

# Freund assignment

Sociology



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Creating Deviance Rules: A Macroscopic Model Author(s): Ronald J. Troyer and Gerald E. Markle Source: The Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Spring, 1982), pp. 157-169 Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the Midwest Sociological Society Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4106327>

Accessed: 16/11/2009 09: 18 Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>.

JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use. Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=black>. Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [\[email protected\]](mailto:[email protected])org. Blackwell Publishing and Midwest Sociological Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to The Sociological Quarterly. <http://www.jstor.org>

The Sociological Quarterly (Spring 1982): 157-169 23 Deviance Rules: Creating A Macroscopic Model\* Ronald J. Troyer, Drake University Gerald E. Markle, Western Michigan University In this paper we propose a macro level the model for analyzing creation of deviance rules. We begin by placing the phenomenon within the context of the social factist and social definitionist the sociological traditions, identifying insights and difficulties the social problems We rule creation. The literature for deviance presents explaining difficulties be resolved by placing the process within a can suggest that the theoretical The consequent dialectical model of deviance framework. sociology of knowledge is that society is composed of a number of designation based on the assumption in of definitions deviance general interests varying degrees of conflict with prevailing outcomes previous of This balance or accommodation contests. becomes representing vulnerable with the introduction increase in strain which is a potential resource or for interest a The groups desiring new definition. outcome of the ensuing conflict is seen as dependent the ability of the combatants employ resources the battle. in on to We conclude by identifying advantages model has for studying deviance the the the rule creation process. of This is how I treat theory: it is something to guide our understanding the social world; it helps us through the labyrinth of the buzzing confusion of conflicting ideologies, and, most of all, theory liberates us from dead facts and worn-out myths. Davis 1980: xv) But since those sociologists who espouse a strong and explicit determinism, and those who practice the techniques of “ verstehen,” “ empathy,” and “ taking the actor’s point of view,” differ upon so very many issues, technical and otherwise, the present suggestions are more likely to be treated as a pollution of the boundary between schools of thought than as a pathway to

<https://assignbuster.com/freund-assignment/>

agreement. (Barnes, 1974: 83-84) For decades the sociology of deviance focused on rule violation. This approach produced works on rule violators, described which rules were violated and how they were violated, and, arguably, why they were violated.

Largely neglected in this work was the process by which rules were created; that is, the process by which deviant categories and designations were constructed. Recently scholars have begun to focus attention on this issue, resulting in various empirical case studies or rationales for the import of the collective definition process (Nuehring and Markle, 1974; Conrad, 1975; Pfohl, 1977; Spector and Kitsuse, 1977; Levine, 1978; Schneider, 1978; Markle and Troyer, 1979; Conrad and Schneider, 1980. As with many deviance studies, these efforts have not produced an explicit framework relating rule creation to the broader theoretical conceptions of social processes and the structural order. As a remedy, ? 1982 by The Sociological Quarterly. All rights reserved. 0038-0253/82/1300-0157\$00. 75 \*The authors thank Roland Chilton, Ronald Kramer, Frances McCrea, Joseph W. Schneider, Malcolm Spector, and Mayer Zald for their helpful comments. Ronald J. Troyer's address is Department of Sociology, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa 50311. 158 THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Collins has called for a radical departure deviance studies, statfrom traditional ing that “ thenext step clearly must be to abolish the field of deviance entirely, to and link its materials with what is known of general explanations stratification of politics” (1975: 17). And Davis (1980: 5) has observed that the time has come “ for the sociology of deviance to move into mainstream theory-based sociology. ” What theoretical form ought these <https://assignbuster.com/freund-assignment/>

investigations take? The developments in sociological theory in the past few decades have been focused around two dominant perspectives.

The nature of these approaches can best be grasped by referring to Ritzer's (1975) distinction between the social factist and social definitionist paradigms. The social factist is primarily concerned with the cause of social phenomena; thus the question asked is a why question. By contrast, since the social definitionist is more concerned with process, the research question is a how question. In studying deviance, for example, the social factists have focused on behavior describing extent and nature asking "Why do these people do it?" It is focused on the process. On the other hand, the social definitionists have primarily how have these persons as asking by which people come to be defined deviant the label? "acquired deviant have and we believe the theoretical of that efforts the factists the definitionists been useful. Such work, though clearly the creation and social construction of scholars, is necessary if the study of rule creation is to lead to generalizations wider applicability. Toward that end, we review some relevant literature, develop creation a sociology of knowledge framework, then present a macro deviance and model which attempt to bridge the gap between the factist and definitionist perspectives. Literature between Perhaps Armand Mauss has best captured the essence of the difference the two major traditional approaches to social problem theory. The essence of the scholarly disagreement, noted, came down to one group arguing that "social problems are 'objective' realities which generate collective behavior and political action" versus the view that "social problems are essentially generated by collective behavior and political processes" (1977: 602, emphasis in original).

