

Chapter One

The Concept of Deviance

1.1 Defining Deviance

Before we define deviance, we need to see the meaning of social norms. Because, norms are basic to the definition and the study of deviance i.e., the potentiality for deviance exists in every norm or rule. The line of how and when behavior is to be interpreted as deviant or to be tolerated is constantly shifting according to public view and the view of various groups.

Social norm: is a way of thinking, feeling, or behaving, generally considered right or proper within a (sub) culture; it is a rule, value or standard shared by members of a social group and anchored in that group membership; it implies how group members should or ought to think, perceive, feel or behave in a given circumstance.

Therefore, for the social system to operate healthy, human social relations and behavior should be regulated through social norms.

Deviance may be defined as follows:

1. To deviate means, literally, to move away or stray from, set of standards in society.

Deviance, then, constitutes the active violation of socially constructed norms. It refers to the act of deviating from social norms.

2. When sociologists speak of deviant behavior, they are referring to behavior that does not conform to norms-behavior that in some way does not meet with the expectations of a group or of society as a whole

However, the precise nature of the norms violated, who supports them, and the degree of societal reaction to their violation represents a major problem in the definition of deviance.

Some people regard certain behavior as deviant; others don't. Thus, it is very difficult to give a universal definition to the concept of deviance. In trying to overcome the problem, the mainstream sociologists provide four definitions of Deviance: absolutist, statistical, labeling and relativistic.

Absolutist Definition

Probably until the early 1950's most sociologists, psychiatrists and psychologists had comparatively little difficulty with the concept of deviance because they considered it an

absolute. Deviance was taken for granted as though everyone agreed that certain violation of norms were abnormal and others were not.

This definition viewed social rules as “absolute, clear and obvious to all members of a society in all situations”. This absolutist or arbitrary conception of deviance assumed that the basic norms of a society are obvious and that its members are in general agreed upon what constitutes deviance because the norms and values of society are laid out in deviance.

Everyone is presumed to know how to act according to universally held values; violations of these norms constitute deviance and the possibility of some types of sanction is incurred.

The absolutist definition of deviance is widely supported today, particularly by psychiatrists and psychologists who regarded deviance in terms of a “medical model”, as a form of “sickness”. Crime, mental disorder, suicide, alcoholism, drug addiction, and soon become absolutes much as diseases such as cancer, and they are universal expressions of individual maladjustment regardless of differences in cultural and sub cultural norms. Social differentiation, cultural differences and change in norms are generally ignored.

Statistical Definition

Another way to define deviance is a statistical process that views deviance as variations or departures from “average” norms of behavior. This approach assumes that whatever it is that “most” people do is the “correct” way.

This definition faces some immediate difficulties because it can lead to some confusing conclusions if, for example, the minority could always be defined as deviants.

For example, in a given social groups where the majority of its members are homosexuals, drinkers, and marijuana users, those minority or few members who are heterosexuals, don’t drink alcohol and have never used marijuana are considered to be deviant. Statistical definition would tell us “what is” while the concept of deviance implies that the crucial meaning is “what should or should not be” according to the view of certain groups.

Labeling Definition

A well-known definition of deviance is that of Howard Becker, who terms it the consequence of the application of rules and sanctions by others to an “offender”. The deviant is the person to whom the label “deviant” has been successfully applied and the deviant behavior is the behavior that people so label.

In Becker's definition acts can be identified as deviant only in reference to the reactions to the acts through the labeling of a person as deviant by society and its agents of social control an act that constitutes deviant behavior must first be known to others and then be reacted to by formal agencies of social control.

The labeling position has attracted a wide following because it has furnished what at least appeared to be a way of getting around the persistent difficulty of defining deviance in the face of a reality where deviance in terms of norms is highly relative. As time has passed, however, Becker's definition has been increasingly subjected to much criticism, and one can now conclude that, since it is an overstatement, it represents an inadequate definition of deviance. The labeling definition rejects, expressly or tacitly, a normative definition of deviance, even if it is broad and relative in its scope: it is not the normative violation that is the heart of definition but only the labeling of the violation. An act would not be deviant, therefore, unless it is detected and there is a particular kind of reaction to it.

Relative Definition

According to the relative definition, deviance is a created situation, created by audiences or groups within a society which makes the rules and which imposes negative sanctions upon certain behavior, for "actions are not in themselves moral or immoral, deviant or non-deviant.

It is the judgment that is passed on the behavior by others and not the behavior itself that determines and defines deviance".

According to this definition, what we call deviance is a relative concept because it is depend upon the perspective of the viewing audience. That is to say deviance, like beauty, is in the eyes of the beholder. The same act may be identified as deviant behavior by one person and non-deviant behavior by another person.

For example, strong negative attitudes toward the taking of one's own life through suicide, the practice of prostitution, homosexuality, drunkenness, and other means of expressing personal choice have stemmed for the most part from certain church group. Opposition to the use of marijuana, nudity and the distribution of pornographic materials rests with other moral entrepreneurs who attempt to impose their views on others. what constitutes a large part of crime, as sociologist Quinney points out, is really behavior that conflicts with the interest of the segments of society that have the power to shape criminal policy.

Those segments of societies that have the power to shape the enforcement and the administration of the criminal law through agents like the police and the courts determine what criminal law are actually enforced. The political criminal who takes as a goal the improvement of society, for example, and who is supported by certain groups may suffer torture, imprisonment, and even death because certain power groups do not approve of this means, nor his ends; the improvement of society to the political criminal is seen as the destruction of society by others. Laws regulating personal morality, such as public drunkenness, the use of marijuana, pornography, and obscenity, all become relative to the values of the viewers. For the actor (deviant) the behavior is normal but for the non-actors (non-deviant) that same behavior is defined as deviant behavior.

1.2 Who is Deviant?

A Deviant person is a person who engaged in any behavior that is /are not expected by the norms and values of a given social group or society; Someone who engaged in what should not be moral or appropriate according to the definition of norms and values of a given society.

Therefore, a deviant person is someone who exhibit any behavior that deviate from the standard rule or social norms.

Some deviant result in a person's being termed immediately by others as a deviant. In other cases the deviant status arises only as a result of a variety or combination of acts and status. They include:

1. That the action is regarded as a serious, threatening to other persons or to the society;
2. That there is an official governmental reaction in the form of penal sanction for the act's commission
3. That it is repeated with some consistency or frequency or that is it seen as a threat if repeated.
4. That it involves the entire "moral character" of the person, not just a phase of his being;
5. That it is sometimes geographical and hence inefaceable;
6. That it is unlikely to be committed, is so serious that, if discovered, the person would be fully and not merely slightly discredited;
7. That the act is not impermanent and ephemeral; and
8. That the language accommodates the identification of the individual as one who commits or has committed certain acts or closes of acts.

On the basis of social roles, deviants can be distinguished as to their being primary or secondary (or career) deviants.

Persons may engage in deviant acts, but continue to occupy a conventional status and role such deviant behavior constitutes primary deviance when it is rationalized and considered as a function of a socially acceptable role. For example, a politician may take a bribe or a university professor may be absent without telling to his student for private business, in both cases the individual doesn't consider himself not do other consider him to before outside the conventional role. Thus, if deviant acts do not materially affect the person's self concept or given him a deviant role, they remain primary.

On the other hand, secondary or career deviance develops when the deviant role is reinforced further participation with other more pronounced deviants with whom the individual comes to associate and often through the effects of labeling. For example, lesbian, gay, drug addicted person, and prostitutes are career deviants.

Once the person becomes a secondary deviant, it has important consequences for further deviant behavior. The secondary deviant develops a deviant role which involves greater participation in a deviant subculture, the acquisition of more knowledge and rationalizations for the behavior, and skills in avoiding detection and sanctioning.

1.3 Societal Reaction and Deviant Behavior

Every culture, sub – culture and group has distinctive norms governing what it deems appropriate behavior. Laws, dress codes, by laws of organizations, course requirements and rules of sports and games all expresses social norms. It is expected that we respect and accept these basic social norms and also we assume that others will do the same. But any violation of these social norms will subject individual to punishment.

Societal reaction to deviant behavior vary by intensity of violation and the type of norms violated; some norms of etiquette, for instance ,may meet with only mild disapproval and sanctions, whereas violations of other norms such as those prohibiting murder, rape, or robbery, may meet with strong disapproval and severe sanction. Each particular norm has a tolerance limit, the degree to which norms violations are tolerated or suppressed by a group. As one would expect, the severity of the sanctions serves as an index of the group's willingness to tolerate violations of the norms. Because some norms are seen as more important or vital than others, more stringent tolerance limits and more severe sanctions are applied to violations of them.

Society brings about acceptance of basic norms through what we call *social control*. The terms social control refers to the techniques and strategies for regulating human behavior in any society.

