplations on the role of criminal justice in society. Rather than merely describing systems of criminal justice, however, Part III, Criminal Justice, focuses on analyzing the patterns and dynamics of criminal justice practices and mechanisms, such as the relevance of race, gun control, crime prevention, and the development of restorative justice. There is no getting around some very definite and oftentimes problematic characteristics of criminal justice. In the United States, in particular, but elsewhere as well, one cannot be blind to the relevance of race and the role of guns – aspects tackled in the respective chapters of April D. Fernandes and Robert D. Crutchfield and of Gary Kleck. Broader trends of criminal justice today must also involve consideration of restorative justice, addressed in the chapter by Rachel Rogers and Holly Ventura Miller, and of the role of risk and prediction – which, from rather different angles, are explored in the chapters on crime prevention by Kristie Blevins and on actuarial justice by Gil Rothschild-Elyassi, Johann Koehler, and Jonathan Simon.

Ever since Max Weber first proposed his theory of the state, the institutions of police and military have been central topics of reflection as among the most critical means of coercion. The transformation of policing in terms of crime control and order maintenance, as well as its professionalization, stands among the most relevant dynamics. Part IV, Law Enforcement and Policing, addresses various issues concerning the function, organization, and practice of policing. Among the topics presented are the history of the police function, the role of technology in policing, counterterrorism policing, and police ethics. Massimiliano Mulone starts off this part, as one must, by tracing the historical origins of the institution and practices of policing, while James Willis's chapter, with similar necessity, discusses the role of technology in policework. At least since September 11, likewise, it would be unwise to not consider the role of policing in counterterrorism, which I and co-author Stephen Chicoine explore in institutional terms on a national and global level, and which Derek Silva analyzes with regard to radicalization as a new central framework of counterterrorism. Finally, the chapter on police accountability and ethics by Toycia Collins and Charles F. Klahm serves a more than useful role in this handbook, given current discussions of police violence and police legitimacy.

Part V, Punishment and Prisons, considers another critical aspect of the criminal justice system within the broader constellation of social control. At least since the seminal work of Emile Durkheim, social scientists have rightly contemplated the transformation of punishment toward less severe but more manipulative forms, as well as toward the generalization of the deprivation of liberty in the form of the modern prison system. This part of the handbook devotes chapters to the most important components of these dynamics, including the history of incarceration, the dynamics of prison culture, the problem of mass incarceration, the resistance of abolitionism, and the death penalty. Ashley Rubin traces the history of the prison as a series of overlapping periods in which new templates of imprisonment diffuse. Next, Laura McKendy and Rose Ricciardelli discuss prison culture in terms of the tensions between collectivism and individualism. Roy Janisch looks at the important problem of mass incarceration, while Nicolas Carrier, Justin Piché, and Kevin Walby consider the altogether different but highly related problem of abolitionism and decarceration policies and programs. Paul Kaplan, finally, examines the death penalty from an informed social-science viewpoint that is intent on analyzing the facts of the case of this most peculiar form of social control.

Technology plays a central role in our daily lives and in many facets of the social order, including indeed social control. In recent years, much work has been conducted in this area under the heading of "surveillance" and a new field of surveillance studies. The chapters in Part VI, Surveillance, analyze relevant aspects of what is often called the surveillance society. Stéphane Leman-Langlois starts off the discussion, appropriately, by focusing on the role of technology. Kiyoshi Abe next analyzes the shifting boundaries of surveillance in its manifestation in public spaces. Turning to the limits of surveillance, James Walsh discusses the potentials and restrictions of countersurveillance strategies, while Anna Rogers discusses the more or less playful and critical ways in which surveillance is treated in various forms of popular culture.

It has been a truism for quite some years now to observe that the world is getting smaller as its varied localized events become more and more interconnected. The world of social control has not remained unaffected by these globalizing trends. Certain developments of an international and transnational character in matters of social control have intensified, and others have changed qualitatively. Part VII of this handbook, Globalization, focuses on such border-transcending – yet also border-affirming – phenomena associated with social control. Indicating the continued relevance of national borders, the chapters by Alexander Diener and Joshua Hagen and by Samantha Hauptman discuss the dynamics of border control and immigration policies, respectively. Turning to dimensions of global social control closely related to political affairs of violence and war, Michael Jenkins and John Casey discuss the major forms of international peacekeeping, while Joachim Savelsberg and Brooke Chambers bring our handbook to a close by providing an informed analysis of more and less formal dimensions of social control designed and enacted in terms of violations of human rights.