The former closely approximates the social factist approach, while the latter represents the social definitionist position. Social factist scholars have tended to explain social problems as the product of some environmental condition. This tradition, disharmonious usually termed the strain explanation, has often focused on economic conditions (Oberschall, between different goals, different values, 1973) but also includes discrepancies values and norms, knowledge and actions, technology and values, and so forth (Smelser, 1962: chap. 3).

Smelser, for example, indicates that “ norm-oriented movements” (defined as attempts to restore, protect, modify, or create norms in the name of a generalized belief,” 1962: 270) often spring from the following kind of strain: Sometimes the appearance of new knowledge initiates a movement to apply this knowledge in order to eradicate a condition previously taken for granted. (1962: 287) Creating Deviance Rules 159 can be between normative and standards actual social conditions provide the basis for a movement whose objective is to modify norms. 1962: 289) it Davis (1975) used a strain model to explain changes in the collective definition of deviance. While seeing deviance definitions products of power struggles as between groups with new rules representing values of those groups able to win state endorsement their values, Davis suggests that “ the diffusion of new knowledge is a major cause of collective searches for new norms in the modern world” (1975: 53). Although strain has been a popular theoretical approach for studying some social problems (e. g. race riots), few empirical studies of deviance designation have followed from this tradition.

Perhaps Chambliss came close in the study of the creation of new rules

against vagrancy. In his words, “ The vagrancy statutes emerged as a result of changes in other parts of the social structure” (1964: 69). Specifically, the strain was the breakdown of the serf system; vagrancy laws were the response of the ruling class to protect their interests and bring the system back to harmony. Zurcher et al. (1977) have also pointed to the crucial role of strain in the emergence of anti-pornography crusades.

In the communities among status studied, they found that as a result of inconsistencies in variables, the traditional middle class was experiencing threats to its life-style. Consequently, efforts to gain new rules against pornography bolster the legitimacy of their life-style. In other words, in the strain tradition of new definitions of deviance are seen as responses to the introduction of various kinds of social change in society. Instead of focusing on the causes of social problems, such as strain (objective conditions that stress collective conditions), scholars in the social definitionist tradition emerge from interaction, processes.

As Blumer stated: especially interpretive “ social problems lie in and are products of a process of collective definition” (1971: 301). Spector and Kitsuse (1977) pursued this theme with their argument that scholars must focus on the claims-making process to understand the emergence of a social problem or definition of deviance. This process tradition has spawned a variety of empirical studies, often focusing on definitions of deviance. The best known of these studies is Becker’s (1963) analysis of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937.

Arguing that there was no major increase in the actual use of the drug, which would be the focus of a strain explanation, Becker attributes the new rule to the activities of a “moral entrepreneur.” (For other interpretations, see Dickson, 1968; Galliher and Walker, 1977, 1978.) Other studies have argued that juvenile courts were not created as a response to increases in delinquency, as the strain model would predict, but rather as part of a moral crusade of (Platt, 1969) or as the product of organizational conflict between supporters of the police and probation departments (Hagan and Leon, 1977).

In two studies of sex offense definitions, Rose (1977) and Roby (1969) also emphasize processual explanations. Roby examined changes in the New York State penal law on prostitution and found that the relative power of numerous interest groups and individuals determined the final version of the act. Similarly, Rose related the rise of the “rape problem” to the ideology and organizations generated by the women’s liberation movement. 160 THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY of The status politics interpretation the temperance movement by Gusfield in (1963, 1967) represents another one of the major processual approaches in the literature.

