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I) REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF CAUSES

For the present study, account for the factors responsible for the habitual crime, socio-economic, geographical and psychological theories dealing with the structural, functional, environmental and situational aspects of the society responsible for the different types of the crime have been referred to research studies and theories relating to the role of family, neighbourhood, association, different social economic factors, sources of instigation and motivation in the commission of the crime and alternate treatment methods for the reformation and rehabilitation of the criminals have been taken as guide to provide sufficient and useful theoretical background for purpose of the present work.

The Search for the causes:

Scholars have sought to explain the crime for many years. Prior to Eighteenth century the explanation tended to be demonological (possession by an evil spirit) or naturalistic (an affected brain). During the Eighteenth century the so called classical school of criminology emerged. Its main exponents were Beccaria (Italy, 1735-1795) and Bentham (England, 1748-1832) The classical school was based on rationalism according to which man enters into a certain relationship with his fellowmen (the contract theory of society). He was presumed to have, innately, the power to choose right from wrong. The pleasure pain theory of man's action (Hedonism) was also incorporated into the Theories of the Classical School of Criminology. Man's Behavior was believed to be guided by what brought him pleasure. He was supposed to turn away from the things, which brought him pain and punishment. One readily recognizes that modern criminal law is based the presumption that man has the power to choose right from wrong (unless he is insane at the time of commission of the deed).
As the various disciplines began to grow, particularly biology, anthropology, sociology, psychiatry, psychology, and statistics the explanation soon shifted from rationalism to causes which exist in heredity, constitutional and psychological make up of individuals as well as the causes which exist in the physical and social environment of man. At one point in the early nineteenth century the geographers became impressed with the variation of crime according to climatic conditions. Such a theory became known as the “Thermal theory”, according to which crimes against persons were considered to be induced by hotter climates and crimes against the property by colder climates. Beginning from 1830, when statistical reporting on crime became a part of Governmental function, several statistics became impressed with the variation in the crime rates by various sections or provinces of the European countries and called attention to the variations in socio-economic conditions which seemed to cause high or low crime rates. Towards the end of Nineteenth century statistically oriented researchers related the yearly fluctuations in the volume of crime with the early fluctuations in the price of grains, when price of grains was high, there was a high volume of crime, when low, a low volume of crime.

The causes of the crime are beyond man’s control, external as well as internal crime undermine his capacity to choose between right and wrong and represents the thinking of the so-called school of positivism. The positivist theory maintains that environmental and psychological forces determine all human behaviour and that an understanding of these forces will provide an understanding of entire human behaviour. Positivism denies that free will can change the course of events, determined as they are by forces beyond man’s control.

Modern thinkers have tended to “soften” the determinism of the early positivists. They do not view Human behaviour as completely and externally determined. In so far as the self of the individual is accorded the capacity to guide and steer his behaviour, he retains the power to direct himself, to choose between
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The causes of the crime are beyond man's control, external as well as internal crime undermine his capacity to choose between right and wrong and represents the thinking of the so-called school of positivism. The positivist theory maintains that environmental and psychological forces determine all human behaviour and that an understanding of these forces will provide an understanding of entire human behaviour. Positivism denies that free will can change the course of events, determined as they are by forces beyond man's control.

Modern thinkers have tended to "soften" the determinism of the early positivists. They do not view Human behaviour as completely and externally determined. In so far as the self of the individual is accorded the capacity to guide and steer his behaviour, he retains the power to direct himself, to choose between
alternatives and to make decisions. This self-direction is not exactly the same as free will (as the power to choose right from wrong), but it is something close to it. Matza in dealing with his Theory of Drift, in which the will is influenced by psychological techniques of neutralizing the infractious nature of behaviour (by rationalizing oneself out of moral dilemma, for example) makes the point that his theory embraces "soft determinism" as opposed to the earlier "hard Determinism".

**Sociological Factors**

Sociologists view crime as a social phenomenon and attempt to explain criminal behaviour in the terms of social structure or social processes by which an individual becomes a criminal. At the very outset it must be accepted that any sociological theory accounting for the existence of crimes in general cannot explain the appearance of the criminal behaviour in particular person. The theories can only suggest general motives, but never explain why 'x' steals and 'y' do not. This implies, however imperative, profound and true may be the social conditions, they cannot fall with equal effect on all the members in the community.

**Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)**

Durkheim develops his sociological arguments and discussions as follows; Are criminals and their actions relatively normal or relatively abnormal in relation to their culture of origin? How does crime originate in society? Emile Durkheim attempts to answer these questions.¹ Durkheim defines crime as a punished or punishable act and it is the social reaction to the act rather than the act itself, which determines whether or not the act is criminal. He argues that crime is normal in society and a society without crime and delinquency cannot exist because the fundamental conditions of social organization logically imply crime as well. According to him crime is not due to any imperfection of human nature or society. He says that if society is to be free from crime, it necessitates a standardization of moral concepts of all individuals. This is neither possible nor desirable.
Crime, according to Durkheim, is normal in the society's framework. Normality is always relative to a given social organization. 'Normal' defines what is ordinary and typical in a given social framework, because what is pathological in one society may be normal in another. Also, there are some 'morbid' conditions in all societies and therefore it is undesirable to have a society without being abnormal. According to Durkheim, crime is not pathological, rather it is normal and inevitable. Moreover crime is a way through which the individuality expresses itself the originality and the creative genius being expressed by a criminal just like a scientist in this field. Durkheim observes that in-spite of the originality, it is an undesirable expression. Still crime is desirable for the simple reason that it does a lot of social functions. Durkheim says that crime is normal, necessary and useful. Durkheim's view is unique and therefore its explanation failed to receive wide acceptance among criminologists.

Durkheim made Anomie (means Lawlessness) an integral part of criminal sociology and wanted to explain crime in-terms of anomie. He says that social cohesion or social solidarity is one of the most prominent characteristics of primitive societies. Social solidarity means to him 'collective conscience'. There are two types of social solidarity i.e. mechanical and organic. Primitive societies are having mechanical Solidarity for no one in such societies is allowed to go against the collective conscience. But as time passed on, societies became more and more complex with the result that the emphasis in law shifted from collective conscience to the individual wrongs. As a result, the law became restitute. This shift is called the shift from 'mechanical solidarity' to 'organic solidarity'. As an outcome of the shift to organic solidarity, increasing heterogeneity creeped into the society. As a result, the traditional values and methods of social control became ineffective. Individuals started facing more social isolation, loneliness and loss of identity. This state of affairs is known as 'Anomie' in Durkheim's view. In a state of anomie, crimes and anti-social acts will flourish -Durkheim said.
Robert Merton's Anomie.

