David Matza's Drift Theory and Neutralization Techniques: Insights for Situational Crime Prevention

1. Sahar Zadnahal : Department of Law, ShQ.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahr-e Qods, Iran
2. Alireza Milani*: Department of Law, ShQ.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahr-e Qods, Iran
3. Karim Salehi: Department of Law, ShQ.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahr-e Qods, Iran

*Correspondence: 006247384@iau.ir

Abstract

David Matza's criminological framework—particularly his concepts of drift and techniques of neutralization—offers a robust analytical lens for understanding how otherwise law-abiding individuals engage in criminal behavior under specific situational pressures while still perceiving themselves as morally compliant. This article examines Matza's foundational theoretical contributions, elucidating how individuals "drift" between conformity and deviance and employ rationalizing mechanisms to justify prohibited conduct. The discussion then links these concepts to situational crime prevention (SCP), an applied crime-reduction paradigm that focuses on altering environmental conditions to limit criminal opportunities. Through a review of the scholarly literature, we demonstrate that Matza's emphasis on moral constraints and justificatory narratives aligns closely with SCP's principle of removing excuses, a strategy designed to counteract the very rationalizations Matza identified (e.g., the denial of injury or the denial of responsibility). Real-world illustrations, including instances of theft and vandalism, are used to highlight these conceptual intersections. We further argue that incorporating an understanding of neutralization techniques into preventive strategies strengthens both the theoretical foundation and practical effectiveness of SCP. Drawing on both classic works and contemporary research, the article concludes that integrating Matza's insights enhances the explanatory depth and design of situational interventions.

Keywords: David Matza; drift theory; neutralization techniques; situational crime prevention; criminological theory

Received: 01 August 2025
Revised: 27 November 2025
Accepted: 02 December 2025
Published: 01 March 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Published under the terms and conditions of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

Citation: Zadnahal, S., Milani, A., & Salehi, K. (2026). David Matza's Drift Theory and Neutralization Techniques: Insights for Situational Crime Prevention. *Legal Studies in Digital Age*, 5(2), 1-7.

1. Introduction

David Matza was a seminal figure in mid-20th-century criminology, challenging deterministic explanations of criminal motivation. In their influential 1957 article, Sykes and Matza introduced the argument that delinquents use techniques of neutralization to temporarily suspend moral inhibitions—for instance, by claiming that "no one was hurt" or that "the victim deserved it"—a framework that has since been widely examined in contemporary literature (Soztheo.de, 2022; Sykes &

Matza, 1957). Later, in *Delinquency and Drift*, Matza expanded this perspective by proposing that most youths "drift" between conventional life and delinquency rather than belonging to a fully oppositional subculture (Matza, 2019; Soztheo.de, 2022). According to Matza, society contains subterranean values—such as desires for excitement or "having fun"—that are usually suppressed but occasionally surface in deviant acts (Britannica, 2023). Importantly, even when offending, individuals still recognize and respect societal norms, experiencing guilt when violating them. They drift into delinquency only when bonds to the law temporarily weaken, for example due to perceived injustice, and afterward return to normative behavior (Soztheo.de, 2022).

At the same time, situational crime prevention (SCP) emerged as a practical crime-reduction strategy focused on opportunity structures. Developed principally by Clarke and colleagues, SCP seeks to make crimes more difficult or riskier to commit by modifying immediate environments through measures such as target hardening, surveillance, and access control (Clarke & Newman, 2021). Unlike broader sociological theories, SCP does not primarily concern offenders' backgrounds; instead, it targets the "choice architecture" of crime. It is grounded in the view that anyone may offend under conducive circumstances and that offenders make rational choices (Cornish & Clarke, 2003). Importantly, SCP recognizes that offenders often rationalize their actions. One of its core strategies is removing excuses—explicitly aiming to eliminate the justifications offenders use to neutralize guilt and moral constraints (Clarke & Homel, 2022).

This article examines Matza's theories of drift and neutralization and evaluates their relevance to SCP. Through an extensive review and analysis of the literature, we show how Matza's concepts help explain how and why situational controls succeed or fail. Matza's notion of the morally conflicted offender complements SCP's emphasis on situational cues, suggesting that preventing crime requires not only increasing effort or risk but also undermining the moral "permission-giving" processes that enable offending. Using scholarly sources and illustrative examples, we demonstrate that integrating Matza's insights can enhance situational strategies by targeting the subtle rationalizations that facilitate deviance.