Basically, Gusfield suggests that the attempt to have a behavior designated as deviant are often symbolic battles “between opposed systems of moralities, cultures and styles of life” (1963: 173). In other words, it is not the behavior per se or social conditions which cause the attempt to label the behavior as deviant. Instead the designation of deviance must be seen as a product of status of for conflict, the competition for the official assignment of honor and prestige through of legitimation group norms. The creation of new health-

<https://assignbuster.com/freund-assignment/>



related of designations deviance has been reviewed Conrad and Schneider (1980).

These authors have set forth a “sequential by of model” and “grounded on generalizations” the medicalization deviance. Following Spector and Kitsuse, they emphasize the import, and not the accuracy, of medical claims-making, view claims as strategic devices, and view medicalization which reflects politics and demedicalization deviance as “cyclical phenomena” of the day. In the most recent processual analysis, Schur suggests that deviance must be seen as a political phenomenon. Arguing that there are at least two sides in any stigma contest, Schur suggests that what is really at stake in deviance definitions is the power of the respective groups.

Since “power, of any sort, is more like a process than an object” (1980: 8), “deviance defining is not a static event but a continuous and changing process” (1980: 66). In summary, the literature reviewed above suggests two models for understanding the collective definition of deviance. The process approach argues that collective definitions are the product of interest group dynamics. By contrast there is for strain explanation that societal disjunctions responsible or at least play a major role in, the emergence new definitions. of Beyond Dichotomous Models During the past decade, a number of scholars have attempted to move beyond the traditional strain or process models. For example, Mauss (1975; Mauss and Wolfe, 1977) argue that new social problems or new definitions deviance are best understood as products of social movements led by interest groups. In this view, social arrangements permit collective behavior which usually focuses on structural strains brought about by social change. Though many strains are

<https://assignbuster.com/freund-assignment/>

present in society, problem definition is the product of interest groups organizing social movements which push for acceptance of their definition of reality.

Resource mobilization theory is another attempt to move beyond the strain and process models. This framework begins with the assumption that society is composed of competing groups (economic, status, racial, etc.). Strain is always present, since there is conflict among groups over which values, norms, economic and arrangements, so forth are to prevail in the society. Group conflict and the of social movements are analyzed in terms of the ability of the coalitions to create and mobilize resources (Oberschall, 1973).

A dynamic element is introduced into the analysis: authorities as well as challengers possess resources; deployment by one side requires some kind of response (mobilization of additional resources) from the other side, lest the cause be defaulted. Creating Deviance Rules 161 Marxist approaches have also tried to move beyond strain and process models. Initially Marxist/conflict interpretations new rules defining deviance suggested that they were “first and foremost a reflection of the interests of the governing class” (Chambliss, 1974: 37).

In this view “the state and legal system are seen as instruments which can be manipulated, almost at will, by the capitalist class” (Beirne, 1979: 379), an approach illustrated by Platt’s (1974) reinterpretation of the establishment of the juvenile court as a conscious effort by some Marxist capitalists to preserve existing political and economic arrangements. They have assigned a more ambiguous role to the state (Block, 1978), suggesting that it exercises

a “relative autonomy” in its relationship the capitalist class to the enactment of legislation is not always in (Beirne, 1979: 379).

Consequently, the objective interests of the capitalist class, “but each case must be examined from and empirically on its own merits” (Beirne, 1979: 380). What is important, this position, is that all of this occurs within the boundaries provided by the prevailing structural relations. Lauderdale and Inverarity criticized the early conflict approaches for inadequately examining the political process underlying the creation of deviance. Arguing that “deviance is socially defined and as such is and changed through political processes” (1980a: 36), they created, maintained, ask under what conditions a form of action comes to be defined as deviant (Lauderdale, 1980: v).

Noting previous studies are characterized a “preoccupation by with subjective interests and lack of attention to measuring objective interests” (1980b: 229), they call for attention to objective conditions underlying the deviance definition process. These efforts are advances over analyses which attribute new definitions of deviance to social psychological processes or to the activities of individuals (moral entrepreneurs). Here, at least, an effort is made to locate the deviance within the larger social context. However, several issues remain unresolved.

First, although recent efforts have attempted to find a role for objective conditions, the remains unclear. At role of strain in the generation new deviance designations of one group of scholars, the social definitionists, suggest objective conditions are largely irrelevant, while others

(especially Lauderdale and Inverarity, to 1980b) are calling for more attention to objective factors. A second major unresolved problem is that none of the collective definitions of deviance approaches explains why specific behaviors are selected for deviance. The literature is silent on this issue.