Merton’s says, “Some unknown but substantial proportion of deviant behavior does not represent impulses of individuals breaking through social controls but on the contrary, represents socially induced deviations-deviations which the culture and the social organization conjoin to produce.” Merton speaks of two major elements of social and cultural structures i.e., the culturally defined goals which people are supposed to pursue and the social structure that regulates or controls the acceptable modes or means for the pursuit of goals and interests.

Merton’s thesis is that the cultural system of a society enjoins its members to strive for success goals by means of certain normatively regulated or approved forms of behaviour. At the same time opportunity to reach these goals through socially approved means are unequally distributed. In such situations, Merton says, “It is only when a system of cultural values extols, virtually above all else, certain common success goal’s for the population at large while the social structure rigorously restricts or completely closes access to approved modes of reaching these goals, for a considerable part of the same population, that deviant behavior ensures on a large scale.”

Merton speaks of conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism and rebellion as the five modes of adaptation to the situation of disjunction. Criminologists are especially interested in ‘Innovation’ for it refers to cases in which people continue to aspire to approve goals, but by means of deviant or illegitimate techniques. ‘Innovation’, according to Merton, represents the acceptance of the goals, but the rejection of the means for reaching the goals. For example, Merton speaks of poor people who normally do not achieve high status in terms of power and income because of their low status and income. They may therefore, turn to deviant behavior. Merton thus presents a sociological theory of deviance. He explains in terms of the nature of society rather than the nature of the individual.
Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin

Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin developed the 'anomie' theory further. They argue that Merton has only dealt with half the picture. He has explained deviance in terms of 'legitimate opportunity structure' but failed to consider the 'legitimate opportunity structure'. They begin their explanation of working class delinquency from the same point of view as Merton that is, there is greater pressure on members of the working class to deviate because they have less opportunity to succeed by legitimate means. Cloward and Ohlin have distinguished three possible responses to this situation, 'the criminal sub-culture', 'the conflict sub culture', and 'the retreatist sub culture'. The development of one or the other of these responses by young people depends on their access to and performance in terms of illegitimate opportunity structure. Cloward and Ohlin in their explanation on delinquent gangs consider deviance as normal, non pathological responses by certain segments of society to existing social (environment) circumstances. A person resorts to deviant behavior because socially acceptable ways of doing things do not produce the desired results. Given this deficiency, the normative rules are irrelevant. They are meaningless, they don't apply a condition of anomie or meaninglessness exists.

People are thus encouraged to deviate. According to Cloward and Ohlin however the specific form of gang delinquency that emerges depends on the community. That is, they contend that whether a delinquent gang normally engages in criminal activities i.e. theft, conflict i.e. fighting or 'retreatist' (engaging principally in drug use), depends on the gangs community and the values of the gangs members.

Culture Theories.

The classic meaning of culture is "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art morals, law custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". In the broader sense culture is man's
entire social heritage. A man who grew up apart from human association would lack culture because he had not communicated with other men and would, therefore, not share the knowledge of earlier generations. He would, however, solve problems and learn from experience, as do other animals.\textsuperscript{8} Culture shows the existence of society and provides the necessary skills for making society work. “A culture refers to the distinctive way of life of a group of people, their complete design for living”.\textsuperscript{9} 

Sociologists are keenly interested in that part of culture which defines the norms and standards for human behavior. “What must be done, ought to be done, should be done, and must not be done.”\textsuperscript{10} 

Although a culture is a “complete design for living”, no one fully masters all of the knowledge and skills nor is motivated by all the values of any culture, however simple. The culture is learned on selective basis only. The individual selects and learns some aspects of his culture because of his sex, his age, the group into which he lives. However, he shares many other ways of doing things with all members of his society because of their common culture. The individual must learn what of the “blue-print of behaviour” applies to him and what he can avoid with immunity. He will become a human being as a member of society, and the kind of human being he becomes depends to a large extent on the culture of which he is a part.

\textbf{Cultural Lag}

In 1922, William F. Ogburn in his theory of social Change\textsuperscript{11} has pointed out that social changes always follow inventions, the creation of new material products or new ways of doing things. Most inventions, according to Ogburn, are technological, and each new development brings with it a disruption in the social system as people learn to adjust to new item or technique. This strain produced in the existing social order by a new invention is called cultural lag.
Or, when a change occurs in the material culture of a society, non material culture must adapt to that change, frequently this rate of change is uneven resulting in a gap between the two sociologists, William F. Ogburn referred to this disparity as cultural lag gap between the technical development of a society and its moral and legal institutions.

Ogburn emphasized that changes in material conditions (especially in the physical environment) and in things\(^\text{12}\) (including houses, factories, raw-materials, and other objects) often out distance the ways of using these things and adapting to these conditions. The ways of adjustment may be called the adaptive culture, which includes wholly adaptive elements, such as Technical routes, and partly adaptive elements, such as the folkways and mores.

Although, Ogburn’s theory has enjoyed popularity the concept of cultural lag, however interesting may be perhaps over simplifies the situations.

**Cultural Conflict Theory**

Thorsten Sellin analyzed crimes in terms of conflicts among norms.\(^\text{13}\) He argued that the ‘conduct norms’ are defined by the groups to which the individual belongs. The major difference between the criminal and non criminal is that they have responded to different ‘conduct norms’. A conduct norm is a rule, which prohibits a specific individual from acting in a certain manner in a certain situations. A criminal is responding to values that are outside the major norm systems of this society are in conflict with them. The question here is why an individual brought up in a single culture responds to values, which are external or intrinsic to it? The sociologists answer to this question is that in all societies there arise value systems that are naturally contradictory and are therefore inconsistent. The sociologists will call this phenomenon as ‘cultural conflict’. Hence the conflict between conduct norms results from cultural conflicts.
Cultural conflicts according to Sellin, can be in two forms, Primary and Secondary. The primary cultural conflict results when the norms and value system of different cultures clash each other, secondary cultural conflict grows out of the process of social differentiation, which characterizes the evolution of once own culture. Since majority of crime are committed by native born it is this type of cultural conflict, which must be viewed as dominant social cause of crime.

Sub-Culture theories

The subculture theories explaining the criminal behavior concentrate on the sub culture of a particular, “social class” Thrasher saw that the gangs developed as a result of social disorganization in the zone of transition. He studied 1313 gangs in Chicago and learnt that innocent play groups came into conflict over space in the crowded and physically deteriorated areas of the inner city. The gang was found to be the result of the social disorganization of the slums. Sub-culture theories emphasize the fact that delinquent behavior in a social class is sanctioned by the sub culture which prevails in that group.14

Albert Cohen developed further the sub culture theories in understanding delinquent behavior.15 The contention of his theory is that boys from the lower class accept the goals of the middle class. Often, they cannot attain the middle class goals by social approved means .The lower class boys have only limited aspirations and as such they find themselves deprived in terms of status as compared with middle class norms. But they cannot usually achieve this. The result is that they experience terrific adjustment problems, and feeling, of a low self-esteem. In order to face these problems, lower class boys develop a sub-culture of their own. The subculture is thus a type of response to the frustrations, the lower class boys experience as they measure themselves and are measured by others in-terms of middle class expectations of the society within this subculture. Cohen says the activities are non-utilitarian, malicious, negativistic, versatile and characterized by short run hedonism and group autonomy. Cohen is not trying to
explain through his theory how a particular boy becomes delinquent rather he is explaining the development of a delinquent sub culture in his theory.