Objectives

This *Handbook of Social Control* may be justified both because of its academic usefulness and because of its pedagogical value. Indeed, existing edited volumes that explicitly deal with social control from a criminological and sociological viewpoint are by now several years old. Among them, for instance, are the collections of articles and chapters

on social control edited by Jack Gibbs (1982), Donald Black (1984), and Stanley Cohen and Andrew Scull (1985), all of which were published some 3 decades ago. A similar edited volume, on social control and political order, is now more than 20 years old (Bergalli & Sumner, 1997).

More contemporary edited volumes on social control are available, yet they either address a wide and rather incoherent variety of different components of control (Chriss, 2010; Downes et al., 2008) or are, instead, focused on more specific aspects, such as punishment (Blomberg & Cohen, 2012; Deflem, 2014; Simon & Sparks, 2012), policing (Deflem, 2016), and surveillance (Ball et al., 2014; Deflem, 2008; Norris & Wilson, 2006). Likewise, many of the existing handbooks and encyclopedias in the area of social control are very broad in scope, dealing with a wide variety of aspects and approaches to the study of crime and/or deviance and its control (Albanese, 2014; Bruinsma & Weisburd, 2014; Inderbitzin et al., 2015; Tonry, 2013), while others are more specialized, focusing on such issues as policing and punishment (Reisig & Kane, 2014; Tonry, 2000).

Therefore, because of its distinct focus on the concept of and theories associated with social control, this handbook fills a void that scholars of crime, deviance, criminal justice, and related areas and issues should appreciate. It also fits well with the related handbooks published by Wiley-Blackwell, such as the volumes edited by Erich Goode (2015) on deviance, by Alex Piquero (2015) on criminological theory, and by Austin Sarat and Patricia Ewick (2015) on law and society. Pedagogically, as well as academically, our *Handbook of Social Control* hopes to fulfill a distinct and unique – yet complementary – role.

The preparatory and editorial work involved in bringing this handbook to fruition has a history too long and unnecessary to be recounted here in any detail. Suffice it to say that the economics of academic publishing are presently undergoing rather drastic changes. Originally conceived as an encyclopedia, the volume was redesigned as a handbook following a series of events far beyond the realms of intellectual consideration. Eventually, these revisions and delays were most fortuitous, as they enabled this handbook to appear in the series of Handbooks in Criminology and Criminal Justice that is so ably edited by Charles Wellford. From submission of a proposal to the final review of this handbook's chapters some 1,129 emails later, I am grateful to Dr. Wellford for his graciousness in evaluating the idea of the volume on nothing but sound academic grounds. As this project moved to completion, I also thank the many fine folks at Wiley who oversaw its production. Finally, of course, I am grateful to the invited authors for writing their chapters and to the reader who will enjoy the fruits of their labor.

References

Albanese, J. S. (Ed.). (2014). *The encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ball, K., Haggerty, K., & Lyon, D. (Eds.). (2014). *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies*. London: Routledge.

Bergalli, R. & Sumner, C. (Eds.) (1997). *Social control and political order*. London: Sage.

Black, D. (Ed.). (1984). *Toward a general theory of social control*. New York: Academic Press.

Black, D. (1997). *The social structure of right and wrong*. New York: Academic Press.

Blomberg, T. G. & Cohen S. (Eds.). (2012). *Punishment and social control*, 2nd edn. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Bruinsma, G. & Weisburd, D. (Eds.). (2014). *The encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice*. Berlin: Springer.

Carrier, N. (2006). La dépression problématique du concept de contrôle social. *Déviance & Société*, *30*(1), 3–20.

Chriss, J. J. (Ed.) (2010). *Social control: Informal, legal and medical*. Bingley: Emerald.

Chriss, J. J. (2013). *Social control: An introduction*, 2nd edn. London: Polity Press.

Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of social control*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cohen, S. & Scull, A. T. (Eds.). (1985). *Social control and the state: Historical and comparative essays*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Deflem, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Surveillance and governance: Crime control and beyond*. Bingley: Emerald.

Deflem, M. (Ed.). (2014). *Punishment and incarceration: A global perspective*. Bingley: Emerald.

Deflem, M. (2015). Deviance and social control. In E. Goode (Ed.), *The handbook of deviance* (pp. 33–40). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Deflem, M. (Ed.). (2016). *The politics of policing: Between force and legitimacy*. Bingley: Emerald.

