

CONTROLLING CRIME

In addition to studying crime, social theorists examine the control of crime. Key topics include the creation of criminal laws and the institutions for their enforcement, and the operation of the criminal justice system (e.g., policing, courts, and corrections). Interpretations of crime's control reflect theorists' assumptions about society and about crime: Conflict theorists criticize social control as a tool for protecting elite interests, while those who assign consensus a central role in societal organization tend to accept the need to control crime. Again, this literature is rich, with multiple competing theoretical paradigms for interpreting criminal justice.

— Joel Best

See also Anomie; Conflict Theory; Deviance; Socialization; Structural Functionalism; Urbanization

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Durkheim, Émile. [1895] 1982. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. New York: Free Press.
- Lilly, J. R., F. T. Cullen, and R. A. Ball. 2001. *Criminological Theory*. 3d ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paternoster, R., and R. Bachman. 2001. *Explaining Crime and Criminals*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

Critical pedagogy is a political project that attempts to change the power structures of everyday life, especially in cultural institutions such as those in education and the media. These changes are brought about through critique, resistance, and struggle. It aims to enable people to avoid manipulation and to empower them. Critical pedagogy is closely linked with the history of cultural studies and its democratic idea of a "long revolution."

The history of cultural studies shows that this project, with its intellectual and political nature, has since its beginning been closely linked to questions of education and pedagogy. This is because it originated in the vital and intellectually varied field of adult education in the 1950s in Great Britain. In productive exchange with mature students from working classes, Edward P. Thompson, Raymond Williams, and Richard Hoggart developed their creative ideas on cultural analysis. In the context of adult education, for example, in workers' education, the roles of professor and student were not so clearly defined by hierarchy as in university. These untraditional students who had been denied access to higher education did not accept as inevitable the authority of professors, but rather applied

what they learned to their own life, asked questions in class that had practical relevance to their own experience, and did not accept the borders between academic disciplines. These radical challenges not only made press, radio, and films, and so on themes alongside literature but also made it possible to bring students to view their own lives in the context of unequal social relationships. As a next step, it showed them ways in which their lives could be changed in order to create more social justice and equality. These institutions, alternatives to university, created a space for cultural studies in Great Britain.

In more recent studies, culture is described as a "network of embedded practices and representations (texts, images, talk, codes of behaviour, and the narrative structures organizing these)" (Frow and Morris 2000:316). Culture is the place where power relationships are legitimized but where they can also be challenged and changed. Cultural studies not only analyses but also has an interventionist character. Since the 1960s, the place of the working classes has been taken by new social movements, marginalized minorities, and oppressed groups whose agency ought to be increased by teaching them to socially contextualise their precise situation in life and to recognise and grasp opportunities to change.

THE WORK OF THE CCCS AND ITS PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) was first led by Richard Hoggart and later by Stuart Hall, who also came from the field of adult education and belonged to the New Left. Here, media studies, that is, the analysis of film, television, press, and so on, was an important topic. Questions of pedagogy, however, were explicitly dealt with only in passing, even when the centre became world famous for its studies of youth. There were two essential fields of research, the studies of youth with their model of incorporation and resistance, on one hand, and media research with its textual analysis critical of ideology, on the other. These do reveal characteristics that are relevant for critical pedagogy.

Thus, it is shown, both in the case of young people from the working classes as well as in the case of television viewers, that they are not "cultural dopes," but rather, they create their own culture in dealing with products or cultural texts available to them. Doubtless, in Birmingham, the focus lay on agency that is restricted by social conditions but is at least rudimentarily existent. Following Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony, popular culture becomes the "zone of contestation." The interdisciplinary investigations by cultural studies aim to increase autonomy by showing, for example, how news on television is structured ideologically and how it can be treated critically from the background of one's own interests.

Because the research has started from concrete questions with a practical relevance, it is not difficult to form links to the lives of those who have been examined. Thus, cultural studies does not limit itself to the analysis of cultural objects or institutions, but examines how people in different social contexts create and experience culture, and so return the focus to the strength to produce and the power to transform. Stuart Hall has shown that on a theoretical level, the cultural studies project develops between the paradigms of culturalism and structuralism, and this can be seen very clearly both in the studies of youth and in media studies. They make it clear that structures are not independent of history or constantly stable, but rather are always "structures-in-use," in which the uses cannot be defined in advance (Frow and Morris 2000:326). The interventionist motive of cultural studies, which aims for social change, implies critical pedagogy even if it is not clearly expressed. On the other hand, it is also understandable why supporters of these forms of critical pedagogy native to the United States and arising from examination of the tradition of Western Marxism (i.e., of the Frankfurt school), have taken up cultural studies since the 1980s. Before we turn to these approaches, because they are of particular relevance to our question, we should look more closely in the following section at an example of the further development in the United States of "audience ethnography" that was first initiated in Birmingham.