Finally, in categorization. In fact, the literature is remarkably the approaches discussed above do not yet explain why some deviance creation efforts are unsuccessful. It is in this context that we believe that resource mobilization theory could prove valuable in the study of rule creation and deviance designation. Not only does it point toward relevant variables for study, it also provides an empirical framework to assess previous movements and predict the success or failure of ongoing movements. Any model or theory of deviance creation must address these issues.

More specifically, a way must be found to subsume these differences in a model rendering theoretical issues amenable to empirical evaluation. Toward a Sociology of Knowledge Given its theoretical import, it seems to us that there have been inexplicably few THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY studies of rule creation. Marxists, subsuming issues within the superstructure, have focused on the creation of laws which maintain ruling-class privilege. Strain scholars treat new rules as responses to changed social conditions (new knowledge, Davis, 1975).

Only process scholars have directly addressed the issue, viewing collective definitions of deviance as “emergent products of an interpretive process” (Hawkins and Tiedman, 1975: 340), but studies in this tradition have not produced a rigorous theoretical explanation. Instead, isolated studies have

been characterized descriptive and idiosyncratic detail without connection to social structure general social processes. In their study of the medicalization deviance, Conrad and Schneider (1980) offer a solution to the interactionist's pose impasse. Although labeling-interactionist of perspective presents us with the questions to ask concerning the development deviance designations," they note (1980: 20), "it is a sociology of knowledge approach that is necessary to answer them. " We think of the sociology of knowledge now as a study of the material basis of social ideas, categories, designations, and so forth. From this framework the dependent variable changes: no longer do we study the deviant actor; rather we attempt to locate historically the origins and the social forces which supported and opposed the definition of the deviant category.

As Friedson has stated, the analysis should not focus on "the etiology of some state so much as the etiology of the meaning of a state. Thus it asks questions like: How does a state come to be considered deviant? How does it come to be considered kind of deviance rather than another?" (1970: 215-16). To develop their knowledge approach, Conrad and Schneider interpret behaviors as social constructions of reality. Adopting Berger and Luckmann's (1966) scheme, they view reality construction a social process of three stages: The process begins with the externalization, objectification, and internalization. The externalization, objectification, and internalization of construction a cultural product or definition a person or collection of persons becomes part of the generally accepted body of knowledge, and concludes as the individuals in public take the new definition for granted as part of their worldview. We applaud Conrad and Schneider's explicit sociology of

knowledge and find their social constructionist approach insightful. Their analysis of the historical contribution a dimension of the medicalization deviance represents significant of in by placing deviance designations the broader social context.

At the same time, we are uncomfortable with the apparent absence of a theoretical model pointing to a more explicit method of data analysis. History is all around us; we need the guidance to separate data from the noise.

In his *Ideology and Utopia* (1936), Karl Mannheim distinguishes two types of sociology of knowledge: "on the one hand a theory and on the other hand an historical-sociological method of research" (p. 266). As a theory with the sociology of knowledge has been pursued, its epistemological implications, seriously.

Its methodological implications have, however, remained underdeveloped. He himself largely ignored the methodological aspects of knowledge. Mannheim theory, though he did write that "the most important task of the sociology of knowledge at present is to demonstrate its capacity in actual research in the historical-sociological realm" (p. 306). The methodological implications of Mannheim's work have been pursued most rigorously by David Bloor in his 1976 book *Creating Deviance Rules*. Bloor contends that our concerns should be phenomenological; method, however scientific. The sociologist is concerned with knowledge, ought to be rigorously tested," he writes, "purely as a natural phenomenon... instead of defining it as true or false belief, knowledge for the sociologist is whatever men take to be knowledge" (p. 2). Given that knowledge is relative and historically unstable, Bloor's task is to

<https://assignbuster.com/freund-assignment/>

elucidate the material basis of its variation. To accomplish this task, he proposes a method which he calls the “strong program” the sociology of knowledge, to wit, that our analysis ought to be causal, impartial, and symmetrical.

While sociologists would not want to argue that social factors are the sole cause of belief, they should focus on how social conditions produce and reflect belief. In demanding an approach which is “impartial with respect to truth and success or failure” (p. 5), Bloor is not advocating falsity, rationality or irrationality, catering a value neutral position. The task is not to crown winners or punish losers but to understand both sides. In that sense, Bloor’s sociology is agnostic. Ultimately even irrelevant, mate truth, in any sense of the phrase, is seen as peripheral, the analysis.