**Ecological Theory**

The study of ecology is concerned with the distribution and relationship of certain phenomena of their environment. The ecologist attempts to explain crime as a function of social change that occurs along with environmental change. Such studies were abundant at the Universities of Chicago during the 1920's and 1930's.16

Human ecology deals with the relations of people to their various reactions to the various environmental stresses and strains. They attempt to study how people learn ways of behavior that are appropriate to their immediate milieu and incorporate them to a set of sociological norms that are fixed as standards for society as a whole.17

The basic assumptions, which the ecologist have are,

1. A person leaves in a geographical region.
2. The area in which he functions, in which he does things, in which things happen to him may be very small, limited to his neighbourhoods of his apartment.
3. For all practical purposes, an individual's effective environment and his milieu may be defined as the area within which significant things happen.
4. Things or condition within the area which do not affect a man or do not make any particular difference in his behaviour can, for all practical purposes, be considered outside his milieu even though they may be close to him.
5. Conversely, conditions or events entering his area from without our decisively affecting him can be considered to be within his milieu even though they may have originated at distant points.
The development of these complex ideas of milieu from an essentially geographical concept of ecology was the achievement of the group of sociologists known collectively as 'Chicago school'. When studied, Chicago school, exhibited five clearly demarcated zones such as 1) Central business district 2) Industrial zones 3) A zone of working men’s houses 4) Better residential zone and 5) A commuters zone inhabited by the more well to do people.

From the study, it was made clear that economic and occupational forces segregate the population in the city of Chicago. The poor people were found to live in zone 2 and they represented the basically unskilled workers. A breakdown in the usual institutional methods of social control took place with the result that crime and vice flourished in that area. Later studies also provided that a gradient of truancy, juvenile delinquency and adult criminality in the city radiating outwards from the center of the city. The conclusions drawn by the ecologist from the study were:

1. There were marked variations in the rate of truancy, delinquency and adult criminality in different areas.

2. These rates tended to vary inversely according to distance from the center of the city that means those nearest to the center had the highest rate and those farthest from the center had the lowest.

3. Areas with high rate of truancy tended to show similarly high rates for delinquency and adult criminality.

4. The highest rates were found in the areas characterized by physical deterioration and declining population. This took place more in the zone-in-transition and therefore crime and vice increased more in those areas.

5. Rate of recidivism and rates of repeated court appearance varied directly with delinquency rates a fact indicating that delinquents from high rates areas were more likely to become recidivists than those from areas with less delinquency rates.
Social Process theory

Gabriel Tarde and Edwin H. Sutherland are two pioneers who have attempted to study crime and criminal behaviour from the point of view of social process approach.

Gabriel Tarde (1843-1904)
Why does a person become a criminal? Tarde explains that he learns crime just as others learn a trade through training and association with others. Laws of imitation are the basis of Tardian explanation for the causation of crime, which an individual learns. In this study on criminal behaviour Tard notes three types of repetitive patterns.

1) Man has the tendency to imitate another and this imitation is in proportion to the closeness of ones contacts with the others. For instance in the towns where contacts are more and closer, the life becomes very active and exciting and as a result imitation is more there. He calls this ‘fashion’. On the contrary, in a stable group the activities are less and also there are only less contacts. Hence there is less imitation. There is seldom any change in a stable group. This Tarde calls ‘custom’.

2) Tarde thinks that both Fashion and custom operate in any society in varying degree. Fashion may uproot and create a new custom. Fashion and custom influence the social life and therefore they do influence the criminal life of an individual.

3) Tarde explains then the direction in which imitations are spread. Usually the superior is imitated by the inferior. For instance, the anti social activities like drunkenness, murdering, by poisoning etc, were originally prerogatives of royalty, but now it has come to all social levels.

4) When two mutually exclusive fashion come together one has to be substituted by the other. For instance murder by knife was substituted by murder by gun. This means one method declines while another method increasingly comes into being.
This law is called the "Law of insertion". If the fashions are not mutually exclusive, then they combine and complement each other.

Tardian theory is nothing but an application of the general laws governing social relations to the phenomenon of crime.

**Differential Association Theory**

Edwin H. Sutherland is best known for his theory of differential association.\(^\text{19}\) His theory is an account of criminalization process. In his theory of crime causation Sutherland simply asserts that 'behavior is determined in a process of association'. The only reference to the possible mechanism of transmission is in his forth postulate. There he asserts that criminal behavior is determined by the quantity of the contacts with criminal pattern, that is the relation is proportional- the greater the number the higher is the rate of contamination. His assertion that there are no personal or social differences in resistance or immunity to contamination is very much criticized. According to him, all are equally vulnerable. Whether on escapes or succumbs depends upon the degree of exposure entirely. Hence the suggested defence is only the distance or isolation from exposure.

Later Sutherland added 'Learning' to his theory. He said that it is through this psychological mechanism, the criminal patterns are transmitted to the individuals. He says that a person becomes criminal or delinquent because he learns an excess of definitions favourable to the violation of law. This is affected through his association with others who indulge in crimes. In 1939 edition of his book, 'The Principles of Criminology', he writes

1. Criminal behavior is going to be learnt. It is learnt in interaction with other persons in a process of communication. This communication can be often verbal and at times through gestures.
2. The principle part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs with intimate
personal groups. And when criminal behavior is learnt the learning includes a) techniques of committing crimes b) the specific directions of motives, drives rationalization and attitudes. The specific direction of motives and drives is learnt from definitions of legal codes as favorable or unfavorable.

3. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of Law. This is in fact the principle of differential association. Differential association may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity.

4. The process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all of the mechanism that are involved in any other learning. While criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since noncriminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values.20

However his learning theory ignored the problems of personality, motivation and individual differences. It did not deal with questions of individual meaning and interpretations. Hence critics say that in light of these newer conceptions of learning, Sutherland's theory of learning is inadequate. His theory is based on the premise that the retention of learnt material is solely dependant upon the frequency and intensity of associations.

Nevertheless, whatever may be the demerits of his theory the fact remains that his contribution to the causation of crime was timely and very important to the sociology of crime. During a time sociologists have largely abandoned the attempt to encompass the data of crime in a systematic way. He reasserted the significance of social environment.