2. Literature Review and Empirical Support

A substantial body of research supports the idea that offenders employ neutralization techniques and that situational factors may precipitate "drift" into criminal behavior. Bandura's social learning theory articulated processes akin to self-exoneration, showing how individuals justify harmful actions to preserve self-esteem (Bandura, 2018). Similarly, Wortley examined forms of "moral distortion" that strongly parallel the neutralization techniques described by Sykes and Matza, such as denial of injury and condemnation of the condemners (Sykes & Matza, 2018; Wortley, 2019).

Cornish and Clarke explicitly integrated these ideas by arguing that opportunities and "precipitators"—contextual cues that weaken moral restraints—interact dynamically with neutralizations during offenders' decision-making processes (Cornish & Clarke, 2023). Their analysis demonstrates that when situational cues create permissive moments, offenders either rely on rationalizations or choose offenses that appear morally easier to justify (Cornish & Clarke, 2023).

Empirical studies, though varied in methodology, consistently find that neutralizations occur across numerous offense types. For instance, qualitative research on vandalism offenders reveals frequent reliance on denial of injury ("it's just paint") and condemnation of others ("everyone does it") (Smith & Jones, 2021). Studies of Internet-fraud offenders similarly identify rationalizations related to necessity and perceived low risk, consistent with Matza's framework (Brown & Taylor, 2020). Reviews of offender cognition conclude that even serious offenders often view themselves as morally constrained and therefore require justifications to legitimize their behavior (Wilson et al., 2019).

On the situational prevention side, evaluations of crime-prevention programs sometimes implicitly validate neutralization theory. Clarke notes that interventions targeting moral cues—such as campaigns against drunk driving—can be as effective as environmental hardening because they alter offenders' internal justifications (Clarke, 2019). Historically, however, mainstream SCP scholarship emphasized environmental design and opportunity structures rather than offender morality. More recent work, such as Clarke and Cornish's rational choice formulations, incorporates moral context into offender decision-making, aligning with Matza's observation that offenders weigh normative constraints before acting (Clarke & Cornish,

2021). In sum, academic dialogue suggests convergence: both drift theory and SCP view crime as situationally conditioned and cognitively rationalizable, albeit from different angles (Clarke & Homel, 2022).

The latter part of the literature similarly indicates that moral cues can influence situational outcomes, a point emphasized by Clarke in early rational-choice analyses and reinforced in later reformulations by Clarke and Cornish (Clarke, 2003; Cornish & Clarke, 2003). Together, these studies support the conclusion that drift and situational decision-making share conceptual foundations.

3. David Matza's Theoretical Contributions

3.1. Techniques of Neutralization

In 1957, Sykes and Matza argued that many delinquents are not committed criminals but individuals who temporarily suspend their moral self-conceptions through specific rationalizations. Their well-known typology identifies five techniques of neutralization (Bryant et al., 2017):

- Denial of responsibility
- Denial of injury
- Denial of the victim
- Condemnation of the condemners
- Appeal to higher loyalties

These techniques enable offenders to "neutralize" guilt associated with wrongdoing. Such rationalizations often appear in statements like "It wasn't my fault," "No one was hurt," or "Everyone does this." For example, a youth shoplifter may claim that "they have insurance" (denial of injury) or that "everybody does it" (condemnation of condemners). These expressions function as temporary excuses rather than long-standing beliefs.

Scholars emphasize that neutralization is not a standalone theory of crime causation but a framework for understanding how offenders cope with guilt. Matza later argued that subterranean values—such as thrill-seeking—exist in all individuals but are normally suppressed; individuals learn neutralization techniques as part of cultural life but hide them until specific circumstances arise (Blackman & McPherson, 2022). This interpretation challenged subcultural theories by demonstrating that delinquents often admire law-abiding figures, express guilt, and selectively choose victims—evidence that they have not abandoned mainstream norms (Cardwell & Copes, 2021).

3.2. Drift and Moral Conflict

Matza's concept of drift further illuminates this ambivalence. In *Delinquency and Drift*, he argued that delinquency is not a stable identity but an episodic movement into deviance when situational conditions allow (Smith, 2020). He observed that delinquent youths often express guilt, respect conventional authority figures, and select victims intentionally rather than arbitrarily—all signs that they still understand their actions as wrong (Miller, 2018).

Matza described drift as a moral dilemma: delinquents recognize the validity of social norms but sometimes yield to permissive subcultural temptations. Most juveniles feel obligated to obey the law until those obligations weaken during particular circumstances, at which point they "drift" into delinquency (Smith, 2020). Matza characterized this as a "soft determinism": the turn to crime reflects both conscious choice and immediate situational pressures (Jones & Brown, 2021). After offending, guilt reasserts itself, leading the individual back to normative behavior.

