**Differential Association theory**

This explanation of crime is very straight forward as it simply applies Social learning theory to crime. So we will not be doing this theory in class. Bring this completed to class for me to check.

First read pages 24 and 25 in the pack.

**A01**

1. Which one of the following is **not true** of differential association theory?

A – It is supported by experimental evidence

B – It is a sociological theory

C – It can explain how people’s attitudes become less favourable to a particular crimes

D – It involves learning processes such as reinforcement

E – It does not incorporate the contribution of inherited characteristics

1. Who proposed Differential Association theory?
2. DAT suggests offending behaviour can be explained entirely by Social Learning theory…
   1. What is learned?

B. Who is it learned from?

C. How is it learned?

1. What is needed to be able to make a prediction about the likelihood of offending behaviour?
2. Finally why is the theory called **DIFFERENTIAL ASSOCIATION** theory - what is the significance of these two words? Why is not just called social learning theory of crime?

**Application**

1. Lauren’s mother and facther divorced and Lauren and her mother had to move to the rough part of town to find cheaper accommodation. Initially Lauren found it difficult to make friends by then started hanging out with the ‘bad girls’ in the neighbourhood. Many of whom have been excluded from school. Lauren’s behaviour seems to go from bad to worse, and the visits from the police soon start after she is found selling stolen property at school.

**How can we explain Lauren’s behaviour is terms of Differential Association Theory?**

**Evaluation**

1. State 2 examples of criminal activity that can be explained well by DAT. State 2 examples of criminal activity that cannot be explained by DAT. What is this issue?
2. Why is Differential Association theory socially sensitive?
3. Which side of freewill v determinism debate would this explanation be on? Why is this problematic and why might this be advantageous?
4. Osborne and West (1979) found that 40% of sons of fathers with a criminal conviction had committed a crime before the age of 18, compared to 13% of sons of non-criminal fathers. How strong do you think this evidence is? Create a PEEL paragraph with this evidence as your first E.