Labelling Theory

Why society labels some people criminal or deviants? Kai Erikson answers the question. "Some men who drink heavily are called alcoholics and others are not, some men who behave oddly are committed to hospitals and others are not
and the difference between those who earn a deviant title in society and those who
go their own way in peace is largely determined by the way in which the
community filters out and codes the many details of behavior which come to its
attention.”.21 He speaks of ‘social audience’ which decides whether or not any
particular action should be made a visible causes of deviance.

Howard Becker says that the only difference between deviants and non-deviants and the only characteristics that the deviants have in common is that they
have been labeled deviants.22 He writes “Deviance is not a quality of the act a
person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and
sanction to an ‘offender’. The deviant is one to whom the labels deviance has
successfully been applied; deviant behavior is the behavior that people so label”.23
Becker says further that the labeling depends upon the several factors. They are 1)
The Time of the commission of the acts 2) The offender and the victim. 3) The
consequence of the act. Certain types of people are more likely to be labeled
deviant than others. Those who are influential politically are not likely to be
labeled deviant. Those ‘privileged group’, if at all commit conventional crimes are
less likely to be labelled deviant. People living in ‘ghetto’ are more likely to be
caught if they commit a crime. They will be then labeled deviants. Once the
person is labeled deviant or criminal, the society looks at him in different way
then what they used to be with him earlier .In turn this may lead him to commit
further crimes.

Many people commit crimes, but only a few are caught and labeled .The
result is that the criminologist is in a dilemma, for evidences at hand show that if
authorities do not take action, the offender continues to commit offence without
any official attention being received for changing his behavior. On the contrary,
if he is caught by the authorities and labeled as criminal or delinquent, the
offender may further commit crimes or at least he may find it more difficult to
adjust himself to the society.24
Critics on labeling theory say that the approach does not speak anything about the causation of crimes particularly in the case of the first offender. Hence labelling has positive and negative effects. Labelling an individual is likely to deter him from committing crimes further. Depending upon the individual labelling may thrust a person to be a repeater in crimes. How do the friends and the society react to the person labelled decides whether the label result in positive or negative behavior. If the society supports the individual to improve, the result is more likely to be positive.

Thus the social process theories have been responsible for understanding better the crime, Crime-doer and criminalization process. The Theories in general explain different reactions to the social structure.

II) ECONOMIC FACTORS

One of the oldest and most widespread theories advanced for the economic cause of crime is poverty. Ettore Fornasari di Verce, who as early as 1894 pointed out that the poor classes of Italy, amounting to 6% of the total population, gave 85 to 90% of the convicted criminals. The economic factor which influence the nature and form of all social patterns and control all other aspects of human life. “The economic explanation of crime in whatever sense they are understood and interpreted, did not contribute substantially to the advancement of modern criminology.” Some attempts have been made to explain criminal behaviour in terms of economic conditions from the time of Xenephone, Plato, Aristotle; Vergil and Horace. Karl Marx (1818-83) proposed ‘economic determinism’ and argued that private ownership of property resulted in poverty. As a result, the exploited class of the society turns to crime owing to their property. The Marx believed that the sole reason of crime was the then existing economic system. Marx internationally did not propose a theory of crime causation, yet he saw the mode of production as the causative element in all social, political, religious, ethical, psychical, and material life. Marx says, “The mode of production in
material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determine their existence, but on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness.²⁸ Just like any other social phenomena, crime too, the Marxists believe, is the result of the economic system.

Another Greek Philosopher, Plato also believed that human ‘greed’ was the potential cause of crime. The thinkers like Voltaire, Rousseau, Beccaria, and Bentham also expressed similar views and agreed that economic structure is one of the important causes of criminality. Poverty give rise to hunger, misfortune, disease and anger, which destroy the personality of an individual and make him irresponsible and to do undesirable acts. Under the circumstances, he is forced to lend himself into criminality. Therefore, according to these philosophers economic factor has a close bearing on criminality and crime-rate rises when poverty increases in times of economic depression.

**Relationship Between Economic Conditions and Crimes:**

Many Criminologists in Europe during Eighteenth century made intensive researches on the impact of economic conditions on criminality. But unfortunately their findings differed radically and it was difficult to reach any positive conclusion. The relationship between economic conditions and crime is founded broadly on two main conflicting views as mentioned below.

William Aldrian Bonger, the noted Dutch social scientist strongly support the contention, that the relationship between economy and crime is inverse; that is when economic conditions are favorable, the incidences of crime is comparatively low but in times of economic depressions criminality records an upward trend. This assumption finds support in all Marxist doctrines and leftist policies.
2) The relationship between economic structure and crime is direct or positive; that is to say, criminality being an extension of normal economic activity increases or decreases with the rise or fall in economy. Thus, according to this presumption, the crime rate shows an increase in periods of prosperity and decreases during the periods of economic depression. This view has been clearly expressed and developed by Fillips Polett as a supplement to the original research of Enrico Ferri and his famous work 'Law of Criminal Saturation'.

Prof. Russel emphatically stated that there is a direct inter-relation between the food prices and the crime rate. As the prices shoot up, the crime rate records a corresponding increase. He attributed increase in crime rate in England during 1815-1842 mainly to the general distress and deterioration in commercial manufacturing and agricultural yield. Another writer R. H. Walsh suggests that crimes multiply during the period of depression and unfavourable economic conditions. Fredrick Engels also adopted the same approach and attributed the increase in crime to the abject conditions of people due to class exploitation. Charles Goring also drew conclusion about the proximate relationship between the crime committed by each of the criminal and his occupation after a careful study of the occupations of about three thousand criminals. According to Gabriel Tarde, crimes are the result of man's craze for luxurious life. Goring, further argued that this egoistic tendency of men can be satisfied only through 'money'. Therefore, if people cannot meet their ends by legitimate means, they are likely to resort to unlawful acts, which we term as 'Crime'.

Bonger’s Economic Theory of Criminality,

William Adrian Bonger's (1876-1940) contribution to Criminology in explaining the interrelation of crime and economic condition deserves a particular mention. He derived his conclusions after an intensive research study of economic conditions prevailing in different socialistic countries in the first half of twentieth century. He stated that the modern age is a period of capitalistic
economy and is one of the potential causes of criminality because the system created an atmosphere for promoting selfish tendencies in men. Even the socialist countries such as erstwhile (former) Soviet Russia and China have experienced that the theories of economic equalization have failed in their practical application.

Bonger examined the life of the primitive people and found that altruism was one of the prominent characteristics of such societies. People from primitive societies are very social and live a life helping one another. They produce things for their personal consumption and in such society there exist no property or wealth of individuals. Hence, when there is abundance, all are fed and when there is scarcity of food, all are hungry. Man is subordinate to nature. These are the reasons why people in primitive societies are not egoistic, rather altruistic in their attitudes. Society is characterized by social solidarity which is the result of the economic system prevalent there.  