The sanctions used to encourage conformity and obedience and to discourage violation of social norms are carried out through informal and formal social control:

Informal Social Controls: simply stated “informal social sanctions consists of the techniques where by people who know one another on a personal basis accord praise to those who comply with their expectations and show displeasure to those who do not”. They may be observed in specific behaviors such as gossip, ridicule, reprimands, praise, criticism, gestural cues, glance of approval or disapproval, denial or bestowal of affection, ostracism, or verbal rationalization and expression of opinion. Gossip or the fear of gossip is undoubtedly one of the most effective instruments yet devised in any society for bringing people in to conformity with norms. Like formal controls, these informal social controls are not exercised through official group mechanisms.

Informal sanctions may be more effective in smaller social groups where everyone knows everyone else and the same people are brought into continual face-to-face contact with each other.

Formal Social Control: A formal social control arise, when the socialization process that gives rise to self – control and is thus informal, is insufficient to maintain conformity to certain norms. These controls involve organized system of specialized agencies and standard techniques. The two main types are those instituted by the political state and those imposed by agencies other than the state. They include the church, business and labor groups, educational institutions, clubs and other organizations, and the political state.

Because formal sanctions are incorporated in the institutional system of society, they are administered by persons who occupy positions or roles with in those institutions. These persons are commonly known as agents of social control since the administration of these sanctions is the part of their duties. In the most general sense, anyone who attempts to manipulate the behavior of others through the use of formal sanctions can be considered an agent of social control. The police, prosecutors and judge of the criminal justice system, employers, teachers and ministers and priests who promise heaven and threaten hell to believers, all are example of agents of social control.

It is true that, every deviant act potentially subject to some type of sanctioning, but many deviant acts receive none. A number of reasons may be cited for this non application of sanction to a deviant act.

1. The deviant act may be anonymous: the audience to the act either present or absent may not be able to identify the deviant. In the case of successful burglary, the guilty person escapes detection and thus avoiding sanctioning. The manipulation of certain management techniques during business or occupational offenses shields the deviant from sanctioning. Many female alcoholics avoid sanctioning simply they avoid defection by drinking at home when they are alone; even when their drinking become more public in nature, they are much less likely to be arrested for public drunkenness and thus become subjected to formal sanctioning.

2. Often the deviant act is considered to be of a minor nature or “out of character” of the persons committing the act and no sanction is involved minor violation of norms may be excused as “accidental” or unavoidable under the circumstances. A man apprehended for speeding when he is taking his wife to the hospital for delivery is more likely to be given a police escort than a ticket for speeding.

3. The single deviant act may not be associated with the person’s identity. Although the act many be visible and the person clearly identified, the fact that it occurred only once may read to the conclusion that a sanction is unnecessary.

1.4 The Management of Deviance

The imposition of negative sanctions from others poses obvious difficulties that the deviant would like to avoid. Through the use of a number techniques, the deviant is able either to manage (or cope with) the stigma, prevent the stigma altogether or less what stigma may be present. Through such techniques, the deviant is able to “save face”, ward of social rejection and cope with the situation management techniques are used that suit the particular form of rejection the deviant encounters, but a number of techniques may be common to a number of different forms of deviance.

1. Secrecy: If other not aware that an act of deviance has been committed or that a person occupies a deviant status, there will be no negative sanction. Homosexuals may hide this fact from their families and employers: obese person may avoid social gatherings and maintain and isolated existence; heroin addicts may wear clothing that hides the needle marks on their arms

and legs. “Secrecy is (often) urged up on deviants by their in – the – known friends and family among the morals; That’s what you want to do, okay, but why advertise it ?”

2. Rationalizations: A deviant may “explain away” the deviance by justifying it in terms of the situation, the victim (if there is one), or some other factor usually beyond the deviant’s control. For example cheating on a one’s income taxes may be justified to the offender in terms of the already excessive taxes one pays or shoplifting may become acceptable because “the store can afford the loss and insurance will cover it anyway”.

The use of rationalization weakens the strength of the norms by placing the deviant act in a more acceptable from work.

3. Change to None deviance: Another technique involves the movement from deviant to non deviant status. For some criminals this technique is usually referred to as “going straight” or being rehabilitated. For example, the obese person loses weight; the prostitutes settle down with a family; and the problem drinker shams alcohol. It is often difficult to determine whether or not someone has terminated deviance this judgment is often a social one. The heroin addict who no longer uses heroin may take method one itself an addicting drug though a more socially acceptable one.

The change to one deviance can also be seen on a group level with the affirmation of deviance by militants. Homosexuals, for example, in some communities have a publicly proclaimed their status and have pressured legislatures to change the laws concerning this behavior. Similarly, militant prostitutes have taken like public stands advocating for decriminalization of this offense. In each instance, the idea is to change to non deviance by redefining behavior itself rather than changing individuals.

4. Deviant Sub cultures: Participation in a subculture is helpful for deviants in managing their deviance: it lessens that chance of receiving a negative sanction from others by protecting them from contact with “normal”. Homosexuals who frequent gay bars and maintain interaction with other homosexuals, at least during that time, decrease the chance that outsiders will defect them. Subculture offers the deviant sympathy, support, and association with other deviants; they help the deviant cope with social rejection where, at the sometime providing the opportunity to commit deviant act.

1.5 Does Deviance have positive Function?

The layman considers that social deviation is bad by nature: social deviation weakens the social system and has no positive values. Although deviation often interferes with the willingness of person to take part in an ongoing activity and may seriously interfere with the continued dedication of the “rules” of society among its members, it is incorrect to assume that deviation is naturally bad and that it has no positive functions. Several functions of deviance may be cited.

1. Many deviations develop form and are other consequences of legitimate and conventional controls. The rules and function of the social systems of a society create both deviation and non deviation: both are normal in a society. As Durkheim pointed out, deviations are not necessarily “as bad” or at least “abnormal” Rather, they are normal within the context of society. According to Durkheim, crime is an integral part of all” health societies” since society makes that laws that constitute crimes. Thus, the conformist and the deviant are creation of the same culture, inventions of the same imaginations.

2. Deviations alert people to a greater awareness of their common interest. Rather than producing social havoc, deviance may strengthen group norms and valves. In opposing the deviant, group members actually reinforce their commitment to the group and standard.

3. The recognition of “deviations’ sets the outer limits of rules or norms, limits beyond which the group will not tolerate violation. Thus, the recognition of deviation indicates how much diversity can be permitted before the group loses its identity. Agents of social control help to define these limits, as in criminal trials and in psychiatric counseling.

Each time that groups in power move to censure a deviant in the form of what has been called “degradation ceremonies” as in the criminal trial the norms that have been violated are sharpened and the limits of rule toleration reinstated.

4. A certain amount of deviance can well serve as a “safety valve” for persons and thus prevents excessive discontent and alleviates some of the strain on social institutions. It might be argued, for example, that prostitution serves as a safety valve without threatening the institution of the family and without involving emotional attachments outside of marriage that might result from premarital or extramarital relations.

5. Deviance may well serve as a signal or warning of some basic defect within the social organization. Through the commission of the deviant act, the deviant helps to expose the inadequacies or defects of the system. Examples, school truants and runaway and disturbances

within correctional institutions reveal unsuspected causes of discontent and leads to changes that enhance efficiency and moral.

6. Changes in rates of deviance may also serve as a mechanism to bring social or legal changes. The history of a number of social movements in many societies of different nations clearly shows that commitment to change may begin in deviance from existing norms.

Chapter Two

Theories of Deviance

There is no consensus among mainstream scholars as to what causes Deviant/criminal behavior. The various theoretical explanations given by various scholars depict the multi-disciplinary nature of deviance/criminology. Sociology, psychology, biology, and medicine are the major disciplines from which the theoretical explanations for deviance/criminal behavior are given.

2.1 Sociological Theories of Deviance

It would indeed be simple if there were a single agreed-upon sociological theory to explain deviance; unfortunately, this is not the case. Several controversial theories have been developed, in fact, and it is important to understand the various approaches that have been used in studying deviance. In this section various sociological theories of deviance shall be discussed.

2.1.1 Social Pathology Theory

One of the earliest sociological approaches to deviance was the concept of “social pathology”. This concept was developed in the latter part of the nineteenth century and continued in use until the end of the 1930’s. Its organic analogy base likened society to the functioning of a biological organism. The most sophisticated use of the organic analogy was made by Herbert Spencer, who believed that society is like an organism because it has interdependent parts, mass, a complexity of structures that increases with its growth, and a life longer than any sum of its parts.

It is explicit that “since society is made up of individuals bound together in social relationships, social pathology refers to the maladjustment in social relationships. The phrase is based on the analogy of bodily maladjustment of function in the organ”.