Downes, D., Rock, P., Chinkin, C., & C. Gearty (Eds.). (2008). *Crime, social control and human rights: From moral panics to states of denial*. London: Routledge.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gibbs, J. (Ed.). (1982). *Social control: Views from the social sciences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gibbs, J. (1994). *A theory about control*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Goode, E. (Ed.). (2015). *The handbook of deviance*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Inderbitzin, M., Bates, K., & Gainey, R. (2015). *Perspectives on deviance and social control*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Janowitz, M. (1975). Sociological theory and social control. *American Journal of Sociology*, *81*(1), 82–108.

Martindale, D. (1978). The theory of social control. In J. S. Roucek (Ed.), *Social control for the 1980s: A handbook for order in a democratic society* (pp. 46–58). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist* (Ed. C. W. Morris). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Meier, R. F. (1982). Perspectives on the concept of social control. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *8*, 35–55.

Melossi, D. (1990). *The state of social control: A sociological study of concepts of state and social control in the making of democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Norris, C. & Wilson, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Surveillance, crime, and social control*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Pfohl, S. (2009). *Images of deviance and social control*, 2nd edn. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Piquero, A. (Ed.). (2015). *The handbook of criminological theory*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Reisig, M. D. & Kane, R. J. (Eds.). (2014). *The Oxford handbook of police and policing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ross, E. A. (1926) [1901]. *Social control: A survey of the foundations of order*. New York: Macmillan.

Sarat, A. & Ewick, P. (Eds.). (2015). *The handbook of law and society*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Simon, J. & Sparks, R. (Eds.). (2012). *The SAGE handbook of punishment and society*. London: Sage.

Tonry, M. (Ed.). (2000). *The handbook of crime and punishment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tonry, M. (Ed.). (2013). *The Oxford handbook of crime and criminal justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Leeuwen, M. H. D. (2000). *The logic of charity: Amsterdam, 1800–1850*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Part I

Theories and Perspectives

1

Social Control: History of the Concept

James J. Chriss

This chapter provides an overview of the concept of social control in the history of sociology. Social control emerged in the late nineteenth century at roughly the same time as the establishment of American sociology, with Edward A. Ross being the main innovator of the concept. A parallel movement in Europe (represented in the thought of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber) focused on the larger problem of social order rather than social control per se. By the 1950s, Talcott Parsons sought to bring into alignment the broader concept of social order with the narrower one of social control by way of the development of a general theory of social systems that specified four functions operating across all levels of human reality. The analytical requirement of four functions implied that social control appeared concretely as four basic types: informal, legal, medical, and religious. By the 1980s, the consensus within sociology saw a further simplification of the Parsons schema into three basic types of social control: informal, legal, and medical (with religious control now being subsumed under informal). The trend over time has been that the most ancient and fundamental system of control – informal control – has waned and become somewhat imperiled in the face of the growth of both legal and medical control.

Ross and Early American Sociology

During the 1960s, the criminologist Travis Hirschi was a graduate student at the University of California at Berkeley. Early in his doctoral training, Hirschi took a deviance course from Erving Goffman, in which the latter provided an overview of the history and current status of social control. It was Goffman's opinion that the reason social control was on the decline (circa the early 1960s) was that it had become synonymous with sociology. As Hirschi explained, "There was nothing you could not study under the rubric of social control" (quoted in Laub, 2011:300).

According to Hirschi, Goffman traced this view of social control as a broad and unmanageable mélange of sociological topics to Edward A. Ross, who had published a series of articles on social control in the *American Journal of Sociology* beginning in 1896. Ross later

collected this series and included them in the first book ever published on the topic of social control, *Social Control: A Survey of the Foundations of Order* (Ross, 1901a). The complexity and diffuseness of Ross's pioneering conceptualization is readily evident in a paper he published titled "The Radiant Points of Social Control" (Ross, 1900).

Specifically, Ross (1900) argued that social control radiates from multiple points, which flow ultimately from power. Yet, power becomes more focused and nuanced as it is coupled with prestige, and the power–prestige system gives rise to 10 radiant points of social control:

- *Numbers:* the crowd;
- *Age:* the elders;
- *Prowess:* the military;
- *Sanctity:* the priests;
- *Inspiration:* the prophet;
- *Place:* officialdom (or the state, claiming control of a sovereign territory);
- *Money:* the capitalists;
- *Ideas:* the elite;
- *Learning:* the mandarins; and
- *Individual strength* (even with lack of prestige in any of the preceding areas): the individual.