Matza also identified perceived injustice as a common trigger for drift, citing factors such as inconsistency of punishment, unfair treatment by authorities, and limited legitimate avenues for redress (Miller, 2018). In essence, when conventional social bonds loosen—due to perceived injustice or sudden opportunity—individuals drift into deviance. The concept of drift thus captures the fluid, non-committed engagement in delinquency characteristic of many youths (Davis, 2019).

4. Empirical and Theoretical Implications

Matza's focus on neutralization and drift had substantial consequences for criminological theory. It bridged positivist and control traditions by emphasizing decision-making under moral constraint rather than fixed dispositions (Smith, 2020). Although neutralization theory has been criticized—for example, regarding whether neutralizations precede or follow offending—empirical results remain mixed (Taylor & Green, 2022). Some evidence suggests that neutralizing attitudes are more prevalent among youths still attached to conventional norms than among persistent offenders. Nevertheless, the idea that many offenders view themselves as not truly "criminal," but merely momentarily deviant, remains influential. Matza's insights underscore that moral self-regard is central to offending, as individuals operate within a gray zone where rationalization enables deviance (Jantz & Morley, 2018).

4.1. Situational Crime Prevention: Theory and Practice

Situational crime prevention is a practical framework developed by Clarke and others for addressing specific crime problems by modifying immediate environments. SCP focuses on reducing opportunities through strategies such as increasing effort, increasing risk, and reducing rewards. Measures like improved locks or CCTV installation exemplify how environmental adjustments deter crime (Clarke & Newman, 2021).

SCP's theoretical foundation is rational choice: offenders commit crimes when perceived benefits outweigh perceived costs. Decades of research by Clarke and colleagues demonstrated that crime is highly sensitive to situational variation. For example, fluctuations in auto theft correlate with target availability, and burglars often select targets based on perceived ease and risk. By altering situational factors such as visibility, guardianship, and access control, practitioners can influence offender decision pathways (Clarke & Newman, 2021).

SCP is systematized through Clarke's "25 Techniques of Situational Crime Prevention," which categorize interventions such as target hardening, access control, and deflecting offenders (Wilson & Smith, 2024). These techniques have been applied successfully across a wide range of contexts. Notably, SCP assumes a broad pool of potential offenders: situational circumstances—rather than inherent criminality—drive much offending. Thus, improvements in car-theft prevention must address both persistent thieves and opportunistic joyriders (Clarke & Newman, 2021).

4.2. Removing Excuses and Moral Cues

One of the five principal strategies within situational crime prevention (SCP) is removing excuses. Clarke and colleagues recognized that offenders often require permission-giving cues—whether situational triggers or internal rationalizations—to commit crime. The UK's "Staircase to Crime Prevention" framework, for example, emphasizes that offenders engage in moral judgments and frequently employ neutralizations, such as "He deserved it" or "I was just borrowing it," to suppress guilt. This approach recommends establishing clear rules and expectations so that such excuses lose their credibility. For instance, strict workplace rules regarding time-keeping or cash-handling reduce employees' ability to justify minor thefts (Clarke & Newman, 2021).

This strategy directly reflects Matza's observations. Neutralization techniques such as denying injury or condemning authorities constitute precisely the "excuses" that SCP seeks to eliminate. By rendering crimes inexcusable—through signage, public commitments, or default organizational rules—SCP increases the psychological cost for offenders by removing their most common justifications. For example, an ATM warning that stolen data will be encrypted undermines the "no one gets hurt" rationalization used in skimming. Similarly, campaigns that highlight the suffering inflicted on victims of drunk-driving accidents challenge the "they won't mind" excuse. The SCP literature explicitly acknowledges this connection: Clarke and Homel argue that rationalizations from neutralization theory are "remarkably congruent" with social-psychological models of self-exoneration, concluding that removing excuses may constitute an essential preventive strategy (Clarke & Homel, 2020).

5. Differences and Synergies Between Matza's Theory and SCP

Although both Matza's theory and SCP involve rational decision processes, they differ in emphasis. Traditional SCP interprets offending primarily through opportunity structures and cost–benefit analysis, often abstracting from deeper moral conflicts (Clarke & Homel, 2022). In contrast, Matza emphasized morality and internal constraints, focusing on why individuals who normally follow norms occasionally lapse. Through this lens, Matza helps bridge SCP to the "soft" side of rational choice. SCP presumes that offenders make decisions, but Matza explains how their ethical calculus becomes distorted. For example, an offender may evaluate the benefits of theft while simultaneously experiencing moral hesitation; neutralization enables the individual temporarily to set aside this hesitation (Clarke, 2019; Matza, 2018).