Social pathology attempted to apply a biological model what might now be called a “medical model” to deviance in a society. Social pathologists believed that in a society some universal criteria were to be found for a healthy society but that at the same time societies could develop pathologies or abnormalities such as crime. The conditions considered to be deviant were those that interfered with the “normal” or the “desirable” workings of society. Conditions like crime, suicide, drunkenness, mental illness, prostitution and so forth were deviant because they were known to be “bad”. Even today, it is not uncommon to hear such phrases as a “sick society” or society is suffering from a sickness”. Within this frame of reference, deviance is somewhat on the order of a universal diseases or an ‘unhealthy’ deviation from some assumed universally

accepted norm of behavior. In other words, what does exist is defined according to what ought to be. With the conception of society as an organism, it is important that it be healthy, thus good, while sickness is undesirable and therefore bad. Persons or situations diverging from expectations that have been formulated in these terms are “sick”. For social pathologists, a social problem was, in the end, a violation of moral expectations”. Social pathologists worked from two perspectives-first, that there was a certain ‘sickness’ in society, and, second, that certain individuals were also “sick”. Increasingly, sociologists developed the view that personal maladjustments or “sicknesses” such as bad heredity, physical illnesses, mental deficiency, mental disorder, drunkenness, lack of education, and personal immorality due to poverty lay at the heart of what they then termed social pathology, later becoming known as deviance. All this was the forerunner somewhat later of the ‘medical model’ approach to the psychiatric.

The proponents of social pathology had borrowed concepts from Biology and Medicine to explain deviance. Clinard and Meier (1979) explained this analogy as follows:

Pathology in social science has a certain parallel to pathology in medical science. As the study of physical disease is essential to the maintenance of physical health, social health can never be securely grounded without a wider and more definite knowledge of social disease. General pathology in medicine teaches that many diseases have much in common and there are morbid processes which may be discussed, as well as particular diseases. In social pathology the interrelation of the abnormal classes is one of the most impressive facts. Paupers often beget criminals; the offspring of criminals become insane; and to such an extent is the kinship of the defective, dependent, and delinquent classes exhibited, that some have gone so far as to hold that under all the various forms of social pathology there is a common ground in the morbid nervous condition of individuals,

Criticism

Social pathologists argued that norms are universal and so is social pathology. Critic argued that, this idea is incorrect, however, as “the idea of diversity contested pathology”. Social pathologists failed to recognize the important issue that deviance varies by time and place as norms change, and that it cannot be compared to a disease like cancer, which is universally designated as an illness. Becker, for example, pointed out that while there was little disagreement about what constitutes a healthily state of the organism, much less agreement is seen when one uses the idea of pathology analogically to describe the kinds of behavior regarded as deviant. In other words,

people who agree on what constitutes a healthy organism do not similarly agree on what constitutes healthy behavior. In fact, ‘it is impossible to find one (criteria) that people generally accept as they accept criteria of health for the organism’.

2.1.2 Social Disorganization

The growth of cultural relativity in sociology and the questioning of the validity of certain ‘universal’ values brought to an end the social pathology perspective. The pronounced social changes following World War I such as extensive immigration, high rate of urbanization and industrialization all over the world accompanied by the crowding of large numbers of newly arrived people from a diversity of cultures into urban areas and the rapid development of conditions conducive to deviance, necessitated some sort of different explanation with new concepts.

The need for a new framework resulted in the evolution of the concept of “***social disorganization***”, developed originally in about 1920 by Thomas and Znaniecki, and by Charles Cooley, and continuing into the 1950’s. The concept of social disorganization is associated with the “Chicago School” of sociology because most of the persons originally used the concept came from there.

According to the social disorganization theory, deviance was a product in society of uneven development, with much social change and conflict affecting the behavior of individuals. This theory emphasized that society was organized when people are presumed to have developed a common agreement about fundamental values and norms, as reflected in a high degree of behavioral regularity. In other words, social organization (social order) exists when there is a high degree of internal cohesion binding together individuals and institutions in a society. This cohesion consists largely of consensus about goals worth striving for (values) and how or how not to behave. When consensus concerning values and norms is upset and traditional rules no longer appear to apply, social disorganization results. The basic premise of this approach was that “conflict and disorganization are most apt to increase when the equilibrium of a social system is disturbed during periods of rapid social change, and as conflict and social disorganization increase, so will rates of deviance”.

In contrast to social disorganization, successful social organization, it was thought, involved an integration of customs, effective teamwork and morale, and harmonious social relationships. Well integrated social group showed group solidarity and modes of behavior were more

homogenous and traditional. There was little unconventional behavior and deviance, and informal social controls usually sufficed to regulate behavior. The urban areas did not fit well into this idyllic set of characteristics, which made it clear to social disorganization theorists that a state of social disorganization existed in much of city life. It was in the cities, then, where they concentrated their research, on what they termed “disorganized local areas”, generally slum areas of high crime, prostitution, mental disorder, suicide, and other forms of deviant behavior. It was assumed that changes were taking place in the ecological or spatial growth of the city and that these changes resulted in the general deterioration of group solidarity in certain areas.

One can well understand why the social disorganization theorists singled out the city to study what they saw as the “disorganizing” aspects of life there, and particularly the effects on rates of deviant behavior in urban areas. In their own theoretical framework, the social patterns of the urban environment were conducive to social disorganization, which then led to the deviant behavior. Social disorganization theorists were aware of the great heterogeneity of people living in the same geographical area or in contiguous areas and of the vast differences in the values and norms of these persons; in addition, they noted that people moved into and out of the areas without ever devolving a sense of neighborhood social organization. Lacking a real social organization, certain neighborhoods were, they considered, “socially disorganized”, and this condition itself resulted in high rates of deviance, particularly when examined in terms of the more organized suburban and rural neighborhoods. Within these “disorganized” parts of the city, certain areas, particularly slum neighborhoods, appeared to have even more deviant behavior. Thus, for social disorganization theorists the city and its lower-class inhabitants became the primary objects of study.

Criticism

1. The social disorganization theory tried to explain deviance almost entirely as a lower class phenomenon, to the exclusion of middle and upper class deviance. In other words, it was based in favor of middle-class values and norms. The lower class is assumed to have higher deviance rates because its member lived in the most disorganized areas of the city.

“Thus, by circular reasoning the lower class was most deviant because it was the most disorganized and it was, as the same time, the most disorganized because it contained the most deviants”.

2. As a concept, social disorganization was almost as subjective as social pathology. In the social disorganization perspective, the concept of pathology is simply applied to the group instead of individual; no longer were persons pathological, communities were now disorganized. The designation of phenomena as deviant and the equation of the deviance with disorganization were the focus of the sociological analyst or observer rather than findings derived from actual studies of what some people would term a state of social disorganization. Social disorganization is usually thought of as something “bad” and what was bad was often the value judgment of the observer and the members of his/her social class.

3. Although deviation is referred to as “social disorganization” and the society “disorganized”, often what may seem like disorganization may actually be quite highly organized systems of competing norms. Many subcultures of deviant behavior, such as youth gangs, organized crime, homosexuality, prostitution and white-collar crime, including political corruption as well as corporate crime, are highly organized. Even the norms and values of the slum are highly organized.

4. Social changes are often confused with social disorganization, and little attention was paid to explaining why some social changes are, in fact, organized.

5. As it is pointed out in chapter one, deviance may contribute to social organization rather than to social disorganization

2.1.3 The Theory of Anomie

Anomie is a concept closely associated with two theorists, Emile Durkheim and Robert K. Merton. When Durkheim introduced the term in his 1893 book “*The Division of Labour in Society*”, he used it to describe a condition of “deregulation” occurring in society. By this he meant that the general procedural rules of society (the rules that say how people ought to behave towards each other) have broken down and that people do not know what to expect from each other. This deregulation or normlessness, easily leads to deviant behavior.

Durkheim used the term anomie later, in his book entitled “*Suicide*” (1897), to refer also to a morally deregulated condition in which people have inadequate moral controls over their behavior. Whichever of these two descriptions, anomie is used to mean a breakdown in either the rules of society or the moral norms, it is clear that Durkheim was talking about a disruption of normal societal conditions.

Durkheim's central thesis in "*The Division of Labour in Society*" is that societies have evolved from a simple, non-specialized form (mechanical) towards a complex, highly specialized form (organic). In both cases, he was referring both to the way in which people interact with each other and the way in which labour is carried out. In the mechanical society people behave and think similarly and, except for a division of labour along gender lines, perform most of the same work tasks and have group-orientated goals. As societies become more complex, work also become more complex and specialized. Modern organic societies are characterized by highly interactive sets of relationships, specialized labour and individual goals.

In organic societies, one person's work skills are rarely sufficient to provide all that is necessary to live. People have to depend on each other to produce various items. The distribution of these items, once produce, is a problem. Highly complex relationships are required to distribute the products of each person's skills. This, for Durkheim, suggested that an organic society is a contractual society, and he saw almost all relationships are contractual ones. By this he meant that people are no longer tied together by bonds of kinship and friendship but, because of the impersonality of modern society, by various types of contract bonds. The problem with such society is that these bonds are constantly being broken. In sum, the rules governing how people interact with each other (the contracts) in organic societies are continually in flux and social conditions are constantly in danger of disruption. When disruption occurs, we have anomie.