AUDIENCE ETHNOGRAPHY: POLYSEMIC TEXTS AND PLURAL FORMS OF USE

Hall's "encoding-decoding" model and the studies by David Morley that followed from it create the basis for a most fruitful and innovative approach to media research: the "audience ethnography." There was little discussion until this time on its pedagogic potential. Above all, it was John Fiske who emphasized the polysemic character of television programmes in order to reveal the heterogeneous potential of plural forms of appropriation. This was in his synthesising works at the end of the 1980s, which started from a deconstructive analysis of television. These forms of appropriation meant that the programmes were seen differently depending on the social and historical position of the viewer. Reception and appropriation of texts become, in his version, a context-based social practice in which texts are not messages sent out with a fixed meaning, but are given meaning on the basis of social experience in everyday life. Thus, on one hand, Fiske takes up the work of Birmingham and, on the other, Michel Foucault's division between power and resistance and Michel de Certeau's analysis of creative everyday practices. "Resistance" can arise in specific historical situations due to discursive structures, cultural practices, and subjective experience. In the cunning and artful use of resources, which are provided by the

(capitalist) system in the form of media texts and other consumables, the everyday participants try to give their own meaning to their living conditions and to express their own interests.

Above all, in his later analysis, Fiske (1994) dedicates himself to specific moments and locations of media use and defines the uniqueness and significance of cultural practices that are performed in a particular place at a particular time. This was a reaction to critics who accused him of assuming that every consumption of popular media would be potentially subversive. It seems sensible to define *resistance* as a possible outcome from popular texts, whereby we need to explain whether the subversive articulation of meaning remains limited to the specific context of the media reception or whether its effects develop into other areas of everyday life. However, the mobilised feelings and negotiated interpretations do not necessarily have to be organised in the sense of empowerment. Douglas Kellner (1995:39) emphasises in his criticism that differentiation needs to be made between the specific conditions of the various forms of resistance and their specific effects. Moreover, Larry Grossberg (1992) points out that it should be investigated how daily life is expressed on the whole with the politics of social formation. Pleasurable appropriation must not result in the disappearance of the preferred meanings dominating texts. Semiotic resistance must not flow into political practice.

Despite the partly justified criticism of "audience ethnography," this innovative field of research demonstrated clearly that the textual interpretation relevant to everyday life is realized in the text's social use. Admittedly, it partly ignores the fact that reception and appropriation in the postmodern media world and also the subjectivity of the consumers will be determined by various influences. Thus, the pedagogic interest of cultural studies is aimed primarily at those interpretations and pleasures that can help people to create their own meaning, express their interests, develop their "flight lines," and broaden their power to act. In this way, texts are integrated into the circulation of interpretations and affective energies within a culture. The political aim of cultural studies is at any time to produce connections between the individual moments of self-empowerment and the surrounding cultural and social processes. In this, it is also necessary to criticize the existing power relationships and to analyse the possibilities of social transformations. Above all, the approach to critical pedagogy developed in the United States is explicitly concerned with that political aim and with the production of a radical democracy.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AS CULTURAL STUDIES

The starting point for critical pedagogy in the United States at the beginning of the 1980s was the investigation of the education system carried out by Bourdieu/Passeron and

others, which shows how it contributes to social reproduction and to the maintenance of existing relationships. The supporters of this field critical of ideology did not limit themselves, however, to analysing social reproduction as a structural effect. In analysis of the theoretical and empirical works from Birmingham and in particular the analysis of the reception of Gramsci's hegemony concept and the studies of youth subcultures, schools were analysed much more as hegemonial places of practices, including rituals, ideologies, and lived experience. This was the case in particular in the fundamental work *Schooling as a Ritual Performance* (1986), by Peter McLaren. As Paul Willis showed, the experience of the social world is not deducible from external determinants, but rather, it is contradictory, varied, and changeable. Culture is the field in which structures are experienced, lived, reproduced, and yet also transformed. It is precisely here that the critical pedagogy begins that seeks to develop and support the pupils' critical powers to act in order to develop strategies of cultural and political resistance. Thus, there are many different positions. Here, we will primarily look at those that are closest to the cultural studies project and that link it to critical pedagogy.