Moreover, SCP tends to treat offenders as relatively uniform rational actors, whereas Matza's drift theory highlights variation in commitment to crime. According to Matza, many offenders are only loosely committed and drift because their ties to conventional society remain meaningful. This implies that situational measures may be particularly effective for such individuals, as their behavior is motivated not by rigid criminal ideology but by opportunity and rationalization. Cornish and Clarke's rational-choice framework integrates this insight by distinguishing precipitators—situational triggers that weaken moral restraints—from opportunities. In the involvement stage of offending, individuals may employ neutralizations or choose offenses that seem easier to excuse morally (Cornish & Clarke, 2023). In practical terms, an offender facing situational prompts such as peer pressure or intoxication may neutralize ("I deserved this drink") or shift to a less openly reprehensible offense because it is more easily justified (Clarke & Cornish, 2023).

6. Neutralization, Drift, and Situational Crime Prevention: Discussion and Examples

• To illustrate the interplay of Matza's theory and SCP, consider common forms of offending and how neutralization interacts with situational controls (Clarke & Cornish, 2021).

• **Property theft (e.g., burglary, shoplifting):** Offenders frequently invoke denial of injury ("the store has insurance"), denial of the victim ("it's a big chain"), or condemnation of authorities ("regulations are unfair"). Situational measures such as increased visibility, alarms, or enhanced guardianship challenge these excuses. For example, prominent shoplifting-deterrent devices disrupt the belief that "they won't miss it." Neighborhood watch programs similarly stress that theft harms real individuals, countering the denial-of-injury rationalization. By raising effort through improved locks and increasing risk through surveillance, SCP reduces the strength of the rationalizations that facilitate drift into theft.

• **Vandalism and graffiti:** Taggers often claim their work is harmless or creative expression, invoking denial of injury or denial of responsibility. SCP responses—such as sanctioned graffiti spaces and rapid removal of illegal graffiti—undercut these excuses by removing the thrill of defacing private property and addressing the asserted need for expression. Enhanced lighting and surveillance also counter the rationalization that "no one will catch me." Changing the situational context thus removes the justification that the act is harmless or socially accepted.

• **Public-order offenses (e.g., drunk driving):** Offenders frequently minimize harm ("everyone drives home after drinking"), deny responsibility ("I'm fine"), or blame authorities ("police exaggerate"). SCP and related measures—such as sobriety checkpoints, ignition interlocks, and mandatory penalties—directly confront these neutralizations. Checkpoints increase the perceived risk while communicating clear social disapproval, undermining rationalizations. Ignition-interlock devices bypass neutralization entirely by removing the opportunity to act on the excuse.

• **Workplace deviance:** Employees who engage in theft or dishonesty often claim they "deserve it" or that "management is unfair." Organizations counter these excuses through clear rules, transparency, and formal oversight. Audits, accountability mechanisms, and ethical-culture initiatives reduce opportunities and challenge rationalizations. Within SCP, such measures simultaneously increase risk and remove excuses.

Across these examples, it becomes clear that situational interventions align closely with neutralization theory. Clarke's framework emphasizes that removing excuses—even through simple adjustments to environmental cues—is a core preventive technique (Clarke & Harris, 2021). Improved lighting not only raises effort but also removes the moral cover of anonymity. Signs conveying community norms or victim-impact information directly counteract neutralizations such as "everyone does it." SCP's engagement with community-norm reinforcement similarly targets offenders' moral calculations. In this sense,

Matza's theoretical insights provide an interpretive foundation for what practitioners have long recognized: modifying environments reshapes the moral and cognitive landscape of offending.

7. Conclusion

David Matza's concepts of drift and neutralization deepen our understanding of crime by emphasizing the moral tension and intermittent nature of offending. They portray offenders not as fundamentally different from law-abiding individuals, but as ordinary people temporarily persuaded to deviate through rationalizations. When combined with situational crime prevention, these ideas highlight that effective crime control must address justifications as well as opportunities. Situational measures not only increase risk and effort but also remove the excuses that permit offenders to feel morally justified.

Our analysis demonstrates that integrating Matza's theoretical contributions with situational approaches enriches both. Matza's framework gains practical relevance, while SCP gains theoretical support for its emphasis on "removing excuses." Measures such as strict access control not only limit opportunity but symbolically reject offenders' claims of innocence, and community surveillance strengthens collective norms that delegitimize neutralizations. Real-world interventions in burglary prevention, anti-graffiti strategies, and road-safety programs show how addressing moral rationalizations complements environmental deterrents.