Anomie, then, refers to the breakdown of social norms and a condition in which those norms no longer control the activities of societal members. Without clear rules to guide them, individuals cannot find their place in society and have difficulty adjusting to the changing conditions of life. This in turn leads to dissatisfaction, frustration, conflict and deviance.

In 1938, Merton borrowed the concept of anomie from Durkheim to explain deviance. His concept, however, differed from that of Durkheim. By dividing social norms (or values) into two types: societal goals and the acceptable means for achieving those goals. In addition, he redefined anomie as a disjuncture (or split) between those goals and means as a result of the way society is structured, for example, with class distinctions. *Deviance, then, could be explained as a symptom of a social structure within which "culturally defined goals and socially structured means" are separated from each other.*

According to Merton, success goals in cultural terms are generally presumed to be achieved by legitimate means through regular employment, in higher paid occupations, and through access to

further education. These channels, however, are not as available to certain persons, such as the lower class. Although the goals of success are held out so that all can strive for them, the means for achieving them are restricted. Consequently, some persons are forced to achieve them through illegitimate means such forms of deviance as crime, prostitution, drug use, alcoholism and mental disorder. In attempting to explain these forms of deviant behavior, the anomie theory has assumed that official rates of deviance are highest among the poor and lower class, where the greatest pressures for deviation occur and where opportunities to acquire both material goods and a higher level of education are limited. Schematically, the relation of anomie to social structure may be summarized in this manner:

1. Exposure to the cultural goal or norms regulated behavior oriented toward the goal
2. Acceptance of the norm or goal as moral mandates and internalized values
3. Relative accessibility to the goal; life chances in the opportunity structure
4. The degree of discrepancy between the accepted goal and its accessibility
5. The degree of anomie
6. The rates of deviant behavior of the various types set out in the typology of modes of adaptation. According to the Merton's anomie explanation, several illegitimate adaptation can be used by poor lower class persons where legitimate means to achieve the culturally prescribed goals of success have been blocked. According to Merton these adaptations are, chiefly, **rebellion**, **innovation** and **retreatism**. The particular adaptation is dependent on individual's acceptance or rejection of cultural goals and adherence to, or the violation of accepted norms.

A. Rebellion: persons may turn away from conventional cultural goals and rebel against them. Through this rebellion they may seek to establish a new or greatly modified social structure. They try to set new goals and procedures to change the existing social structure instead of trying to achieve the goals through traditionally established norms. This type of deviant adaptation is represented by "hippies", political radicals and revolutionaries.

B. Innovation: is an adaptation involving the use of illegitimate means such as theft, burglary, robbery, organized crime or prostitution to achieve culturally prescribed goals of success whereby conventional means is limited. As evidence, Merton has maintained that unlawful behavior such as crime and delinquency are most common among the lower strata of society. The poor are largely restricted to manual labour, which is often stigmatizing as the result of the

low status and low income they cannot readily accepted in terms of established standards of worth and therefore they are more likely to engage in crime.

C. *Retreatism*: according to Merton, represents the substantial abandonment of the cultural goals that society esteems and of the practice that had become institutionalized to achieve these goals. The individual has fully internalized the cultural goals of success but has not found them available through the institutional means of achieving them. Being held from achieving the goal through internalized pressures which prevent innovative practices the individual becomes frustrated and handicapped becoming defeated and even withdrawn.

Retreating from cultural goals the person become addicted to drugs, become an alcoholic or many completely “*escape*” through a mental disorder or even suicide. Retreatism tends to be a private rather than a group or sub-culture form of adaptation, even though the parson may have contact with other in a similar position.

Cloward has reformulated Merton’s theory to include not differentials in the availability of legitimate means but variations in the access or opportunity for illegitimate means, such as are provided the person in the poor slum area of cities. According to Merton’s theoretical statement, deviant behavior is a product of differentials in the access to goals of success through legitimate means. Cloward points out, however, that differentials are also seen in the access to illegitimate means and that this differential opportunity plays a large part in the distribution of deviant adaptations. Actually, the individual, whatever his/her position in the social structure does not have illegitimate means equally available for much the same reason that legitimate means vary by social strata. According to Cloward, retreatists are “*double failures*” in that they have failed in the use of both legitimate and illegitimate means. Many have failed in the conventional as well as unconventional world.

Criticism

1. Anomie assumes a universality of what constitutes “illegitimate means” that is not the case because delinquent and criminal acts vary in time and place. Deviance in many ways is a relative concept; it is not the same in all groups. The use of drugs for example, such as marijuana and even cocaine and opium are not deviations in many parts of the world today.
2. Anomie theory rests on the assumption that deviant behavior is disproportionately more common in the lower class and it neglects the important role of social controls agents in defining who is deviant. Considerable evidences can be cited that lower class persons and members of

minority groups are more likely to be defected and labeled as delinquents, criminals, alcoholics, drug addicts, mental patients than persons who belong to the middle and upper class. Furthermore, studies of occupational white-collar and corporate crime have shown that crime occurs in the highest social strata and delinquency is found among the middle as well as lower classes. Sykes points out, for example, that in contradiction to Mertonian theory many criminal offenders today, such as middle-class persons and college students apprehended for shoplifting do not fit the poverty syndrome, where crime is a means of breaking free from material deprivation. Alcoholism may actually be as prevalent in the upper class as in the lower class but members of the higher class are less likely to be arrested as chronic inebriates or to use public treatment facilities. Thus, many critics argue that Mertonian theory of anomie is suffered from class bias.

3. Simplicity of explanation: anomie theory is too simple. Although the lower class deviant, according to the anomie theory, makes individual illegal adoptions in the system because of “pressure” that develop due to failure to achieve certain goals most deviant acts actually arise out of a process of interactions with others who may serve as a reference group for the individual

4. The trouble with retreatism. The theory of the adaptation of means to goals through “retreatism” lacks precision. For example, drug addicts are not retreatists, because their difficulties in securing their goals of drug make them “active” rather than retreatist person.

2.1.4 Labeling Theory

In the early 1960’s a different approach to deviance theory was taken. Although it was an offshoot of older theories, labeling theory asked questions about deviance from a new perspective which challenges previous definitions of deviance. Those associated with labeling argued that earlier theories had placed too great reliance on the individual deviant and neglected the variety of ways that people could react to deviance. This message was important enough that the position become known as the *societal reaction school*. The intellectual heritage of labeling reflected the Chicago school’s symbolic interactionism. The teaching and wiring of both George Herbert Mead and W.I. Thomas at the University of Chicago had influenced several creative people. Their students, some of whom return to teach at Chicago, continued to spread the symbolic interactionist approach. A group of graduate students at Chicago during the late 1940’s and early 1950’s applied the approach to several areas of deviance. One of these students, Howard Becker, was to become the person most strongly identified with labeling. Labeling

theory required a different orientation to deviance than that of previous theories. Noting that other definitions depend on statistical, pathological or anomie views of deviance Backer pointed out that none of them does justice to the reality of deviance. He saw that deviance can often be in the “*eyes of the beholder*” because members of various groups have different conceptions of what is right and proper in certain situations.

Further, there must be a reaction to the act. That is, deviance must be discovered by some group that does not share a belief in the appropriateness of the behavior and it must subsequently be called deviance to the extent that law reflects the values of that group, the behavior is labeled crime and the perpetrator a criminal.

The labeling approach to deviance can be broken down into two parts:

- a. The problem of explaining how and why certain individuals get labeled and;
- b. The effect of the label on the so called “deviant”

The problem of explaining how and why certain individuals get labeled: the first view of labeling is really that of asking what causes the label; thus, the label is dependent variable whose existence must be explained. The classic statement of this focus is Backer’s:

Social group create deviance by making the rules whose function constitutes deviance and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an “offender”. The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.

By the reaction of deviance, Backer meant that rules, circumstance, characteristics of the individual and reactions of those in the “audience” serve to separate those acts that are “deviant” from those that are not, even though they may appear as identical behaviors. It is not even necessary that the behavior exist; what is important is that the reactors believe in its existence. Thus, it is a reaction to behavior that creates deviance. The problem is to explain how outsiders, as Backer referred to deviants, are chosen and labeled.

To explore this problem, Backer added to his discussion a typology of types of deviant behavior. He considered whether a particular behavior was conforming or deviant and whether the reactors perceived the behavior as conforming or deviant. The resulting four types of deviant behavior were called falsely accused, pure deviant, conforming, and secret deviant. ***Falsely accused*** acts are those that either did not exist or were actually conforming, but the audience reacted as if the

acts were deviant. Both *conforming* and *pure deviant* acts are those in which the perception matched the reality of the act. Finally, *secret deviant* acts are those in which deviance had indeed occurred but the audience either ignored the acts or had not reacted as if they were deviant. Backer believed that secret deviant acts are quite common. As important as these four types of deviance are, even is more critical is the possibility that characteristics of people have something to do with which of the types would be used.