In a capitalist society, Bonger argues, man is egoist in nature. He shows interest only in producing for himself. He may produce things in surplus and wants to exchange them for profit. This leads to social irresponsibility and eventually to criminality. Economic system prevailing in capitalistic societies provides a 'climate of motivation' for criminal behavior. Hence Bonger says: "the part played by economic conditions in criminality is preponderant, even decisive."  

Turning to our own country, Haikerwal in the early thirties has made some studies on the relationship of economic conditions and criminal behaviour. He observes; "A review of the crops and crimes of various years in different parts of the country clearly shows the important role that harvests play in the increase or decrease of crime. Nothing short of a complete over-hauling of the social and the
economic system can stamp out crime. As long as temptations persist and social and economic organization does not offer equal opportunities to all, but perpetuates the differences between undeserved poverty and idle luxury, between forced unemployment and production of luxuries, there will remain persons to do criminal acts. The generalizations made by Haikerwal were not founded on empirical research findings.

Venugopal Rao, while speaking of the 'economics of crime' writes; “It is estimated that at least half of the miscellaneous offences suggest the primacy of monetary considerations in interpersonal tensions or emerge as manifestations of resentment against exploitative practices by individuals or groups. On the basis of this rough computation, it is estimated that nearly 80% of the cognizable crimes under Indian Penal Code have a strong economic base. To this number has to be added a large number of offences pertaining to gambling, prostitution, smuggling, tax-evasion, black-marketing, adulteration of food and drugs, violation of financial regulations, corporate frauds and administrative and political corruption. Official statistics reveal that the bulk of traditional crime is committed by economically deprived or disadvantaged sections of society, because it is this segment which figures prominently in them."

Unemployment and Crime

Unemployment, another economic factor in crime causation, play a decisive role in the commission of crime and delinquency. Unemployment indicates economic backwardness in any developing country.

There are a few studies, which deal with this subject; Mary Van Kleeck found that 52% of the inmates in Sing-Sing prison committed crimes when they were out of work. Again Vadackumchery found a high positively significant correlation between unemployment and offences against property in India. The most disturbing aspect of unemployment problem in India is the state of chronic
involuntary idleness among two important section of the population namely the 
agricultural class and the educated middle class. However, no noteworthy research 
work has been done in the country to study the correlation between 
unemployment among farmers or educated middle class. Some casual observation 
of the Naxalities activity in some parts of the country make some to feel that one 
of the root causes of Naxalitism is the unemployment of the educated folk. The 
frustration among the college going population and the anxiety about their future, 
compel them to deviate from the social norms and involve in law violations. The 
individuals, owing to unemployment, get themselves disorganized in life. Drug-
addiction, gambling, alcoholism etc may be seen in aimlessness in students’ life. 
They, further involve themselves in criminal activities.

III) GEOGRAPHICAL CAUSES

An awareness and importance of explaining place-to-place variations in 
crime has existed for centuries. The early explanation tended to be on the 
relationship between crime and physical environments. Cohen suggests that such 
studies have not been undertaken frequently since 1900.36 One is indeed, hard 
pressed to find any although Huntington (1926 and 1945),37 Kaplan (1960),38 and 
miller (1928),39 have all examined some aspect of the relationship between crime 
and climates.

According to the Geographers, the phenomenon of crime is closely related 
with the geography, climate, and attitude of the place where crime takes place. 
The criminologist, D. R. Taft, explaining on geographical school says, “The 
geographical school attempts to show the influence upon behaviors of such factors 
as climate (including temperature, humidity, barometric pressure, change in the 
weather and so on), topography natural resources and geographical location.”40 
The chief proponents of this school are Quetelet, Gueery and Montesquieu and 
lombroso.41
Adolph Quetelet, “the father of statistics,” says that certain types of crimes are so linked with geographical conditions that these occur in a particular climate and in a particular area and not in others. Thus, he claimed that, crimes against persons usually take place in summer whereas crimes against property take place in winter. He called this the “Thermic Law” of crime.

Similarly, certain studies reveal the variations of crimes of different nature according to the geographical area. The crime rates varying according to the weather, months, north and south, cold and warm, rural and urban areas have also been noted. Thus the rate of crime is rather low in areas where land is fertile and the harvest plentiful and the rate of crime is a high where there are large tracts barren land or lands with poor irrigation facilities. Similarly, the people living at higher altitude are less prone to crime than people of low lands.

Montesque, after making an intensive study of crime, has come to certain conclusion that the rate of crime and nature of crime varies in different hemispheres and different latitudes and longitudes of earth. According to him the rate of crime is very high in areas on or near the equator. The climate on equator is intensely hot and humid, and therefore makes the people irritable and angry. On account of these offences of physical violence are in abundance.

Lombroso in his investigation of the phenomenon of crime discovered that the incidence of crimes is less in plains as compared with rocky land, plateaus and valleys.

Prince Peter kropotkin (1842-1921), the great Russian anarchist, went so far in this climatic approach as to set up a formula by which he contended that the number of homicides could be predicted. Here it is “Take the average temperature of the month and multiply it by 7: then add the average humidity,
multiply again by 2 and you will obtain the number of homicides that are committed during the month.\textsuperscript{43}

The extreme climatologists have tried to show a spring urge, or biological sex-periodicity, to explain the maximum of sex crimes in May and June, but modern science denies the survival of a natural season for human mating.

American, Edwin Grand Dexter\textsuperscript{44} with more scientific and less concerned mathematical formulas, contributed more outstanding and thorough studies of the effects of climate and meteorological conditions on human behavior. In a statistical study of certain criminal cases in New York City and Denver, he correlated them with the records of the weather. He found that cases of assault and battery (from 1891 to 1897) in New York City were most numerous in the warmest months of the year, during periods of low barometer and low humidity, during winds, on cloudy day and during period of some precipitation. The divergence in his findings is explained by the difference in the number cases studied and in the differences in the altitudes of the two cities.

The decline of interest in a deterministic approach to the geography of crime was matched (and to some extent preceeded) by the development of the ecological approach, made explicit by the Chicago school of sociology in the early decades of this century. The ecological studies have usually concentrated on intraurban situations and the major works in the field, written by Shaw and Mckay, have dealt primarily with juvenile Delinquency rather than with the whole range of offenders.\textsuperscript{45} To day, however, no studies of delinquency within urban areas have matched their detail. Shaw's original work (1929) was based on data of 60,000 offenders and included fifty maps. The major findings were that (a) offence patterns in Chicago exhibited marked geographical differentiation and (b) an inverse relationship existed between crime rates and distance from the center.\textsuperscript{46} The later work jointly authored with Henry D. McKay and revised in 1969,
expanded the study to Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati Cleveland, Richmond as well as Chicago.

