

Gottfredson And Hirschi's Theory Comparison

Posted on October 11, 2022

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/gottfredson-and-hirschis-theory-comparison/>

Introduction

Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime and Sutherland's differential association theory explain offending from different starting points. The general theory asks why some people are more consistently attracted to immediate, simple, risky, or self-interested rewards and emphasizes self-control as a relatively durable individual characteristic. Differential association asks how people learn criminal techniques, motives, rationalizations, and definitions through interaction with others. One perspective therefore emphasizes regulation of immediate impulses, while the other emphasizes social learning within relationships. Neither theory requires the conclusion that crime has one universal cause, and contemporary criminology increasingly examines how individual characteristics and social environments interact over time. A person may select friends partly because of existing tendencies and then be influenced by those friends, while opportunity determines whether either process becomes a specific offense. The most useful comparison is therefore not a competition to identify a single "correct" theory. It is an analysis of what each mechanism explains well, where each becomes incomplete, and how self-control, peers, morality, opportunity, family, and wider institutions combine across development (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2024).

Self-Control, Immediate Reward, and Opportunity

Gottfredson and Hirschi argue that people with lower self-control are more likely to prefer immediate gratification, risk, simple tasks, and short-term benefit over delayed consequences. This concept should not be treated as an inborn criminal personality. The theory proposes a general propensity that can express itself through many risky behaviors, with crime occurring only when attractive opportunities are available. The existing Academic Master discussion of [low self-control](#) is therefore most accurate when it focuses on how people weigh immediate reward against future cost. A teenager may steal an unattended item because the reward is immediate and the chance of detection appears low, while the same person may refrain when supervision is strong. Contemporary research also complicates the early claim that self-control is essentially fixed by childhood. Relative differences can remain stable, but regulation can change with development, context, relationships, and intervention. Kammigan (2022) found that the effect of self-control varies with morality and situation across countries, supporting a probabilistic rather than deterministic interpretation of the theory.

Differential Association and the Learning of Crime

Sutherland's differential association theory proposes that criminal behavior is learned through communication in intimate groups. People acquire techniques for committing offenses as well as definitions that justify or condemn law violation, and the influence of a relationship depends on its frequency, duration, priority, and intensity. The theory is therefore more precise than the idea that "bad friends cause crime." A close and long-lasting relationship in which offending is normalized should matter more than brief exposure to a stranger or a media image. Modern social-learning research builds on this framework by examining reinforcement, imitation, peer networks, and definitions favorable to delinquency. The principal methodological problem is separating influence from selection. Adolescents with similar attitudes may choose one another before they reinforce the behavior they already share. Longitudinal evidence increasingly shows both processes. Peer association can shape conduct, but self-control, family relationships, school attachment, and existing behavior also influence who becomes a friend. Differential association remains valuable because it explains how crime becomes meaningful and teachable, not simply why a person might prefer an immediate reward.

Motivation, Peer Selection, and Reciprocal Effects

The deepest disagreement concerns whether crime requires a special learned motivation. Differential association assumes that social interaction can teach definitions favorable to law violation and provide practical knowledge or reinforcement. The general theory assumes that immediate rewards are widely attractive and asks why some people restrain themselves more effectively. The same offense can therefore generate different explanations. If a teenager steals with friends, differential association examines whether peers normalized theft, explained how to avoid detection, or rewarded participation. Self-control theory asks whether the teenager was already attracted to excitement and easy reward and then selected similarly inclined friends. Recent longitudinal work supports reciprocal relationships rather than a one-way process. Park, Peck, and Ray (2026) found that higher self-control predicted less association with delinquent peers while delinquent-peer association was also connected with later reductions in self-control among justice-involved youth. This evidence makes an integrated explanation more plausible: personal regulation shapes environments, environments reshape behavior, and opportunities determine when those tendencies become action.

What Each Theory Explains—and Misses

Self-control theory performs well when behavior involves impulsivity, immediate reward, weak planning, or risk, but it becomes less complete for offenses requiring patience, specialized knowledge, organizational cooperation, and delayed payoff. Corporate fraud, corruption, complex cybercrime, and long-running conspiracies may involve careful planning even when offenders discount moral or legal

consequences. Social-learning theory can explain how workplaces or networks teach techniques and rationalizations such as “everyone does it,” yet it also faces limitations because association does not prove causation and some crimes occur without strong deviant networks. Both theories can understate structural context if used alone. Neighborhood opportunity, policing practices, inequality, trauma, school exclusion, family resources, and legitimate employment shape the environments in which choices and peer relationships develop. Neither theory explains every offense equally well, and neither should be turned into a label predicting an individual’s future. Risk factors alter probabilities, not destiny. Theories are most useful when they identify testable mechanisms that can be compared with evidence rather than when they are treated as complete descriptions of a criminal person.

Prevention and an Integrated Contemporary Model

The theories lead toward different but compatible prevention strategies. A self-control perspective supports early family support, consistent nonviolent discipline, emotional regulation, problem solving, delayed gratification, school engagement, and environmental design that reduces easy opportunities for offending. Differential association supports mentoring, prosocial peer networks, family attachment, structured activities, and interventions that challenge definitions favorable to crime while rewarding lawful behavior. Simply removing a young person from one peer group may fail if the underlying environment and incentives remain unchanged, just as self-control training may have limited impact when a neighborhood offers few legitimate opportunities and repeated exposure to violence. Contemporary prevention therefore works best at several levels: individuals, families, peers, schools, communities, and justice institutions. Programs should be evaluated by outcomes rather than by theoretical loyalty. An intervention can strengthen self-regulation while simultaneously changing peer networks and opportunity. Theories provide different lenses for deciding where to intervene, but effective crime prevention rarely depends on only one mechanism because development is shaped by reciprocal relationships among the person and the social environment.

Conclusion

Gottfredson and Hirschi’s general theory of crime and Sutherland’s differential association theory remain influential because they explain different parts of the offending process. The general theory focuses on self-control, immediate reward, and opportunity, while differential association explains how techniques, motives, and definitions favorable to offending are learned through relationships. Modern evidence weakens any strict either-or interpretation. Self-control predicts delinquency across settings, yet its effect varies by context and can change over development. Delinquent peers matter, but peer effects are entangled with selection, family influence, morality, and prior behavior. Longitudinal findings showing reciprocal relationships between self-control and peer association illustrate why integration is analytically stronger than treating one factor as the sole cause. The comparison also has practical value because the theories identify different intervention points: emotional regulation and parenting, peer networks and mentoring, opportunity reduction, school

connection, and prosocial reinforcement. Each perspective is incomplete on its own, but together they help explain how individual regulation and social learning interact as people move through changing situations and relationships.

References

Enzmann, D. (2022). Michael R. Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi: *Modern Control Theory and the Limits of Criminal Justice*. *International Criminology*, 2, 98–101.

Kammigan, I. (2022). Reflecting on the interaction of self-control and morality in situational action theory. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2024). *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences* (8th ed.). SAGE.

Marshall, I. H., et al. (2024). Testing key concepts of three delinquency theories in a multi-national sample of adolescents. *Deviant Behavior*, 45(12).

Park, H., Peck, J. H., & Ray, J. V. (2026). Who influences whom? Examining self-control and delinquent peer dynamics among justice-involved youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 55, 2014–2029.

Ray, J. V., et al. (2024). Heterogeneity in the development of differential reinforcement. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*.

Walters, G. D., Kremser, J., & Runell, L. (2024). Does decreased parental support/bonding or increased peer deviance lead to a rise in delinquency in early adolescence? *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 22(3).