Finally the strong program demands a symmetrical analysis. Too often scholars have attempted to analyze deviant and normal beliefs from different stances, the former needing special explanation, while the latter—seen as logical, rational, or truthful—are seen to need no special explanation. We are interested in using the sociology of knowledge as a methodological guide, as a way of using historical materials to build rigorous models. In a sense, then, we use Mannheim and Bloor to build a theoretical method for empirical methods, especially as it applies to social history, study.

The notion of the theoretical has been developed by Stinchcombe (1978; see also Graff, 1980). Good social theory, he asserts, must be grounded in historical data. “People do much better the theory,” he argues, “when interpreting historical sequence than they do when they set out to do ‘

theory'" (p. 17) and " thatthe centraloperationfor building theories of history is seeking causally significantanalogiesbetween instances" of Thuswe aremost interested the methodological in implications the sociology of knowledge: as a way of pointingtowardvariables, as a way of using history, as a way-in short-of structuring analysis.

Suchan analyticstrategy, as a macroand rigorousversionof groundedtheory, ought to allow us to relateprescopic vious theoriesof devianceand our data in an iterativesort of way and, thus, to build and evaluatea model of how deviantcategoriesare designated. A DialecticalModelof DevianceDesignation In attemptingto addressthe theoreticaland methodologicalissues raised, we propose a dialecticalmodel of deviance designation. The model, presentedin to however, it attempts transcend Figure1, is influenced resourcemobilization; by arany single theory.

We begin with the assumptionthat within the structural is composedof a numberof generalinterestsin varying rangements, every society degreesof conflict. Such groups may be of varyingnature: with inclusiveor exin clusive membership, broad or narrowfocus. Their concernwith the definition (p. 7). Figure 1. A DialecticalModel of DevianceDefiniti General vested & other interests Definition i - +- Strain General vested & other interests S/ Specific interests CreatingDeviance Rules 165 question, however, is either peripheral, quiescent, or not effectivein the public arena.

The initial or prevailingdefinitionof a behavioras acceptableor unacceptable representsthe outcome of previous specific interestgroup conflict; in other words, the balanceof the resourcesthe two sides were able to mobilize. or



This balance or accommodation becomes vulnerable with the introduction of an increase of strain. This development provides existing general interest groups with a new resource and opportunity for claims-making. For specific interest groups toward the specific (including the state) form, or mobilize, or become redirected issue in question.

Faced with a challenge to their interests, groups benefiting from the prevailing definition respond by marshaling their own resources. The battle of these groups to maintain or change a rule is joined, the outcome depending on the balance of the mobilized resources. To speak of the “balance of mobilized resources” should not be seen as merely suggesting a simplistic accounting balance. Of course the matter is much more complex. For example, the efficient employment of resources—using resources in an arena where they have of maximal impact—may be just as important as quantity.

The net result is that over a period of time, at time 2, the original definition survives or a new designation takes its place. In explicating the model, we make the following arguments of its utility in collective definition deviance: of examining issues raised in the 1. The model addresses or handles many of the theoretical literature. For example, existing sociological explanations assign central importance to, or ignore, the role of strain. The dialectical model directs the scholar's attention to the role of strain but does not preclude, in fact demands, examination of other social processes.

In addition, by viewing the state as an interested party, albeit a group with unique resources, it is possible to examine official actions without assuming the existence of an all powerful monolithic the definitional outcomes. Furthermore, model permits analysis entity determining and explanation of outcomes where neither side achieves total victory. in 2. The dialectical model is consistent with the “ strong program” the sociology of knowledge. As Bloor (1976) has requested, this model is causal, impartial, and symmetrical. Figure 1 is time ordered; that is, variables appear in causal sequence with one another.

Moreover these sequences are made explicit, thus data analysis. The model thus allows for attempts at statistical model facilitating of process variables by techniques developed from social factist traditions. ing The model treats deviance rule creations as natural phenomena. Whether a rule is good or bad is irrelevant our analysis. Recalling Gusfield’s study of the to temperance movement, the validity of analysis was independent of truth claims about alcohol. Whether the drug is actually an aphrodisiac, a depressant, or a tool of the devil was essentially irrelevant to his conclusions.