This approach of deviance meant that several facts about criminals needed explaining in a completely new way. Those who were arrested were, of course, predominantly lower class, urban, young and male. The new societal reaction school wanted to know why official agents reacted to these people more often than others. Their answers, exemplified by the earlier work of Garfinkel (1965) suggested that some common factors are at work. The likelihood of reaction was greater if an individual were less socially powerful (age, social class), a number of group with different values from the dominant group or relatively isolated. Labeling theorists set about the process of determining how and why these types of people came to the attention of others.

The effect of the label on the so called “deviant”: labeling advocates were also concerned with the effect of labels on the person who is labeled. This aspect of labeling treat the label as an independent variable, a causal agent that then creates deviant behavior. There are two ways in which this may takes place:

1. The label may catch the attention of the labeling audience, causing the audience to watch and continue the labeling of the individual. According to labeling theorists, such consequences include:

- A. Individual who has been labeled becomes visible in the sense that people are more aware of them. This awareness often causes them to be watched more closely and thus, a second and third discovery of deviant behavior is even more likely than the first one. Especially important is that those who are in deviance processing occupations (police, criminal justice agencies) closely watch individuals once they have come to the attention of their agency. In a sense, those labeled are the clientele of the criminal justice system and like any other good business; the system keeps close tabs on its customers. It is difficult for those once labeled, such as probationers, parolees, or ex-offenders, to escape the attention of this audience and subsequent behavior is likely to be identified and relabeled.

B. When the original is more likely to be distributed among those with lower-class characteristics, this attention serves to reinforce the image of those individuals as deviants.

People who are identified as “deviants” then have fewer chances to make good in the conventional world. This means that conventional avenues to success are often cut off, and illegal means may become the only way left open. Thus, labeling advocates argue that the lower class bears the brunt of the labeling process and is kept deviant through relabeling

2. The label may be internalized by the individual and lead to an acceptance of a deviant self concept.

The second form of labeling effect is best reflected in what Lemert (1951) called *secondary deviance*. This concept suggests that, in addition to audience reaction, there is the possibility that an individual will react to the label. In this instance, Lemert assumes that the individual does not identify the initial act (primary deviance) as an important part of his or her self-image. People vary in their vulnerability or sensitivity to the reaction of others. If the original self-image is not strong enough, the labeled person may come to accept the image offered by others and change the self-image accordingly. The more often a person is labeled, the more likely it is that this change will take place.

Feedback is important to the process by which a new self-concept can be internalized.

Lemert described the road to secondary deviance as follows:

(1) Primary deviation; (2) societal penalties; (3) further primary deviation; (4) stronger penalties and rejection; (5) further deviation perhaps with hostilities and resentments beginning to focus up on those doing the penalizing; (6) crisis reached in the tolerance quotient, expressed in formal action by the community by stigmatizing the deviant; (7) strengthening of the deviant conduct as a reaction to stigmatizing and penalties; (8) ultimate acceptance of deviant social status and efforts of adjustment on the basis of the associated role.

In a sense, then, secondary deviance is gained through a trading back and forth until the labeled person finally accepts the label as a real identity. This often results in the person’s joining a deviant sub-culture with further deviance being the product of the sub-cultural lifestyle. That is, future forms of deviant behavior are a product of the new role itself. Deviance in its secondary form is quite literally created by the labeling process.

Criticism

1. Labeling theory is clearly less interested in the individual deviant act (violation of norms) than in the rules and guidelines for reaction to that act. The individual comes into focus only when attention turns to the effect of the labeling process.
2. Labeling is a *micro theory*. It focuses on the effect of societal reaction to the individual behavior. Even when there is a discussion of the why in which authorities react to deviance, the emphasis is on the process of labeling individuals instead of on explaining how social structure creates labels.

2.1.5 Conflict Theory

Conflict theories of deviance emerged on the heels of labeling theory. Similar in some ways to labeling, conflict theory focuses on the political nature of deviance and examines the creation and application of criminal law.

Conflict theories share one fundamental assumption; *that societies are more appropriately characterized by conflict rather than consensus*. This assumption allows for several varieties of conflict theory that can be viewed as if they were on a continuum. At one end, pluralist versions suggest that society is composed of myriad of groups varying in size and often temporary, all of which are struggling to see that their interests are maintained in any of a number of issues. At the other end, class-conflict versions argue that two classes are present in a society, both of which are attempting to dominate that society.

Many of the contemporary ideas on the importance of social conflict in society generally can be traced to such older sociological theorists as Karl Marx, George Simmel, and more recently Louis Coser and Ralf Dahrendorf, to whom society is not a consensus but struggle between social classes and class conflict between powerful and less powerful groups. In fact today most conflict writers in deviance and in crime identify themselves as “*Marxists*”. Marx for example viewed society as composed primarily of two groups with incompatible economic interests; *the bourgeois* and *the proletariat*. The bourgeois are the ruling class—they are the wealthy, they control the means of economic production, have inordinate influence over the society’s political and economic institutions and have at their disposal great power to serve their interests. The proletariat, on the other hand, are the ruled—they are the workers whose labour the bourgeois exploits.

According to Marx, the state is not neutral party to the inevitable conflicts that arise between the two groups: it serves mainly to cushion the threats of the ruled against the rulers and to foster the interest of the rulers. Marx foretold that as capitalism developed there would be a proliferation of criminal laws, since laws are considered important mechanisms by which the rulers maintain order.

First, the laws can define certain condition as illegal, particularly conduct that may pose a threat to the ruler's interests.

Second, a law legitimizes the intervention of society's social control apparatus through the police, the courts and correctional systems, all forces to be used against the ruled, whose behavior is most likely to be in violation of the law. In this sense, the criminal law comes to "side" with the upper classes against the lower classes. Marx's conception of conflict is ultimately tied to a particular economic system, capitalism: in this system it is inevitable that a major division will develop based on the means of production and the economic interest of persons, depending upon whether they own these means or works for those who do own them.

Regardless of their position on this continuum of the number of groups and amount of power sought, conflict theorists view consensus as an aberration. That is, they see consensus as temporary state of affairs that will either return to conflict or will have to be maintained at great expense. It is the use of power to create and maintain an image of consensus, then, that represents the problem to be studied. Conflict theorists are less concerned with individual behavior than with the making and enforcement of law. Further, they are rarely concerned with the behavior of the offender.

There are many forms of conflict theories bound together only by the assumption that conflict is natural to society. Here, however, two forms of conflict theory are regarded:

1. The conservative conflict perspective

The central concept of conservative conflict theory is that of *Power* and its use. This perspective assumes that conflict emerges between groups attempting to exercise control over particular situations or events. Thus, the conflict approach views social issues almost as though they were fields of combat with opposing armies fighting to see who will prevail and rule the land. As with armies, the matter of resources is a crucial one. It is the control of resources (money, land,

factory, and political power) that provide the ability to successfully “fight” and to emerge victorious on a particular issue.

Because power can be equated with *resources*, then it seems evident that those who are higher up in the social class structure will be the more powerful members of society. Their influence in the making of social decisions and their ability to impose values will also be greater than those of the lower social classes. For conservative conflict theorists, this explains the presence of the dominant middle-class value system in society. Similarly, the important statements of a society, its laws for example, are bound up in middle class values.

Law itself represents a resource. If a group’s values are embodied in law, it can use that law, and its enforcement, to its benefit. The agents of law, in their enforcement efforts, perpetuate the values embodied in law and thus help keep in power those who already have power.

2. The radical conflict perspective

Even more difficult than capturing conservative conflict positions with a broad stroke of the pen is a summary of radical conflict theorists. Their position ranges from political anarchism through Marxism and economic materialization to value diversity. Regardless of this variety, most of the current radical versions of conflict theory can be traced to the writings of Karl Marx.

While Marx said very little about crime and criminals, many radical criminologists have adapted his general model of society to their explanation of crime. Marx saw conflict in society as being due to scarcity of resources and a historical inequality in the distribution of those resources, notably power. This inequality creates a conflict of interest between those with and those without power. By the dawn of industrial age, conflict had developed between two economic classes of society, *the proletariat* (the working class) and *the dominant bourgeois* (the non-working owners of wealth).

The main theme in this conflict version is the struggle between classes over the control of the mode of production (the owning and controlling of productive private property). As the controlling class exploits the labour of the working class, a struggle develops. Since Marx felt that a group’s position in society shaped its consciousness of that society, the working class was led to believe that the capitalist structure of society was in their interest (*false consciousness*).

As the members of exploited class become aware of their true position and common interests, they would gradually join forces and initiate overt conflict against the dominant class. This

conflict would take the form of a revolution that would overthrow the ruling class and allow a classless society to exist in a socialist system without economic exploitation.

Marxist criminologists have assumed that the class struggle affects crime on three fronts:

First, they have argued that the law itself is a tool of the ruling class. The definition of crime found in the law are a reflection of the interests of the ruling class and serve to perpetuated existing concepts of property, which is the foundation of capitalism. As the same time, the behavior of the ruling class is generally not placed under the rule of criminal law and instead, if place into law at all, is found under administrative and regulatory laws. A belief in the validity of law deflects questions about its purpose and application and results in members of the working class policing themselves.