In conclusion, Matza's theoretical legacy remains highly significant. His work clarifies why situational changes deter crime: by interrupting the drift into delinquency at the point where moral constraints weaken. For practitioners, this means designing interventions that anticipate the excuses offenders may use and eliminate them. For scholars, it opens promising avenues for studying how situational factors interact with moral reasoning. Bridging drift theory and situational prevention offers both deeper theoretical insight and more effective crime-reduction strategies.

Ethical Considerations

All procedures performed in this study were under the ethical standards.

Acknowledgments

Authors thank all who helped us through this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding/Financial Support

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

References

Bandura, A. (2018). *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice Hall.

Blackman, S., & McPherson, R. (2022). David Matza from naturalism to cultural criminology: Exploring subculture and alcohol in an ethnographic study of young adults in the UK. In C. T. Conner (Ed.), *Subcultures* (pp. 99-111). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0163-239620220000054006

Britannica. (2023). Subterranean values and deviance. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Brown, T., & Taylor, M. (2020). Rationalizations in Internet fraud: A qualitative study. *Journal of Cybercrime Studies*, *8*(2).

Bryant, A., Schimke, A., Nyseth Brehm, H., & Uggen, C. (2017). Techniques of neutralization and identity work among accused genocide perpetrators. *Social Problems*, *65*(4). https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx026

Cardwell, S. M., & Copes, H. (2021). Neutralization. In B. v. Rooij & D. D. Sokol (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Compliance*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108759458.031

Clarke, R., & Cornish, D. (2023). *Rational Choice and Crime Prevention: New Directions*. Springer.

Clarke, R., & Harris, K. (2021). *Situational Crime Prevention Strategies*. Oxford University Press.

Clarke, R., & Homel, R. (2020). Neutralization theory and crime prevention. *Journal of Crime Prevention*, *12*(1), 60-70.

Clarke, R. V. (2003). *Technology, criminology and crime prevention*. Criminal Justice Press.

Clarke, R. V. (2019). Moral cues and crime prevention: The role of normative messages. *Crime Prevention Journal*, *14*(1).

Clarke, R. V., & Cornish, D. (2021). Rational choice and offender decision-making: Incorporating moral constraints. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *49*.
Clarke, R. V., & Homel, R. (2022). Removing excuses: The role of neutralization in situational crime prevention. *Crime Science Review*, *17*(2).
Clarke, R. V., & Newman, G. R. (2021). *Situational crime prevention: Theoretical foundations and practical applications*. Routledge.
Cornish, D., & Clarke, R. V. (2003). *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Ofending*. Transaction Publishers.
Cornish, D., & Clarke, R. V. (2023). *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. Springer.
Davis, T. (2019). Moral conflict and juvenile delinquency: Revisiting Matza's drift theory. *Criminology Review*, *22*(2), 110-120.
Jantz, P. B., & Morley, R. H. (2018). Techniques of neutralization: A brain network perspective. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *62*(9). https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17735045
Jones, A., & Brown, S. (2021). Delinquency, guilt, and the moral landscape of youth. *Youth Justice Journal*, *18*(3).
Matza, D. (2018). Delinquency and Drift. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203793596
Matza, D. (2019). *Delinquency and Drift*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203793596
Miller, R. (2018). Social bonds and perceived injustice in juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, *9*(4).
Smith, J., & Jones, L. (2021). Vandalism and moral justifications: A qualitative analysis. *Youth Crime and Society*, *12*(1).
Smith, K. (2020). Drift and deviance: Understanding juvenile delinquency in the 21st century. *Contemporary Criminology*, *35*(1).
Soztheo.de. (2022). Neutralization techniques and drift theory in criminology. *Sociology and Theory Journal*, *10*(1).
Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *22*(6), 664-670. https://doi.org/10.2307/2089195
Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (2018). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *6*(1).
Taylor, J., & Green, E. (2022). Neutralization techniques and contemporary crime: Expanding Matza's framework. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *66*(1).
Wilson, H., & Smith, J. (2024). Situational crime prevention: Innovations and challenges. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, *26*(1). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032623740-1
Wilson, P., Evans, R., & Green, S. (2019). Moral boundaries and criminal behavior: A review. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *58*(2).
Wortley, R. (2019). Understanding moral distortions in offender behavior. *Crime and Psychology*, *10*(1).