Taking such an it agnostic position has methodological implications: allows for the formal model variables. Moreover, Bloor’s last dictum—that analysis ing of phenomenological be symmetrical—has obvious implications for the dialectical model. Note that interests for or against any definition are handled in the same way, and have the same causal input into the model. 166 THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY 3. The model is dialectical. The theory is timeless and has no end stage. Figure 1 shows only one reference frame. But

upon acceptance of “Definition 2,” general vested or other interests are already in place, advocating for or against a new definition.

Though the theory is sequential, in the sense that it goes forward in time, the units of time are not specified. Some deviance designations for long periods of time, others move more rapidly through stages of change and vindication. Conrad and Schneider, thinking along the same stigmatization of and demedicalization deviance lines, have conceptualized medicalization as “cyclical” (1980: 271). We prefer to use the term dialectical, in that it leaves rather than suggesting a direction of the next redefinition problematic as it turns to an original point. nor 4. Deviance and normalcy are not distinct categories.

We conceptualize coordinate system. As a prescribed point in a multidimensional guide for conduct, a rule designates the limits of space around the point in which a behavior is seen as deviant. Behavior is viewed as normal. Outside this boundary, now we can justify using the terms “rule creation” and “deviance designation” more or less synonymously. The former refers to the boundary itself, which may be thick or fuzzy; the latter refers to the space outside the boundary. Any behavioral boundary, in our view, is subject to cultural, temporal, or situational factors which continuously define it, or redefine it.

Thus is the boundary of deviance and normalcy continuously drawn and redrawn, and a behavioral situation, but rather by definition occurs not by quantum leaps, as an “either-or” or pulled through a system of space. In the dialectical model the being pushed as pusher or pulls are manifested strain or

process. and analytic intentions 5. The model is macroscopic. Our conceptualization the collective level. We do not directly consider, for example, the are clearly at motivations of an individual actor or leader. For two reasons we down-play the import of, or perhaps even ignore, such questions as: Did leader X make decision or Y sincerely or cynically?

Is he or she a moral entrepreneur a typical (but not concerned suburbanite? First, we doubt, in social factist language, authoritarian) that such variables explain very much variance in deviance designation. The individual, qua individual, role in collective, historic processes is always limited. To Our second reason is methodological: the extent that psychological variables are important, how are they to be measured or assessed? For historical studies, motivation seems particularly Secondary sources, as well as various problematic. kinds of documents, seem suspect here.

Even in contemporary settings, people's of their own or others' motivations are not trustworthy, especially given reports or the vested or strategic interests which can be served by lying, exaggerating, selectively forgetting. Rather, we focus on such variables as strain and resources over time. and which can be operationalized measured comparably 6. The dialectical model uses history. The model invites, perhaps even demands, a given rule to be placed in historical context. Moreover the data needed to test the model are historical, preferably in time series, data.

The model is shaped by these data and is thus grounded and inductive as Conrad and Schnei- Creating Deviance Rules 167 der (1980: 265) have suggested. In that sense the dialectical model is meant to evaluate, as much

as formally test, historical sequences of data. 7. The model is conflict oriented, though not necessarily Marxist. Many deviance designations, particularly those formalized as laws, are amenable to a Marxist analysis consistent with the model. Large sums of money or other resources are often used by ruling elites for maintenance of deviance definitions do or, less often, change.

However, some deviance definitions not seem to fit the Marxist model (see Markle and Troyer, 1979, or Hagan and Leon, 1977, for two such case studies). In the dialectical model, vested or other interests (religious, ethnic, sex, status, etc. ) can militate for, and indeed be successful at, creating new definitions of deviance. Similarly strain might be substructural strain (employment, new technology, etc. ), but the model allows for superstructural (e.g., new knowledge). Using the Dialectical Model as an inductive theory, the true test of the dialectical model is its utility.

Let us and suggest a few ways, then, how the model might be operationalized and used. We begin with the concept of strain, which can be operationalized several ways. In our own research on cigarette smoking (Markle and Troyer, 1979) and estrogen replacements (McCrea and Markle, 1980), strain was the appearance, or dissemination of new knowledge; strain in our research on Laetrile of legitimation, (Markle and Petersen, 1980) was, among other factors, an increased concern over cancer. As new health-related knowledge claims, strain can be measured with various bibliometric techniques.