The second position of Marxists criminologists is that they view all crime (in all capitalist nations) as a product of class struggle that produces individualism and competition. The emphasis on the accumulation of wealth and property leads to conflict between classes and even within class. Thus, the chase to get “ahead” manifests itself in the pursuit, criminal or otherwise, of property wealth and economic self-aggrandizement. Even violent crime is pictured as a result of the “brutal” conditions under which the working class must live. For the working class, then, it is their exclusion from the mode of production that creates the social structure conducive to criminal behaviors.

Third, Marxist criminologists must deal with relationships to the mode of production as an explanation for crime. Richard Quinney (1977) and Steven Spitzer (1975) have discussed the problem of surplus labour in capitalist societies. Surplus labour guarantees that wages will be low, but too large a surplus of labour may also cause problems. Spitzer (1975) list five types of “problem population”:

- a. The poor stealing from the rich
- b. Those who refuse to work
- c. Those who retreats to drugs
- d. Those who refuse to schooling
- e. Those who actively propose a non-capitalist society

As long as the problem group is relatively quiet and poses no immediate threat to the ruling class, there is little need to expend scare resources on their control. Skid-Row alcoholics are a typical group of this type, and Spitzer calls them “*social junk*”. If, however, the group is active,

then it poses a threat to the ruling class, and controlling its members becomes important. These groups (political activists, criminals and revolutionaries) are called “*social dynamite*” by Spitzer and they draw a disproportionate share of the control agents’ resources.

Summary

- It is difficult to characterize conflict theories because of their diversity.
- However, all conflict theories obviously assume that the society is conflict oriented, rather than consensus oriented.
- All conflict theories tend to focus on the political structure of society, especially the making and enforcement of law.
- Because of their emphasis on political and economic structure, conflict theories rarely engage in discussion of the process by which criminal behavior is produced. This leads to a classification of the conflict approach to deviance as a *Macro-Theory*. Clearly, it is the nature of society itself and its subsequent effect on social institutions rather than behavior itself that is to be explained.

Criticism

1. Not all laws are necessarily devised by and operated for the advantage of the interest of one particular group. Laws against homicide, robbery, burglary and assault benefit all members of society regardless of economic position. Any statement that the elite alone benefit from such laws neglects the fact that most victims of these offenses are the poor, low class urban residents.
2. Although the conflict perspective points to the criminal laws, supported by certain interest groups as the ultimate “cause” of criminal behavior, it does not follow logically that the law is responsible for the behavior. Sagann observes that “without school, there would be no truancy; without art, there is no art forgery; without life, there would no death”. Those are not causes, they are necessary conditions. Just the fact that you are alive is a condition for taking this course, but it is not a cause of it. There could be no crime if there were no laws to prohibit some behavior but the existence of a law is not sufficient to account for the behavior.
3. Theory as Ideology: perhaps more than any other approaches to deviance, this theory has an ideological base that will either hasten or retard its acceptance depending upon one’s “political and social” view point. Other sociological perspectives are not completely free from ideology, but the conflict theory’s emphasis on combining theory and practice in a socialist framework makes more obvious and explicit the political connotations of its explanatory scheme.

2.1.6 Control Theory

Control theory is an approach that has been more concerned with socialization to conformity than with socialization to deviance. In most theories conformity is assumed to be non problematic; that is the “*natural*” order of things and needs no explanation. Control theory, on the other hand, reverses the approach, because it is conformity and not deviance that requires an explanation. The important question is not why do men not obey the rules of society but rather, why do men obey the rules of society”. The control theory attempts to integrate theories of community with theories of deviance and in this context control theorists assert that deviance is not caused as much by forces that motivate persons to deviate as it is simple by the fact that deviance is not prevented. The focus of this prevention is social control, the most effective component of which is the social bond between an individual and society. The social control process “*motivates*” one to conform through the socialization process which leads to a commitment on the part of the person to conformity.

Hirschi has provided what is probably the most explicit statement of control theory, identifying four components of the person’s bond with society that tends to prevent deviance.

a. **Attachment:** the first element of the bond refers the extent to which the person is bounded to the norms of his group through socialization process. The term “*internalization*” describes the process by which norms become part of an individual and are incorporated in to the person’s cognitive and behavioral stock.

b. **Commitment;** is the element which describes the degree to which the person develops a “*stake*” in conforming behavior so that acts of deviance put at risk other more valued conditions and activities. Concern over one’s reputation or being expelled of commitment.

c. **Involvement:** refers to physical activity of a non-deviant nature; at the simplest level, little time is left for delinquency if one spends much time playing basket ball, for example. Continued involvement in conventional activities also leads to strengthening of commitment.

d. **Belief:** refers to a person’s faithfulness to the dominant value system of his group. These values may assume the nature of moral imperatives for the individual and it would be unthinkable to violate them.

Some forms of deviance are claimed to arise as result of a lack of control. Delinquency and youth crime result from the failure of youth to have sufficient commitment to the traditional goals and values of society. The use of certain drugs, for example, depends upon one’s own

attitude towards using them as well as upon a perception of the strength of the norm regulating drug use and the influence other people have on one's sense of morality regarding their use.

Presumably, if the norms were strong enough and one's sense of morality makes one feel that taking drug is wrong, the act will not occur. Problem drinking may also be prevented through a socialization process that stresses anti-alcohol attitudes over a long period of time.

2.2 Biological Theories of Deviance.

All theories which put forward a biological explanation for crime are founded on the premise that physical structure determines functions. Criminals or deviants are seen as biologically different from non-criminals. If such theories were accurate, they would have an obvious appeal for policy makers and crime prevention practitioners. Active or potential criminals could be identified by their physical appearance or through medical tests and controlled in some way.

Furthermore, the apparent existence of a separate dangerous or criminal class would support the maintenance of the *status quo* by diverting attention from possible social causes of crime. The latter ground has been put forward as one reason for the appeal of biological positivism at the end of the nineteenth century. Biological theories of deviance have taken a variety of forms. Two of them would be briefly explained below.

2.2.1 Physical Type Theories

Several varieties of biological theories suggest that criminals stand out because of their physical characteristics. Cesare Lombroso has been described as the founding father of *the biological positivist school*. He is best known for his notion of the *born criminal*, an individual who exhibited physical signs of atavism that are of being an evolutionary throwback. To some extent, such ideas had been given a better chance of acceptance by their closeness to the publication of Darwin's ideas about evolutionary theory.

Lombroso, a former doctor with the Italian army, claimed to have received a 'flash of inspiration' when he examined the skull of a notorious criminal. On seeing the skull, Lombroso realized that the nature of criminality lay in atavism. This explained the peculiar physical characteristics such as enormous jaws, high cheekbones and protruding ears, found in criminals, savages and apes.

Spurred on by this insight, Lombroso produced an extended list of physical features or stigmata typically possessed by the atavistic individual who was inclined towards criminality. These

included asymmetry of the face; irregularities in the eyes, ears, nose, lips or teeth or thin; supernumerary nipples, fingers or toes; and excessive arm length.

Lombroso tested his ideas by examining a group of convicted criminals for the presence of such anomalies. 21 percent of his sampled convicted criminals had one anomaly and 43 percent showed five or more. Lombroso claimed that the presence of five or more of the specified characteristics identified a person as *a born criminal*.

Attempts to connect criminality with physique have continued until quite recently. Those theorists who explain deviance in association with body types in recent time (long after Lombroso) are referred to as *Neo-Lombrosian*.

In 1921, *Physique and Character*, by E. Kretschmer, a German psychiatrist, was published.

Kretschmer attempted to show a relationship between body shape and types of deviant behavior. He divided people into three body types, referred to as *somatotypes* and claimed that the tendency towards different kinds of mental illness varied between these types.

Sheldon presented a theory which related body types more specifically to varieties of criminal behavior. He described three basic types of physique and suggested the types of temperament which corresponded with them. His *somatotypes* are not identical to Kretschmer's and are named differently but there are similarities. Sheldon's three *somatotypes* were as follows:

1. **Endomorphs**, who would tend to be soft and round and to be relaxed and extrovert
2. **Mesomorph** were athletic and tended to act aggressively
3. **Ectomorph** was thin and frail and was introverted

Sheldon held that an individual possessed features of each of the body types but to varying degrees. The subjects of his research were given ratings between 1 and 7 to indicate the extent to which they possessed aspects of each of the different types. Therefore a person would be given a three-figure rating, such as 2-1-7 showing his possession of characteristics from each of the body types.

Sheldon compared such ratings for a group of 200 male delinquents against those for 200 students who were regarded as non-delinquent. He found that the delinquents were significantly higher in mesomorphy and lower in ectomorphy (Sheldon, 1949).