It was noted that Chicago Crime areas had not changed significantly since the first study and that immigrant or migrant groups played a key role in the generation of delinquency in the city. Particularly applicable to an understanding of the very high arrest rates for blacks in urban America today as observed by Shaw and McKay the analysis of time series of delinquency rates revealed high rates of increase in areas recently occupied by blacks. The high rates of increase were matched by high rates of decrease also in black community areas, but in those with established, rather than newly arrived, populations.47

Morris in the course of a study of delinquency areas in a london suburb, provided a review of ecological studies, including criticism of the work of Shaw,48 Schimids study of Seatle, another comprehensive work of intraurban ecological type, confirmed the presence of an inverse relationship between crime rate and distance from the city center and used isopleth maps as the basis for discussion of selected crime types.49 Other ecological studies have been made, most recently by Lee and Egan in Denver50 Philips has discussed such studies in the context of the historical development of the geography of crime.51

In general geographical study of crime has proceeded some what intermittently both in time and space. Although crime is a constant problem, geographers have not elected to contribute to an understanding of its spatial dimension and a great deal of work remains to be done clearly, a geographical approach will not “solve” the crime problem, but it can contribute to what is an inherently interdisciplinary effort. To date, the best work on the geography of crime has been done by sociologists, however, with new techniques, and with an understanding of significant foundation already laid, student and research workers interested in a geographic approach have the potential to contribute to the
IV) PSYCHOLOGICAL CAUSES

Psychology plays an important role in supporting the causes of crime. Psychology is nothing but, the study of individual qualities such as perception, memory, thinking, learning, intelligence, creativity, and personality.

Genetic transmission: According to the theory of genetic transmission, hold that crime is a product of heredity—a criminal is born not made. Lombroso (1836-1909) of the Italian School of thought, was first criminologist who attempted to understand the personality of offenders in physical terms and employed scientific methods in explaining criminal behaviour, and shifted the emphasis from crime to criminal. Lombroso an Italian psychiatrist made an attempt to study the criminals, on anthropological basis. After an intensive study of physical traits of his patients and later on of criminals, he made a conclusion that criminals were physically inferior in the standard of growth and therefore, develop a tendency for inferior acts. Thus Lombroso through his biological and anthropological experiments on criminals, justified the involvement of Darwin’s theory of biological determinism in criminal behaviour. So Lombroso classified criminals into three categories

i) Hereditary criminals or born criminals

ii) Insane criminals

iii) Criminoids

Hereditary criminals or born criminals: According to Lombroso, born-criminals were of a distinct type who could not refrain from indulging in criminality and environment had no relevance whatsoever to the crimes committed by the Atavists.

The second category is of insane criminals, who resorted to criminality on account of certain mental depravity or disorder.
The third category, according to him was those of criminoids who were physical criminal type and had a tendency to commit crime to overcome their inferiority in order to fulfil their needs.

The above criminal category explains that criminals were the product of genetic constitution unlike that found in the non-criminal population. Though, Lombroso also invoked the notion of indirect heredity, suggesting that criminality could be acquired through contact with other 'degenerates' such as insane people. Further, Lombroso extended his view with the suggestion that environmental conditions such as poor-education could also be a factor among the causes of crime. Lombroso, in his later writings, concluded that about one-third of offenders were born criminals, the remainder had to be accounted for by some other means of explanation.

**Psychopathic Personality and Criminal Behaviour**

Hervey Cleckley, has explained psychopath briefly as a person who is free from neurosis, psychosis or mental defectiveness, who knows the consequences of his behaviour but seems to have no inner feeling for what he verbalizes so rationally, who is habitually unable to adjust his social relations satisfactorily, who is not deterred by punishment (instead he seeks it out), who lacks motivations (if motivated, the motivation is not congruent with his behaviour): who expresses normal effective responses (but shows a total lack of concern and callous indifference to others): who has poor judgement and who does not learn from experience (This is evident from his pathological lying, repeated crimes and other anti-social acts).\(^{53}\)

Sutherland and Cressey, on the relationship between psychopathic and criminality, says that the evidence at hand is not indicative of arriving at a definite conclusion. Some psychiatrists says that 98% of the criminals were found to be psychopaths while others would say that only 5% were diagnosed to be so.\(^{54}\)
Gough made studies on psychopathy and criminal behaviour, to identify the major attitude and characteristics of psychopathic personality. He said that the psychopaths could not look on themselves as objects or identify their role with another’s point of view. As a result they lacked social emotions—such as embarrassment, contrition, identification and loyalty etc. 55

Psychiatry And Criminality

Psychiatry has contributed much to the development of theoretical and practical aspects in criminology. Psychiatry is the medical field that deals with mental disorders. Psychiatry can be discussed under psychoanalytic contribution.

Psychoanalytic Contribution

The term psychoanalysis is derived from the theories of Sigmund Freud and his followers. According to them.

i) Behaviour is determined largely by unconscious psychological forces or drives.

ii) The corollary principle that the functional behaviour disorders arise primarily because of conflicts related to the unconscious drives (to their repressions or inadequate socialization) which interfere, with the normal or required activities of the individual.

Psychoanalists observe that, criminality is the outcome of the uncontrolled instinctual forces. They considered, human mind as having been made up of three layers – i.e., the conscious mind, the sub-conscious mind and the unconscious mind. There is also an inter psychic mechanism called ‘censor’ operating in the human mind. They also believe that human mind has ‘ego, super ego and id’, as its contents.

The therapeutic principle that the most appropriate treatment to these disorders is to help the patient to gain insights into his unconscious drives. They believe that psychoanalytic techniques will be able to cure the patients. 56
These are some of the deviant behaviour which can be seen in psychological aspect.

**Summary.**

Crime is as old as society. There are many causes, which influence the individual who is prone to criminality. But the present study is focused on socio-economic, geographical and psychological factors.

The socio-economic causes play chief role in the aspects of criminality. The individuals or groups, which are neglected by the society and are not given their due share in its achievements or accomplishments move away from society and become apathetic to it. If this apathy is not counted by positive social response, it turns to hostility towards society in general and those groups or persons in particular who are directly responsible for the neglect. In order to settle their scores with society such groups operate like undergrounds and keep moving. Besides social factors, economic factors, too, play an important part in helping tribes towards criminality. With the advance of civilization a number of economic problems also crop up. It is well known that with the advancement of civilization, social organizations also become more intricate and complex. In the result, only intellectually and technically resourceful people can find important gainful roles in society. The social changes moreover render many hitherto important and useful persons superfluous. Their skills are no longer worthwhile. Due to social upheavals many persons and groups become economically sterile. Thus we see that economically sterile groups are driven by the society in a phased manner, from vegetation in jungle to prostitution and crime. What is more, well-to-do groups find in them an easy prey to appease their lust.
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II) Theoretical Views and Review of Literature of Reformation, Correction, and Rehabilitation of Criminals.