In this way, Henry Giroux, one of the leading representatives of this synthesis, had already negotiated in his early work *Theory and Resistance in Education* (1983) between culturalism and structuralism in his efforts to introduce ideology critique to classroom practice. Moreover, the pupils are supposed to reflect in class on their own social experiences. In a process of learning through dialogue, they should first deconstruct their "self" by understanding it in the context of their social relationships. This is the precondition to become potential participants in the historical process and to change existing relationships through criticism and struggle. Giroux's pedagogy of resistance is aligned with the transformation of society and so is linked with hope, transcendence, and utopia.

An intensive treatment of poststructuralist, postmodern, and postcolonial approaches within cultural studies led Giroux (as well as Peter McLaren) gradually to a transformation of his own approach. Today, he presents a critical pedagogy that is explicitly directed at cultural studies. This links the politics of difference with a demand for a radical democratisation of society. On one hand, he emphasises the important significance of cultural studies for the understanding of education, culture, and politics. Thus, his efforts are to make pedagogy an essential part of cultural studies. On the other hand, Giroux criticises the "textualist readings" and the "audience studies" that limit themselves to the analysis of the enthusiastic, subversive use of media. Therefore, he emphasises, for example, in an analysis of the Disney empire, that while many Disney texts do encourage opposing versions, this however does not destroy its power "to monopolize the media and saturate everyday life with its own ideologies" (Giroux 1999:7). Thus, the audience

studies can learn from critical pedagogy that creative and subversive interpretations during reception and appropriation are not enough to better realize democracy.

Critical pedagogy, above all, makes the negotiation and the production of meaning between teachers and pupils its theme, which they critically analyse in the context of discursive practices and power/knowledge relationships. In the age of neoliberalism and increasing privatisation of public spaces, we need to develop an ethic reflecting the relationship between power, the subordinated position of the subject, and social practices. "Critical pedagogy commits itself to forms of learning and action that are undertaken in solidarity with subordinated and marginalized groups" (Giroux and McLaren 1995:32). Starting from contemporary social conflicts, the ethical discourse should not only recognise (ethnic) differences but also show how justice is possible. Furthermore, the learners should examine the multitude of narrations and traditions, which are typical of today's multicultural society, and understand history and their own subjectivity as a place of social struggles. Therefore, students should learn to understand how "conflictual social relations" have determined their habitus. "The task of critical pedagogy is to increase our self-consciousness, to strip away distortion, to discover modes of subjectivity which cohere in the capitalist body/subject and to assist the subject in its historical remaking" (McLaren 1995:74). In this way, the agency of the student should be expanded. On one hand, critical pedagogy is a cultural practice; on the other, it is a form of social memory. This is particularly clear in the "postmodern counternarratives" project in which cultural studies is itself described as a "counternarrative" that rejects the technocratic and market-orientated rationality of teaching and learning in favour of a democratic appropriation of knowledge and cultural texts. This also leads to a pointed criticism of the "corporate university."

Among various political viewpoints, critical pedagogy also leads to an examination of existing theories, which are newly read and reformulated so they can be directed to the specific question. As in Birmingham, borders between disciplines can thus be broken down in order to produce new forms of knowledge that allow more democratic and more just ways of life. Here, critical pedagogy must research a language of political and moral possibilities that overcomes the ironic nihilism and cynicism of postmodern sensibility (Grossberg 1992) and leads to political participation. The promotion of "multicultural literacy" is a matter of particular concern in this. Cultural studies, with its focus on everyday experiences and practices, analyses the conditions of empowerment and creates therefore a basis for practical cultural politics. Therefore, children and young people, who are increasingly socialised by the commercial consumer culture, should, above all, develop a critical agency, acquire cooperative relationships, and direct themselves by democratic values (Giroux 2001).

Popular culture is a focus of the critical pedagogy orientated by cultural studies, in particular the analysis of popular films. Therefore, Giroux reveals the characteristics of the pedagogy of Hollywood in deconstructive and critical analysis. He examines the media politics of representation by analysing the discourse and images of race, gender, class, and sexuality. Thus, he shows, for example, how the media representations of African Americans have produced "a white moral panic." Giroux (2002) is interested in how films and other media texts mobilise meaning, enjoyment, and identification, which influence the construction of social realities and one's own definition of oneself. In this way, popular films present a pedagogic space in an "image-saturated culture."