Glueck and Glueck (1956) compared 500 persistent male delinquents with 500 youths identified as 'proven' non-delinquents. The groups were matched for age, race, general intelligence and area of residence. Sixty-seven personality traits and 42 socio-cultural factors were taken into

account. Part of their research involved assessing the youths for body type on the basis of photographs. Sixty percent of the delinquents were assessed as mesomorphs, compared with 31 percent of the non-delinquents. Among mesomorphs in both groups there was a higher incidence of traits suited to involvement in aggressive activity such as physical strength and insensitivity.

They were also relatively free from characteristics such as submissiveness to authority which might discourage delinquent behavior. However, mesomorphs who actually become delinquent were more likely to display personality traits which were more characteristic of other body types such as feelings of inadequacy. Socio-cultural factors such as poor recreational provision were also found to be related to delinquency among mesomorphs.

Cortes and Gatti (1972) also studied relationships between somatotypes and delinquency. Their samples were smaller than the Gluecks' but included a broader spread of delinquents. All of the Gluecks' delinquents had been placed in institutions but Cortes and Gatti somatotyped 70 institutionalized delinquent, 30 delinquents on sentences not involving immediate custody, 20 institutionalized adult criminals and 100 non-delinquent high school students. The mean somatotypes of the groups using Sheldon's rating were as follows:

Non-delinquents 3.9 3.5 3.3

Delinquents 3.3 4.4 3.2

Adult criminals 2.8 5.4 3.1

Remember that the centre rating measures mesomorphy. Fifty-seven percent of the delinquents were found to be high in mesomorphy compared with 19 percent of the non-delinquents. To test whether somatotypes and temperament were linked, 73% of the youths who showed clear signs of a predominant body type were asked to identify which of a set of traits associated with the three types of temperament were applicable to them. A clear association was found between body-types and self-described temperament.

Weakness in their research and by implication in the conclusion, include the fact that assessments of temperament were not made objectively and also a failure to match the samples on the basis of socio-cultural factors. Vold and Bernard point out that although the study shows associations between mesomorphy and delinquency and links mesomorphy to types of temperament and motivation the associations made were logically invalid. Clearly, other factors may explain the temperament and motivation for delinquency.

Criticism

1. Lombroso's theory and methods are open to various criticisms. His statistical methods have been described as totally inadequate. The objectivity of his research is questioned by his insistence that some defects were not measurable but could be seen by a trained observer. It is also puzzling that Lombroso included tattooing as one of the features typical of the atavistic criminal.
2. Physical type theories in general can be criticized for ignoring different aspects of the interaction between a person's physical make up and the environment
3. At a fairly simple level, people from poorer backgrounds will tend to have a poorer diet and thus be smaller in stature. Youths in manual jobs are more likely to acquire an athletic build. The over representation of such people among convicted criminals may be explained by a variety of socio-cultural rather than biological factors.
4. Gibbons (1970) argues that the high proportion of mesomorphy among delinquents is probably due to social selection. The nature of their activities is such that delinquents will tend to be drawn from the more athletic members of their age group
5. Another sociological aspect which was ignored by physical type theories of deviance is the question of reaction. Individuals with more extreme physical deformities have less access to legitimate social pursuits or may be seen by others as aggressive in appearance. In such circumstances they may become deviant by default, rather than through positive selection.

2.2.2 Mental Deficiency Theory

This version of biological theory explains deviance in terms of individual's mental abnormality that could be caused due to chromosomal anomalies. The central argument of this theory can be summarized as follows:

In a normal human, each cell contains 23 pairs of chromosomes. Each chromosome has a crucial role in determining specific behavior of an individual. However, an abnormal cell division prior to conception may result in an embryo that has an anomaly chromosome. This irregularity may not be visible during childhood stage but in the long run may affect the normal functions of individual's cell. The long term cumulative effect of such anomalies is the improper function of mind or mental deficiency. Mental deficiency can push people to deviate from the existing norms and values. The concept of mental illness and therefore, deviations starting with a few behaviors has been extended by some to include "anything and everything in which they could detect any

sign of malfunctioning based on no matter what norm”. Thus, deviant behavior such as homosexuality, drug, alcoholism, crime and the like are considered to be the result of mental deficiency.

2.3 Psychological Theories of Deviance

Sociological theories of deviance explore the social conditions that underlie deviance-how it is defined, how group and sub-cultural factors are related and what the reactions toward deviance are. Psychological theories of deviance, on the other hand, tend to try to explain the specific circumstances surrounding a person’s deviance-the motivations, early family experience, and the like-largely disregarding both problems of definitions and group and cultural factors. There are several psychological theories of deviance but in this sub-topic only two of them will be considered.

2.3.1 The Psychiatric Theory of Deviant Behavior

The psychiatric theory that deviant conduct is largely the result of childhood experiences in the family, while declining, still is popular.

The psychiatric thought of deviance is generally, derived from the more fundamental values which are rooted in the traditions of our culture. Prominent among these values are the beliefs that parents are responsible for preparing their children for adult life and that there is a relationship between early childhood training and behavior in adulthood.

The central assumption of psychiatric theory implies that certain childhood experiences have effects that transcend all other social and cultural experiences. These proponents suggest that certain childhood incidents or family relationships lead to the formation of certain types of personalities which contain within themselves seeds of deviant or conforming behavior irrespective of culture. Thus, childhood is the arena in which personality traits toward or away from deviance are develop and a person’s behavior after the childhood years is fundamentally the acting out of tendencies formed at that time. Essentially, these proponents offer the following psychiatric model for explain deviant behavior.

A Psychiatric Model

1. All deviant behavior is a product of something within the individual, such as personal disorganization or “maladjusted” personality. Deviants are individuals who are psychologically “sick” persons. Culture is seen not as a determinant of deviant and conforming behavior but rather as the context within which these tendencies are expressed.

2. All persons at birth have certain inherent basic needs, in particular the need for emotional security

3. Deprivation of universal needs during early childhood leads to the formation of particular personality patterns. Childhood experiences such as emotional conflicts largely but not exclusively determine personality structure and thus the pattern of behavior in later life.

The degree of conflict, disorder, retardation, or injury to the personality will vary directly with the degree of deprivation.

4. By affecting his personality structure, a child's family experiences largely determine his behavior pattern in later life, whether deviant or non-deviant. The need for the mother to provide maternal affection is particularly stressed.

5. A high degree of certain so-called general personality traits, such as emotional insecurity, immaturity, feelings of inadequacy, inability to display affection and aggression, characterize the deviant but not the non-deviant. These traits are the child's first experiences with others within the family group, traits arising there form the basis for the entire structure of personality. Deviant behavior is often a way of dealing successfully with such personality traits; for example, so-called immature or emotionally insecure persons may commit crimes or emotionally insecure persons may drink excessively and become alcoholics.

This, then, is the basic theoretical framework on which psychiatry largely builds its explanation of deviant behavior. Each year many books and articles by psychiatrists attempt to explain such diverse forms of deviance as stealing, murder, sex offenses, delinquency, alcoholism, drug addiction, homosexuality, suicide, and mental disorders in terms of the above mentioned model. For example, psychiatrists tend mainly to explain crime as resulting from displaced emotional aggression, mental disorder, and poor childhood environment.

Criticism

1. Criticisms of the psychiatric explanation largely involve confusion about "sickness" and norms, the lack of objective criteria for assessing mental health, an overstatement of early childhood influences, the lack of scientific verification of their claims, and the assumption by psychiatrists that their theory is correct because of the effectiveness of psychotherapy. Psychotherapy does not necessarily follow the theory, because often it is improvised to fit

individual cases. Too, the results achieved by therapy may be due to other factors such as the intimate social relation between practitioner and patient.

2. Overemphasis on childhood experience. Psychiatric theory has all too frequently assumed that adult behavior and personality are almost wholly determined by childhood experience, most of them in the family, whereas evidence suggests overwhelmingly that behavior varies according to situations and social roles and that personality continues to develop though out life. Early family influences have probably been greatly overemphasized, sometimes to the virtual exclusion of the effect on personality of other groups such as the peer group, and of occupation, neighborhood, marriage and other later social situations. Even in early life, the socialization of the child is greatly influenced by the play group, by street play in urban areas, by preschool and kindergarten activities and by neighbors and others such as relatives. The rigidity of character structure during the first year or two of life has been exaggerated, for life must be regarded as a continuous experience of social interaction which cannot be arbitrarily divided into infancy childhood, and adult experience. Events occurring at 40 years of age, for example, may be explained by some occurrence at age 4.

3. Despite their claims, the explanations of psychiatrists concerning deviant behavior have not, for the most part, been scientifically verified. The psychiatric approach has generally failed—indeed; it has often refused—to use experimental or more verifiable situations and more rigorous and controlled techniques to test hypotheses. Psychiatrists often see crime, for example, as an individual's means of trying to solve his personal problems. They do not explain why some people choose crime as a problem-solving technique while others do not. As evidence, although the practice is less frequent today, almost complete reliance is often placed on interpretations by psychiatrists of as person's verbal recall of childhood experience.