This was around the same time that American sociology was founded as an academic discipline, initiated largely as a result of the publication in 1883 of Lester F. Ward's two-volume *Dynamic Sociology* (Ward, 1883). (Indeed, Ross dedicated *Social Control* to Ward, and later married his niece and named his third son Lester Ward Ross.) Ward and the other founders of American sociology – William Graham Sumner, Albion Small, Franklin Giddings, and Charles H. Cooley being the most prominent – were equally concerned with social control, although they utilized different terminology and concepts, such as telesis, psychic factors of civilization, regulation, social organization, consciousness of kind, folkways and mores, social bonds, assimilation, adaptation and aggregation, cooperation, human association, primary and secondary groups, and – influenced most directly by Gabriel Tarde (1903) – imitation.

Why did social control emerge as an overriding concern in early American sociology? A standard explanation is that American society was born into conflict, which created a tapestry of recurring challenges to the social order (Meier, 1982). A short list of key historical events and trends would include the American Revolution, the settling of the western frontier, and the Civil War and the period of Reconstruction leading to the Gilded Age and a later Progressive Era. And laced throughout the major historical events were steady population growth, concerns over immigration, labor strife, and the transition from a largely rural to an increasingly urban way of life.

As the sociology of knowledge would predict, Ross and other early American sociologists developed social control in response to the fear that rapid social change was systematically and inexorably releasing individuals from the traditional controls of family and community. This concern was also informed by Herbert Spencer's (1860) pioneering conceptualization of society as an organism, which depicted individuals not merely as random or isolated units within the larger whole, but as aggregates fulfilling particular functions for the operation of the social system. This stood as an early solution to the problem of explaining how collective or corporate action was possible among an increasingly disparate and diverse

American citizenry. Ross acknowledged that levels and types of social control in any society wax and wane over time, but saw the stability and flux of social control as two sides of the same coin. According to Ross (1901b:550):

> The function of control is to preserve that indispensable condition of common life, social order. When this order becomes harder to maintain, there is a demand for more and better control. When this order becomes easier to maintain, the ever-present demand for individual freedom and for toleration makes itself felt. The supply of social control is evoked, as it were, by the demand for it, and is adjusted to that demand.

But who, exactly, is making this demand for social control? For Ross, this would depend on the particular radiant point of control pertinent to the situation, as well as the nature of the parties to the action. Ross (1901a:62) argued there are three possible attitudes toward social control, namely, those of the actor, the victim of the action, and bystanders to the event (Martindale, 1966:283). This reflects the standard utilitarian view of human action launched by Hobbes and later formalized and refined by Bentham and Mill. It views social control as a dependent variable; specifically, as a reaction by victims (or agents or guardians acting on their behalf) to pains imposed by a person or group. Ross further argues that for control to be social, the reaction must have the whole weight of society behind it. From this perspective, actions of lone or isolated individuals are illegitimate or, at the very least, suspect. The most ancient, primitive radiant point of control is the individual, but a situation in which individuals are imposing their will on others returns us to the state of nature, where "might makes right." It is nature's method whereby organisms utilize whatever resources are available in the struggle for survival. Here, there is no "ought," no morality, no right or wrong, but merely expedience (success or failure). The march of civilization leads inexorably to the development of systems of rules and regulations whereby, at least in the earliest stages of this development, the group reigns supreme over the individual. The effort to explain this movement from premodernity to modernity is especially evident in the work of two founders of European sociology, Emile Durkheim (in France) and Max Weber (in Germany).

Durkheim and Weber

Ross's vision of social control was grounded in a Midwest parochialism that reflected the idea of "American exceptionalism," referenced primarily by the lack of indigenous feudal institutions in the United States. This absence of an aristocracy created a more diffuse "township" model of control, which was sustained by the system of federalism as outlined in the US Constitution (Hamilton & Sutton, 1989). This was a form of decentralized power that rejected the idea of domination by a sovereign, whether by way of kingship, aristocracy, or other authoritative systems of ruling. Both Durkheim's and Weber's thoughts on social control were informed by European formalism with regard to the nature of the state, authority, and domination, and hence parted ways with the early American contributors to the subject (Melossi, 2004).