A simple content analysis of relevant articles, over a period of years, from Index Medicus can be used to chart such knowledge claims. The

perceived legitimacy of such claims can be assessed by the professional prestige of the author or journal. Finally, the entry of such knowledge claims into the public arena can be measured using the New York Times Index, which Jenkins and Perrow (1977) found highly effective, or by one of several newspaper data banks (e. g. , Newsbank) now in existence. After looking at strain, it is easy enough to identify specific interests involved in redefinition.

Such organizations groups will have appeared as recipients, or sponsors, aggrieved parties, etc. , in news accounts or scholarly citation. The resources of these groups can be measured in several ways. The Encyclopedia of Associations, updated almost yearly, lists purported memberships and other for simple demographics many such groups. Moreover, most interest groups have which are usually easy to obtain, often at literature or even regular publications no cost. When interests are corporate, much information on resources can be gleaned from annual reports or, with somewhat more effort, from regulatory agencies such as the Securities and Exchange Commission. In studies where there is an interested party, vast amounts of official statistics may be government available (see, e. g. , Markle and Troyer, 1979). Moreover, the researcher can use the Freedom of Information Act to obtain a deep window into government actions and resources in various deviance designations. Through public records and other available data, every concept in the dialectical model can be operationalized. Indeed, to measure resources in comparable ways, we have suggested the development of a research protocol (Markle and Petersen, 1981). 168 THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY A Final Word

been neglected social theory research. and or in has We believe that neglect comes from theoretical. The misdirection. dialectical these difficulties. to model, which is knowledge based, is our attempt to ameliorate. Because it attempts to integrate traditional theory, it invites two approaches, both philosophical-empirical-based and criticisms. Though we welcome the one we are interested in the latter. The real test of the dialectical former, are particularly models whether they work. it And whether or not they work can only be judged by holding it up to the light of, and adjudicating with, historical and contemporary

A crucial element of social change and conflict, why and how definitions of deviance and crime. REFERENCES Barnes, Barry. 1974. *Scientific Knowledge and Sociological Theory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press. and the critique of Marxism on law and crime. " *Social Problems* 26: 373 Beirne, Piers. 1979. " Empiricism 85. Berger, Peter L. , and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City, N. Y. : Doubleday. Block, Fred. 1978. " The ruling class does not rule. " Pp. 128-40 in Richard Quinney, ed. *Capitalist Society: Readings for a Critical Sociology*. Homewood, Ill. : Dorsey. Bloor, David. 1976. *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Blumner, Herbert. 1962. " Society as symbolic interaction. " Pp. 179-92 in Arnold Rose, ed. , *Human Behavior and Social Processes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1971. " Social problems as collective behavior. " *Social Problems* 18: 298-306. —. Chambliss, William J. 1964. " A sociological analysis of the law of vagrancy. " *Social Problems* 12: 67-77. . 1974. " The state, the law, and the definition of behavior as criminal or delinquent. " Pp. 7-42 in Daniel Glaser, ed. *Handbook of*

Criminology. Bobbs-Merrill. Indianapolis: Collins, Randall. 1975.

Conflict Sociology: Toward An Explanatory Science. New York: Academic Press.

Conrad, Peter. 1975. "The discovery of hyperkinesis: notes on the medicalization of deviant behavior." Social Problems 23: 12-21. , and Joseph W. Schneider. 1980. Deviance and Medicalization: From Badness to Sickness. St. Louis: Mosby.

Davis, F. James. 1975. "Beliefs, values, power, and public definitions of deviance." Pp. 50-59 in F. James Davis and Richard Stivers, eds. , The Collective Definition of Deviance. New York: Free Press.

Davis, Nanette J. 1980. Sociological Construction of Deviance: Perspectives and Issues in the Field. 2d ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.

and morality: an organizational perspective on a moral crusade." Dickson, Donald T. 1968. "Bureaucracy Social Problems 16: 143-56.

Freidson, Eliot. 1970. Profession of Medicine. New York: Dodd, Mead.

Gallagher, John F. 1978. "The politics of systematic research error: the case of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics as a moral entrepreneur." Crime and Social Justice 10: 29-33. , and Allyn Walter. 1977. "The puzzle of the social origins of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937." Social Problems 24: 367-76.