If we go through the reviews of literature on the problem of reformation, correction and rehabilitation of criminals who are engaging the attention of criminologists and penologists all around the world, we come to know that the history of the treatment of criminals is as old as compassion itself. Several of the ancient philosophers were concerned with the problem of punishment, and many of them thought along lines that are in many respect reminiscent of modern ideas of reform.

Plato (427-347 BC), who wrote in his "Laws" (Book IX):- "For no penalty which the law inflicts is designed for evil, but always make him who suffers either better or not so much worse as he would have been." Plato saw the criminal, as a sick man whose recovery must be a concern. I Seneca, a contemporary of Jesus Christ, also believed that punishment should not humiliate the offender. In Sellin's opinion, Seneca anticipated views that have won general acceptance in modern criminology.2

In the early periods in Germany, we see the punishment in the form of, tooth for a tooth and eye for an eye. The system was based on the doctrine of severity of punishments, punishment being inflicted in the same manner as the offender has committed his wrong. In Hammurabi's code it was provided, that "If a man has caused the loss of an eye, his one eye should be plucked away. If he has shattered a patrician's limb, one shall shatter his limb. If a man has made the tooth of a man fall out, one shall make his tooth fall out;"

During Greek civilization, Protagoras protested emphatically against brutal retaliation as the basis of theory of punishment. He proclaimed the theory of deterrence as a proper theory of punishment ³.
Thus the code of Hummurabi, and the Protagoras, who proclaimed deterrent as punishment has no place in modern correctional administration. This code provides punishments as mean to prevent other persons from committing similar offences. It has no reformatory objects.

According to the Gorgias, the object of punishment is to reform the criminal. Aristotle’s idea of punishment is that of deterrence and retribution. According to him, “the corrective just must be the mean between loss and gain”.

European jails in the middle ages were places for the confinement of prisoners awaiting punishment, rather than custodial institutions in which punishment was meted out.

Reformation involves individualised of treatment and re-education. Plato recognizes the objects of punishment as those of deterrence and reformation.

The Classical School View on Reformation

1) Cesare Bonesana Marches Beccaria (1738-1794). Beccaria was the Italian nobleman, who was the most prominent classical theorist. His book “Crime and Punishment” is world famous, which is treated as a classic on criminology.

The views of Beccaria on crime and punishment was completely based on the philosophy of hedonism, that every action of man is motivated by the urge for pleasure, which provides explanation for human behavior. According to Beccaria, every man is responsible for his own action though his action is guided purely by the consideration of pleasure-pain equation.
Beccaria also proposed his theory of penology, in which it underlined the need for a well-defined criminal justice system. He sought to humanize the criminal law by insisting on natural rights of human beings. He raised his voice against severe punishment, torture, and death penalty. Beccaria's view was supported by Voltaire, as a result of which many European countries redrafted their penal codes mitigating the rigorous barbaric punishment.

The View of Bentham

Bentham was the chief supporter of classical school. In his criminological theory and penal code the chief concern was social welfare. According to him it was essential that we should legislate with a view to maintain social order and welfare of the society. The aim and object of the law was social welfare.

Bentham's theory of crime also includes his theory of punishment. According to him, punishment is essential for every criminal act, because without punishment there can be no effective check on anti-social tendencies of man. Before imposing punishment, all relevant factors should be taken into account, and if the social welfare is the end of penology the punishment should be sufficiently hard to deter recurrence of crime. He says penal code should not be rigid but flexible to make room for social change. The classical school had its own pitfalls. It proceeded on an abstract presumption of free will and relied solely on the act (i.e., the crime) without devoting any attention to the state of mind of the criminal. The school suggested equal punishment for same offence thus making no distinction between first offenders and habitual criminals.

Positive School

The main exponents of this school were three eminent Italian criminologists, namely Cesare Lombroso, Raffaele Garofalo, and Enrico Ferri.
1. Cesare Lombroso (1836-1909)

Lombroso was the first criminologist who made an attempt to understand the personality of offenders in physical terms. He employed scientific methods in explaining criminal behavior and shifted the emphasis from crime to criminal. He further says that criminals are less sensitive to pain and therefore they have little regard for the sufferings of others.9

His theory was that criminals were different physically from normal persons and possessed few physical characteristics of inferior animal world. Lombroso, greatly emphasized over the individual personality of the criminal in the incidence of crime. This view gained favor in modern criminological measures to attain the aim of individual treatment of criminals. It has been observed that the sociologist emphasis on the external factors, psychologists on the internal factors, while Lombroso considered both as common denominators that is "individual".

2) Enrico Ferri10 (1856-1928)

Another chief exponent of the positive school of criminology was Enrico Ferri. Ferri as the researcher proved that, only biological reasons were not enough to account for criminality. He observed that other factors such as emotional reaction, social infirmity or geographical conditions also play a vital role in determining criminal tendencies in men. Therefore, sometimes he is called as founder of 'Criminal Sociology.'

Ferri emphasised that a criminal should be treated as a product of the conditions that exist in his life. So the main intention of crime prevention programme should be to remove condition that prompts people to commit crimes.
Ferri suggested an intensive programme of crime prevention and focused on a series of measures for treatment of offenders. He suggested that punishment could be a possible method of reforming the criminal. He recommended for indeterminate sentence keeping in view the possible chances of inmate’s re-adjustment in the society.

3) Raffaele Garafalo (1852-1934)

Raffaele Garafalo was one of the three main exponents of positive school of criminology. He was the member of Italian ‘Judiciary’ and was well known with the existing criminal law and procedure in the administration of criminal justice. He recommended death, imprisonment for life, or transportation and reparation as three modes of punishment for criminals. Garofalo as judge had faced total failure in the field of correctional measures in France, and therefore he was not very optimistic about reformation of offenders. He, therefore, strongly pleaded for elimination of habitual offenders who were incapable of social adaptation as measures of social defense.

Regarding the treatment of the criminal, Dr. Ellis. Advocates the use of re-educative methods after a thorough diagnosis of the personality traits of the individual offender. The offender should be entrusted to highly and specially trained persons, for the purpose of re-educating him. He emphasizes the need for the indeterminate sentence, and reiterates that our prisons must be like hospital.11

According to Ewing, ‘The reformation implies that the offender should, while being punished by detention, should be put to educative and healthy or ameliorating (but never degrading) influences. He should be re-educated, and his character traits be re-shaped and put once again in the furnace for being moulded. Reformatory punishment may mean either that the offender is reformed while being punished, or that he is reformed by the punishment itself qua the
punishment". According to Hegel, punishment as such tends to reform the offender.13

As observed by Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor Glueck, “Frequent contacts, animated by personal interest in the progress of each inmate would seem to be of the essence of the reformative process.”14 The reformation of offenders can only be achieved, when each individual offender is interviewed should, from time to time, and the prison officer and the psychologist must be satisfied that good results have actually been achieved. There must be sincere and determined efforts to bring the prisoners to reformation by remoulding the traits of his personality.