Durkheim (1984) did, however, argue that between the mass society of modernity and the individual stood certain intermediary formations that provided new forms of organic solidarity. In the new industrial society, Durkheim sees the division of labor as the modern source of social solidarity. He argues against the notion that people become merely cogs in

the machinery of the industrial juggernaut, falling prey to dulling routine and bureaucratic overregulation. Rather than a debasement of human nature, Durkheim suggests that with the increasing differentiation of tasks in the division of labor, men and women are not separated from each other and their own humanity, but are put in a position of having to rely on one another more than ever before. That is, with the onslaught of work specialization, workers become more dependent on their co-workers, and, to a great extent, are more generally tied into the community because of this specialization. In this sense, workers are not simply an appendage of a machine.

Durkheim (1984) realizes as well that rules of division are not enough to create the kind of solidarity founded on sameness and cultural homogeneity seen under the older mechanical solidarity. For example, class wars have been waged because of an overly regulated or forced division of labor. The caste system opens itself up to the fact that many will experience tension between their positions founded on inheritance and the social functions they believe they can fill. So, "for the division of labour to engender solidarity, it is thus not sufficient for everyone to have his task; it must also be agreeable to him" (Durkheim, 1984:311).

Therefore, the distribution of natural talents is essential, because if labor is assigned otherwise – as in the forced division of labor – then what is produced is friction, not solidarity. The division of labor must be established spontaneously, by virtue of each individual's initiative. That is, those who are most capable of moving into a particular occupation will no doubt do so. Since, obviously, there is a natural inequality of talent and capacities, there must be reflected a parallel social inequality. Where mechanical solidarity was characterized by homogeneity and external equality, organic solidarity is similarly characterized by external inequality.

Because it is essential that there be harmony between the division of labor and the spirit of spontaneity, to deal with the frictions that could result from the social inequalities inherent in the modern system, there must be simultaneously an effort put forth to initiate and continue the work of justice. This would be accomplished primarily through the formation of organizations that deal specifically with worker-related issues. Thus, a complete system of agencies must emerge along with the division of labor to ensure the continued functioning of social life. This is conceptualized by Durkheim as the birth of the corporation.

Durkheim's thought concerning how social control is shifting from the informal realms of family, friendship, and community toward intermediate groups of the civil society – with the corporation standing as an important new form of control within modern or organic solidarity – easily moves toward an even greater emphasis on systems of power and organization in the guise of the state. Max Weber's theory of the shifting of the nature of legitimate authority from earlier to modern times is consistent with Durkheim's theory of the shift from an earlier mechanical solidarity to a modern organic one.

Weber specifies three types of legitimate authority, namely, traditional, charismatic, and legal-bureaucratic. The most ancient form is traditional authority, which rests on an established belief in the sanctity of long-standing traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them. Members of societies in which traditional authority prevails give their obedience to the masters (tribal leaders and fathers in patriarchal society), not to any enacted legislation (Weber, 1968).

Charismatic authority rests on devotion to the exceptional qualities or exemplary character of an individual person. Charismatic persons are said to be endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or exceptional powers or qualities of magical or divine origin.

As Weber (1968:241) explains, "In primitive circumstances this peculiar kind of quality is thought of as resting on magical powers, whether of prophets, persons with a reputation for therapeutic or legal wisdom, leaders in the hunt, or heroes in war."

Finally, legal-bureaucratic authority rests on the belief in the legality of rules and the right of those in positions of authority to issue commands. This is a modern, rational system of control that eliminates the whim or caprice of the ruler in favor of the institutionalization of rational authority. This rational authority is carried out by specialized control agents vested with the coercive power of organizations or states, thereby providing greater predictability of human behavior through the bureaucratization of official rule-making and control processes (Wood, 1974). To reiterate from the preceding discussion, Weber's work illustrates a European strand of theory concerned with the growth of formalism, and especially the growing reliance on law in modern society. Rather than fealty based on the particular characteristics of authorities (as was the case for the elders wielding traditional authority under mechanical solidarity), in modern society persons obey commands of law officials and bureaucrats on the basis of the legitimacy of the positions they hold, which is grounded in an established and preexisting set of rules for office-holding. Weber (1978:39) describes the state as an extended political authoritarian association, namely, "an institutional enterprise of a political character, when and insofar as its executive staff successfully claims a monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force in order to impose its regulations." This is considered a more rational form of authority to the extent that achievement (a publicly available record of one's training for a position) prevails over ascription (one's personal characteristics).