Theoretical Methods in Social History. American Graft, Harvey J. 1980. Review of Arthur J. Stinchcombe, Journal of Sociology 85: 1442-46.

Gusfield, Joseph. 1963. Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. -. 1967. "Moral passage: the symbolic process in public designations of deviance." Social Problems 15: 175-88.

delinquency: social history, political ideology, and Hagan, John, and Jeffery Leon. 1977. "Rediscovering the sociology of law." American Sociological Review 42: 587-98.

Creating Deviance Rules 169



Hawkins, Richard, and Gard Tiedman. 1975. *The Creation of Deviance*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Jenkins, J. Craig, and Charles Perrow. 1977. "Insurgency and the powerless: farm worker movements (1946-1972)." *American Sociological Review* 42: 249-68.

Lauderdale, Pat, ed. 1980. *A Political Analysis of Deviance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. , and James Inverarity. 1980a. "From a political to political analyses of deviance." Pp. 15-44 in Pat Lauderdale, ed. , *A Political Analysis of Deviance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. . 1980b. "Afterword: suggestion for the study of the political dimensions of deviance definition." Pp. 221-37 in Pat Lauderdale, ed. , *A Political Analysis of Deviance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Levine, Harry Gene. 1978. "The discovery of addiction: changing conceptions of habitual drunkenness in America." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 39: 143-74.

McCrea, Frances B. , and Gerald E. Markle. 1981. "The estrogen replacement controversy in the United States and Great Britain: different answers to the same question?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social Studies of Science, Toronto.

Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. Translated by Louis With and Edward Shils.

New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Markle, Gerald E. , and James C. Petersen. 1980. *Politics, Science, and Cancer: The Latent Phenomenon*. Boulder, Colo. : Westview Press. , 1981. "Controversies in science and technology: a protocol for comparative research." *Science Technology and Human Values* 6: 25-30.

Markle, Gerald C. , and Ronald J. Troyer. 1979. "Smoke gets in your eyes: cigarette smoking as deviant behavior." *Social Problems* 26: 611-25.

J. Mauss, Armand L. 1975. *Social Problems as Social*

Movements. Philadelphia: B. Lippincott. Sociology6: 602-606. . 1977.

Reviewof social problemsbooks.

Contemporary , and Julie Camile Wolfe. 1977. This Land of Promises.

Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott. of Neuhring, Elaine, and Gerald E. Markle. 1974.

“ Nicotine and norms: the re-emergence a deviant behavior. ” Social

Problems21: 513-26. Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. Social Conflictand Social

Movements. EnglewoodCliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall. Pfohl, StephenJ. 1977. “

The discoveryof child abuse. ” Social Problems24: 310-23. Platt, Anthony M.

1969. The Child Savers: The Inventionof Delinquency. Chicago: Universityof

Chicago Press. 1974. “ The triumphof benevolence: the originsof the

juvenilejustice systemin the United States. -. Pp. 356-89 in RichardQuinney,

ed. , CriminalJusticein America. Boston: Little, Brownand Company. Ritzer,

George. 1975. Sociology: A MultipleParadigmScience. Boston: Allyn and

Bacon. Roby, Pamela A. 1969. “ Politics and criminallaw: revisionof the New

York State penal law on prostitution. ” Social Problems17: 83-109. Rose, Vicki

McNickle. 1977. “ The rise of the rape problem. ” Pp. 167-95 in ArmandL.

Mauss and Julie CamileWolfe, eds. , This Land of Promises. Philadelphia: B.

Lippincott. J. Social Schneider, Joseph W. 1978. “ Deviant drinkingas disease:

alcoholismas a social accomplishment. Problems25: 361-72. Schur, EdwinM.

1980. The Politics of Deviance: StigmaContestsand the Uses of Power.

EnglewoodCliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall. Smelser, Neil J. 1962. Theory of

CollectiveBehavior. New York: Free Press of Glencoe. Social Problems. Menlo

Park, Calif. : Cummings. Spector, Malcolm, and John T. Kitsuse. 1977.

Constructing Stinchcombe, ArthurL. 1978. TheoreticalMethods in Social

History. New York: AcademicPress. Robert G. Cushing, and CharlesG.

Bowman. 1977. "The antiZurcher, Louis A. , R. George Kirkpatrick, a pornography campaign: symbolic crusade. " Social Problems 19: 217-38.