Here, Giroux coincides with the critical media pedagogy, which Kellner follows in his works on media culture. Kellner also ties up with British cultural studies. However, above all, he links with the Frankfurt school because he feels it is necessary to consider the area of production and the political economy of culture. On the other hand, he strives for a cultural critique that theoretically expresses the present moment in history and thus reveals its utopian possibilities. A critical media pedagogy should empower the viewer to decode the messages, ideologies, and values in media texts, in order to escape manipulation and be able to develop one's own identity and forms of resistance. In addition, it should initiate and support politically engaged media activism in order to produce alternative forms of culture and counter public spheres, which are of decisive significance in a living democracy (Kellner 1995:337). Here, above all, the pedagogic work of teachers and other "cultural workers" is needed. They should introduce their knowledge and competence to win back public spaces and to create a culture of participation and of active citizenship. By acquiring media literacy in a context of dialogue based on cooperation, understanding of other cultures and subcultures can be awakened and deepened. Admittedly, a deconstruction of the social and political idea of "whiteness" is also part of this. It should be shown that the white cultural practices are limited and historically produced. By individual and collective acts, they are potentially transformable.

In particular, the new media demand the development of new forms of "media literacy" that are appropriate for the interactive fields of computers and multimedia. "Multiple literacies involve reading across varied and hybrid semiotic field and being able to critically and hermeneutically process print, graphics and representations, as well as moving images and sound" (Kellner 2002:96). Kellner is of the view that critical pedagogy directed toward cultural studies must help students in the new millennium precisely in the field of cyberspace. Students need help to develop their own spaces and forms of interaction in order to realize the project of a radical democracy.

Peter McLaren follows another direction. As a reaction to the post-Fordist economy, he requires again in connection

with the works of Paulo Freire, Gramsci, and Marx a "critically revolutionary pedagogy." It should protect and demand variety and creativity of human action in the era of neoliberal globalisation. To be able to counter that market ideology, McLaren feels it is necessary to once more incorporate and deepen the Marxist analysis of society and the education system.

It must be emphasized that the interests of cultural studies are aimed at a criticism of power and an art of autonomous and creative agency (Winter 2001), which can develop, for example, in the productive and creative examination of media and other cultural forms in everyday contexts. Cultural studies do not proclaim the end of the subject, but rather address a strengthening of "agencies," of the ability to create their own meaning by interpreting their social situation and themselves. As the works of Giroux, Kellner, McLaren, and others show, media and cultural analysis in the framework of cultural studies should always be integrated with critical pedagogy that opposes the implicit pedagogy of media texts and seeks to intensify or just make possible a productive confrontation. Thus, everyday life is defined as "contested terrain" that should be opened onto collective dialogue so that many different voices can express themselves in order to produce a more democratic and just society.

— Rainer Winter

See also Cultural Marxism and British Cultural Studies; Cultural Studies and the New Populism; Hall, Stuart; Hollywood Film; Public Sphere

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Fiske, John. 1994. "Audiencing. Cultural Practice and Cultural Studies." Pp. 189–98 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frow, John and Meaghan Morris. 2000. "Cultural Studies." Pp. 315–46 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2d ed., edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Giroux, Henry A. 1999. *The Mouse That Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2001. *Public Spaces, Private Lives. Beyond the Culture of Cynicism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2002. *Breaking in to the Movies. Film and the Culture of Politics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Giroux, Henry A. and Peter McLaren. 1995. "Radical Pedagogy as Cultural Politics: Beyond the Discourse of Critique and Anti-Utopianism." Pp. 29–57 in *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era*, edited by Peter McLaren. New York & London: Routledge.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. 1992. *We Gotta Get Out of This Place. Popular Conservatism and Popular Culture*. New York & London: Routledge.

- Kellner, Douglas. 1995. *Media Culture. Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics between the Modern and the Postmodern*. New York & London: Routledge.
- . 2002. "New Media and New Literacies. Reconstructing Education for the New Millennium." Pp. 90–104 in *Handbook of New Media: Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs*, edited by Leah H. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLaren, Peter. 1995. *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Winter, Rainer. 2001. *Die Kunst des Eigensinns. Cultural Studies als Kritik der Macht*. Weilerswist, Germany: Velbrück Wissenschaft.

CULTURAL CAPITAL

The late Pierre Bourdieu, one of the leading French social thinkers of the twentieth century, developed the concept of "cultural capital" to explain the ability of elite managers and professionals to transmit their privileged status to their children, a process he referred to as "social and cultural reproduction." By "social and cultural reproduction," Bourdieu referred not only to the intergenerational reproduction of family status but also to the reproduction, first, of larger systems of social inequality and, second, of systems of cultural hierarchy (for example, the prestige of high-culture genres such as ballet and classical music compared with chorus lines and hip-hop).