Talcott Parsons: Functionalism and Control

Early in his career, Talcott Parsons did more than any other sociologist to introduce the thought of Durkheim and Weber to English-speaking audiences. By the 1950s, Parsons was the preeminent American sociologist, having published two highly influential books in *The Social System* (Parson, 1951) and *Toward a General Theory of Action* (Parsons, 1952), the latter of which included a number of coauthors. Although the four-function AGIL schema would not be fully developed until the 1960s (see, e.g., Parsons, 1961), in these early works there are clear indications that he was seeking to create an analytical strategy for the simultaneous establishment of the structural and functional aspects of all things of relevance to sociological observers.

Although Parsons did not set out to develop a specific theory of social control, it is clearly the case that, located within the expansive edifice of the general systems theory that he built from the ground up (starting with the unit act), the problem of social order includes four types of social control, coinciding with four functions (adaptation, goal-attainment, integration, and latent pattern maintenance) that operate in and across all levels of reality. Unlike the elitist approach to social order, which focuses on the hierarchical distribution of force, and unlike the Marxist economic approach, which emphasizes property relations even over the organs of violence (the state) or normative elements (ideology), Parsons developed a normative approach to the problem of social order, which synthesized elements derived primarily from Weber and Durkheim (Etzioni, 1961).

Like many of his predecessors, Parsons (1951) defines social control as any attempt to counter deviance, and goes on to argue that along one analytical dimension, the conceptualization of deviance and its control can take either a situational or a normative focus.

Along a second analytical dimension, deviance can involve a disturbance of the total person (an individual orientation), or it can involve disturbances in particular expectations (a group orientation). When considering deviance from these two axes – situational–normative and individual–group – four distinct kinds of social control emerge.

Where there is a disturbance of the total person from a situational focus, Parsons interprets this as a problem of "capacities" for performing specific tasks or roles in a situation. Persons who are healthy can generally perform tasks or roles in particular situations, and this is the conformity situation. Persons who cannot perform in these situations, who lack the capacity to get things done as expected, are considered ill or sick. Hence, deviance within the individual-situational configuration is illness, and it is here that medical control prevails.

Where there is a disturbance of the total person from a normative focus, Parsons interprets this as a problem of commitment to values. The conforming situation is a "state of grace" or "good character." Conversely, the deviance situation is sin or immorality. The salient form of social control here is religious control.

When the disturbance shifts from the individual level to the group-expectations level, two additional forms of social control emerge. Again, we need to consider this level first from a situational and then from a normative focus. Within the group-situational focus, disturbance of group expectation in particular concrete settings leads to poor social bonding or rejection of significant others (such as estrangement from primary groups). Hence, the general category of deviance produced here is disloyalty to or detachment from the group. As a result, the salient form of social control is informal control.

Finally, when considering the group level from a normative focus, deviance is the problem of a lack of commitment to norms. Here, Parsons is referring to lack of commitment to legal norms, and of course the type of deviance generated here is crime or illegality. This means that the form of social control most salient to the group-normative dimension is legal control.

From this, we can easily derive which of the four functions are associated with which types of control. Medical control fulfills the adaptation function, as this involves the capacities of the human organism to adjust and adapt to his or her environment. Insufficient mental or physical capacities limit the individual's ability to perform expected roles, and hence illness is the form of deviance with regard to the function of adaptation.

Parsons argued that law fulfills an integrative function for society, but this cannot be defended. Law uses the medium of power, seated in the polity, to extract compliance from individuals or groups through coercion or its threat. Law does not assure integration first and foremost; instead, that is the work of group living and everyday life – that is, of informal control. Law attempts to steer persons to pursue goals that are defined as legal and legitimate, using strong inducements such as the threat of arrest or incarceration if criminal laws are violated. Hence, legal control fulfills the function of goal-attainment, *not* integration.

The integration function of social control is fulfilled by informal control. The bonding of individuals to one another within the context of groups and interpersonal relationships creates a tapestry of solidarity and stability that makes it difficult for properly bonded individuals to violate group expectations (Chriss, 2007; Hirschi, 1969). This is Durkheim's notion of the precontractual basis of contract, and it is the foundation for all other forms of order and control beyond those of the primary group (Parsons, 1935). Finally, the latent pattern-maintenance function of social control is fulfilled by religious control. Religion encompasses the realm of ultimate values, providing guidance for the thoughts and actions of the true believers in this world, who, if they remain devout in following the teachings of their religion,