In America the Massachusetts Reformatory system provides individual treatment of offenders. The American psychiatric-psychological examination followed by suggestions as to methods of mental and physical hygiene necessary for the offenders self re-education. In the treatment of psychiatric-psychological examination, specialized mental efficiency tests, ethical determination tests and an analysis of the offender’s personality traits are held.15

In England, today, individualization of treatment is the basic principle of prison management. And depending upon the persons skill, psychologist and sociologists are appointed to offices in prisons and they have achieved good progress.16

Theory of Reformation of Prisoners.

Criminologists as well as sociologists have different conception of crime or deviance.17 As this study is concerned with the reformation of prisoners, let us focus on criminologists who postulated that an offender can be reformed. The criminologists who believe in the theory of reformation looked crime as deviance, which is frequently defined as rule breaking. The reformers who believed that an
offender can be rehabilitated and reformed, given the definition of deviance in their own ways. Thorsten Sellin helds that, any act that violates the conduct norms of the group is deviant. Albert A. Cohen considers that deviance is any act that violates the institutional "expectations which are shared and recognized as legitimate within the social systems."

Walter Miller observes deviance as any behaviour which goes against in rules of dominant culture. R.S.Cavan, the well known sociologist, suggests that only those acts which violate in most conventional norms are to be considered deviant.

Charles E. Fraizer views: "Deviance is behavior that violates the standard of the person performing the act, the perceived standards of some person or some group that important to that actor or both." This view puts the focus on the actor's own perceptions of the quality of his conduct.

Therefore, the above views focus that deviance is a result of negative social control and that deviant behavior can be changed by socializing process.

Socialization Approach to Reformation.

The socialization approach to reformation is formed by the important theoretical traditions. These are the Cultural Transmission Theory, the Anomie and the Cultural Conflict.

Cultural Conflict Theory.

In the 1920's from the studies by sociologists at the University of Chicago, theories of the cultural transmission tradition was started and continued through the 1950's. Theory focused on the deviant behaviour which was learnt in the transfer of culture to the individual from his social setting.
Shaw and McKay.

The clearest statement on the cultural transmission theory comes from Clifford R. Shaw and H.D. Mckay. They focused that change of individual behaviour could by achieved. The most important ingredients of change phase, in their view, involved two things.

i) The removing individual from the environment that produced the deviant behaviour; and

ii) The establishment of new associations in conventional social groups.

Through involvement in conventional groups and isolation from deviant groups the deviant would take on new values and new behaviours consistent with conventional standards.

Sutherland and Creassey:

Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, tried to explain proposition on changing deviant behaviour patterns in their differential association theory. In which they highlighted 3-points for changing deviant behaviour.

i) Some form of desocialisaion process where by the individual disavour internalized deviant values.

ii) Assimilation of the deviant into law-abiding non-deviant groups and society.

iii) Resocialisation in terms of non-deviant values.

Anomie Theory

Anomie Theory is another theoretical approach to socialization as a factor in explaining deviant behaviour. The term ‘Anomie’ means the breakdown in or imperfect development of the society which influence the deviant behaviour pattern. There are two different concepts of anomie; one that was developed by Robert K. Mertons, Albert K. Cohens, Richard Clowart and Lloyd Ohlin, and the
other was by Emile Durkheim, Albert Reiss, E. Ivan Noye, David Matza and Walter C. Reckless.

**Mertons**

According to Mertons, deviant behaviour may be considered as a disease of a disorganized society. Merton further argues that when the cultural system is not co-ordinated with the social system, society becomes mal-integrated. Here the cultural system in society means goals and prescribed means of achieving the goals common to all members of the society.

Mertons on explanation of deviant behaviour, says that when all members of society share the same goals but the legitimate means for achieving the goals are not equally available to all, society becomes mal-integrated and high rates of deviant be expected.\(^{25}\)

Therefore, reformation of deviant or criminals can only be achieved, when the system of mal-integration in society is removed. Obviously, the poor socio-economic groups have less accessibility to the various means to success in life. For Mertons it is essentially socialization that is at the root of individual deviance and individuals develop a psychological bends toward deviant modes of behavior. So the reformation of a prisoner requires change of social system which is mal-integrated.

**Cohen**

The views of Albert Cohen is similar to that of Merton's, Cohen stated that if the opportunities for achieving goals are blocked to an individual, deviance is likely. According to Cohens, deviant behaviour becomes pattern as deviant values of the sub-culture based on these values. These deviant values are internalized through socialization in differential association with members of sub-culture.
So, according to Cohens change of individual deviant behaviour patterns would require at least de-socialization, removal from the sub-cultural support of deviance and re-socialization in terms of non-deviant values.\textsuperscript{26}

**Cloward and Ohlin**

Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin adopted a theory in the anomie tradition. According to their view, the deviants tend to be persons who have been misled to except opportunities because of their over perception of potential abilities to meet the formal criteria for success. The deviants feel capable but when the system fails to fulfil their expectations by providing opportunities for being evaluated as a success, they feel it as an injustice.\textsuperscript{27} This feeling of injustices in turn, weakens motivation and permits the individual to accept alternative values and pattern of conduct, normally a deviant role model. This pattern of deviant behaviour are developed by social support of a sub-culture or deviant peers.\textsuperscript{28}

Therefore, change of individual deviance would entail de-socialization, removal from group support and resocialization.

**Culture Conflict Theory**

This culture conflict theory was formulated by Walter Miller in 1958. The purpose of this theory is that behaviour patterns of all forms are learnt within district cultural groups.

**Miller**

Miller theory explained that deviance are motivated to their misconduct by desires to achieve certain conditions of qualities rewarded in their cultures. Miller studied on lower class body, who were socialized in a habitant with standards and expectations that demanded certain characteristic behaviour. The behaviour designed to achieve reward within the lower class culture is reached to as deviant
by middle class dominated institutions. The patterning of deviant behaviour being socialized into the lower class culture, which is an autonomous sub-culture that happens to be at variance with the dominant culture. Unlike Cohen’s, Cloward and Ohlin’s deviant, Miller’s does not reject or react to the dominant system in patterning forms of deviance. 29

So, any successful change from deviant behaviour patterns would firstly need specific de-socializing efforts involving in devaluation of internalized values. In addition, removal of the deviant from the cultural environment that influenced deviant behaviour would be essential to permanent change, and finally, the individual would have to be re-socialized in terms of the values of the dominant culture.
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