Bourdieu was an abstract thinker with a gift for concrete social analysis. Like his other concepts, cultural capital has both a general definition and specific referents. Most abstractly, cultural capital comprises familiarity with and easy use of cultural forms institutionalized at the apex of a society's cultural hierarchy (for example, orthodox religious doctrines in a theocracy). In his work on contemporary France, Bourdieu used "cultural capital" to refer to familiarity with prestigious aesthetic culture, such as the high arts, literary culture, and linguistic ability. Such "high culture" is often produced by artists who eschew commercial values and claim to pursue art for art's sake. In many countries, it is distributed by nonprofit or public institutions. And its status is ensured by substantial public and private investment in school and university curricula that celebrate it, as well as high-culture programming in libraries and broadcast media and, in many countries, direct government support for high-culture artists and cultural institutions. Consequently, compared with other forms of prestigious knowledge, familiarity with the arts (or an understanding that such familiarity is a sign of distinction) tends to be nearly universal, cross-cutting boundaries of

region, gender, or profession. The precise content of cultural capital, however, differs from society to society (e.g., in Japan, cultural capital includes knowledge of Noh Theatre and tea ceremonies).

Bourdieu asked how high-status people with relatively little personal wealth, for example, managers of publicly held corporations or professionals such as lawyers, doctors, and university professors, are able to pass down their privileged positions to their children. Before the rise of the manager-control firm, transmission of privilege was easy: The owner of a business simply bequeathed it to his (very rarely her) children. Once businesses passed into the hands of shareholders, direct transmission was no longer practical. Instead, Bourdieu argued, families transform their economic capital into "cultural capital" by exposing children to prestigious culture from early childhood on, through household conversations, lessons, and visits to museums and performing-arts events. Thus trained, children possess what Bourdieu called "embodied cultural capital": cultural capital built into their ways of seeing and their schemes of evaluation, which they carry with them wherever they go. (Bourdieu also wrote of "linguistic capital," the ability to speak with confidence, correctness, and grace, which may be regarded as a form of cultural capital.)

When children from privileged backgrounds go to school, their teachers mistake this embodied cultural capital for intelligence or giftedness. Thus, they convert their cultural capital into good grades, encouragement, and admission into competitive academic programs. Success in school facilitates success in later life, especially with completion of university training, at which point embodied capital is supplemented by the *credentialed cultural capital* of degrees and diplomas. (Bourdieu also wrote of "objectified cultural capital," or books, paintings, musical scores, and other physical objects that one needs embodied cultural capital to appreciate, but this plays a less important role in his theory.) After completing schooling, children from high-status families "reconvert" their cultural capital back into economic privilege, completing the circuit of reproduction. Cultural capital remains useful after school, however, enabling its possessors to establish comfortable relations with potential patrons, employers, or marital partners.

In advanced capitalist societies, Bourdieu argued, cultural capital is most important for those members of the "dominant class" (owners of capital, high-level managers, and credentialed professionals) with the least economic capital. Scions of the wealthiest families, he argued, can afford to be casual in their approach to schooling and culture. By contrast, lower-income professionals (educators or librarians, for example) rely almost exclusively on their ability to transmit cultural capital (and with it, school success and an agreeable personal style) in order to ensure their children's success. Bourdieu thus portrayed the "dominant class" as an inverted pyramid: Those with the most

Encyclopedia of SOCIAL THEORY

VOLUME I

EDITOR
GEORGE RITZER
University of Maryland, College Park

A SAGE Reference Publication

 **SAGE Publications**
Thousand Oaks ■ London ■ New Delhi

Copyright © 2005 by Sage Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information:



Sage Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
E-mail: order@sagepub.com

Sage Publications Ltd.
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP
United Kingdom

Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
B-42, Panchsheel Enclave
Post Box 4109
New Delhi 110 017 India

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Encyclopedia of social theory / George Ritzer, editor.
p. cm.

Sage reference.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7619-2611-9 (cloth : acid-free paper)

1. Sociology—Philosophy—Encyclopedias. I. Ritzer, George.
HM425.E47 2004
301'.01—dc22

2004003251

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

04 05 06 07 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

<i>Acquisitions Editor:</i>	Jerry Westby
<i>Production Editor:</i>	Denise Santoyo
<i>Copy Editors:</i>	Carla Freeman Barbara Coster Linda Gray
<i>Typesetter:</i>	C&M Digital (P) Ltd.
<i>Indexer:</i>	Kathy Paparchontis
<i>Cover Designer:</i>	Michelle Lee Kenny