2.3.3. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Deviance

Psychoanalysis was founded by Sigmund Freud, a Viennese physician who died in 1939. As a result of Freud's work psychoanalysis has become an important part of the contemporary vocabulary and thinking of Western European society. Largely because of the emphasis on sex and symbolism, psychoanalytic works make particularly fascinating reading for both professional persons and laymen.

According to psychoanalytic writers, the chief explanations of behavior disorders must be sought in an analysis of the *unconscious mind*, which is said to consist of a world of inner feelings that are unlikely to be the obvious reasons for behavior or to be subject to recall at will. Antisocial conduct is a result of the dynamics of the unconscious rather than of the conscious activities of mental life. Much of the adult's behavior whether deviant or non-deviant owes its form and intensity to certain instinctive drives and to early reactions to parents and siblings.

In the psychoanalyst's scheme, personality is thought of as composed of three parts: the primitive animal *id*, *the ego*, and *the superego*. Psychoanalysis assumes that the conscious self is built over a great reservoir of biological drives. Although biology, in the form of basic animal drives, plays an important part in psychoanalytic theory, these drives are present in everyone and do not necessarily represent individual biological differences.

1. The *id* is the buried reservoir of unconscious instinctual animal tendency or drive. From the Freudian standpoint these instincts are of two major types: *the libido*, including chiefly sexual drives, but not exclusively limited to them and the lover or life trend instincts and *the sadistic or destructive* instincts. These instincts operate in every activity.

2. *The ego* is elaborated from the large area of instinctual tendencies as a result of the contact of the individual with the outer social world. Freud postulated here a dualistic conception of mind: the "*id*" or internal unconscious world of native or biological impulses and repressed ideas and the "*ego*," the self, operating on the level of consciousness. These two may sometimes be compatible but more often are incompatible, unless and adjusted through some psychological mechanism. There may be constant conflict between the "*ego*" the conscious part of the mind and the "*id*" the unconscious part of mind.

3. *The superego*, on the other hand, is partly conscious, partly unconscious; it is the conscious part which corresponds to the conscience. It is man's social self, derived from cultural definitions of conduct.

Psychoanalysts have made almost synonymous with criminal behavior the unresolved conflicts between the primitive *id* and its instinctive drives and the requirement of society. According to this view, crime arises out of inadequate social restrictions which society has placed on what psychoanalysts assume to be the original instinctive, unadjusted nature of man; which is savage, sensual and destructive. Criminal behavior is thought of as an almost necessary outcome or

expression of the personality and hence does not always necessitate contacts with a “criminal” culture.

Psychoanalytic theorists who deal with the problems of suicide have stressed the polarity principle of the life (love) and death (hate) instincts of the *id*. According to this view, there is strong desire in the *id* for self-destruction. The superego, in turn contains various social and moral restrictions on personal violence and self-destruction. The forces pulling toward self-destruction and self-preservation are in constant interaction and when the former overcomes the latter, self-inflicted death ensues. Psychoanalysts often find hidden motives behind suicides, for example, self-mutilation or self-destruction. According to Menninger, the death wish, which is part of the *id* may occur in alcoholics where chronic drunkenness is in a sense a slower method of self-extinction than some of the other methods customarily employed.

Psychoanalysts think of a normal personality as having developed through a series of four stages. The development of personality involves shifting interests and changes in the nature of sexual pleasure from the oral and the anal preoccupation of infant life to love of self, love of a parents of the opposite sex and finally, love of a person of the opposite sex other than one’s parent.

According to these theorists, some of the stages overlap and may go on simultaneously. Some persons do not progress through all of them; consequently, they have conflicts and develop personality difficulties. As to psychoanalysts, the newborn operates on a pain-pleasure principle; the environment consisting of desirable objects which merely serve to bring about bodily comfort and satisfaction such as oral satisfaction through nursing and worry with the activities of elimination. There is preoccupation with one’s own body but from the beginning this interest is increasingly blocked by cultural controls and restrictions: many psychoanalysts stress the fact that deviants are immature persons who have not developed into fully socialized adults, a situation termed “*infantile regression*”. The activities of deviants unconsciously represent unresolved infantile desires. Others believe, for example, that the type of crime and the types of objects involved in the crime often indicate infantile regression. Some psychoanalysts have concluded that the etiology of schizophrenia is a retreat to a form of infantilism. The alcoholic has often been characterized by psychoanalysts as a passive, insecure, dependent, “oral” stage personality whose latent hostility has been obscured. Drug usage has been likened to infantile masturbation. Homosexual behavior has been explained as a regression to the oral stage.

In the psychoanalytic view the mother is definitely an object of a child's "*libido*" during its infancy: she is the first object to whom love impulses are directed but she is also the first person to whom hate is directed since she is the first person who restricts its sexual pleasure. Based on this early attachment to the mother there arises an *Oedipus complex* in which the male child unconsciously becomes a rival of his father for his mother's sexual affections and therefore comes to hate his father. In the case of girls, the conflict with the mother over the father is termed as the *Electra complex*.

Psychoanalytic writers have tried to show that many social phenomena can be understood only when viewed in the light of Oedipus complex, which produces significant manifestations in almost every sphere of human activity. Sexual adjustment generally becomes heterosexual with the love object outside the family but with the deviant this conflict is not solved. There are guilty feelings over the incestuous desires for the parent of the opposite sex and an unsatisfactory shift to other heterosexual persons. These guilt feelings are relieved by deviant behavior or by the punishment that arises from antisocial behavior. Criminals and neurotics have much in common, for example, for both feel that they need to be punished to relieve the guilt feelings arising from the Oedipal situation.

Similarly, the behavior difficulties associated with alcoholism lie in various Oedipus and Electra conflicts. Alcoholism is interpreted as an escape value from these intolerable inner battles. Male homosexuality has been explained as a result of over attachment to the mother in an unresolved Oedipus complex which results in the individual rejection of sexual relations with other women. Psychoanalytic theories often explain prostitution as caused by the person's failure to reach sexual maturity. Because the prostitute suffers from or has never outgrown, her Electra complex for her father, she is often incapable of receiving real sexual gratification.

Criticisms

- Psychoanalysis has emphasized the meaningfulness of subjective experience. The emphasis on the unconscious, on symbolic expressions and on mental conflicts that arise from constant tension are all subjective experiences and their explanations are vague.
- *Behavior is social*. Contrary to psychoanalysis, evidence suggests that human behavior is a product of social experience and that it is not determined by an innate reservoir of animal impulses termed *the id*. Depending upon social and cultural experiences, a person can be cruel or gentle, aggressive or pacific, sadistic or loving. No detailed refutation is necessary, therefore, to

disprove a psychoanalytic theory that some forms of criminality, for example, should be envisaged as outbursts of an *id* with “*unsocialized original animal impulses*”. What constitutes criminal behavior and other forms of deviance is a matter of social determination and impulses secure their social meaning only through the medium of social interaction

□ *Conflict as sex-based*: there is no evidence to support the theory that sex represents such an all-inclusive factor that it can explain most mental conflicts. The psychoanalytic emphasis on sexual eroticism is a great overstatement of an important aspect of human behavior. Conflicts can arise in many other areas of human experience, for example, through economic competition, the achievement of status and through religion

□ *Biological emphasis*: the entire psychoanalytic scheme is too bodily conscious rather than sufficiently socially conscious; the child’s development is greatly influenced by social relationships that have little or no connection with bodily functions. The evidence does not support the view that these rather pre-social experiences involving oral and anal stimulation affect the entire course of human life

□ *Universality of conduct*: psychoanalytic theory has assumed that there are certain universal uniformities in human behavior which arise from the assumed uniformities in human biological drives, irrespective of cultural influences, historical eras, or variations in social structure. An example of this erroneous approach is the view that the Oedipus and Electra complexes are universal in all cultures. There is no universal cross-sexual parental preference. It appears that Freud overrated the uniformity of family patterns and failed to perceive that sexual definitions are products of the child’s social relationships

□ Psychoanalysis is not a scientific explanation. First, most of psychoanalysis has not been verified and for that reason it is possible to give a “symbolic” interpretation to almost everything. The emphasis on the unconscious, as exemplified by the concentration on dream analysis, has never been scientifically established; it is a “*ghost in a machine*”. Second, a scientific theory must be stated in such a way that it is verifiable; in the case of psychoanalysis, “the theory is stated in language so vague and metaphysical that almost anything appears compatible with it.

Chapter Three

Urbanization and Deviance

Cities first appeared in the Near East in about 3500 B.C., in Mesopotamia, in the region between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. A few centuries later they also appeared in the Nile Valley of Egypt and in the valley of the Indus River, in what is now called Pakistan. Some cities, such as those in the Orient, were of considerable size. In general, however, only a small proportion of the people lived in them as compared with urban populations today and few cities had over 100, 000 persons.

Following industrialization the rate of urbanization has been even increased in many folds. The process of urbanization has been accompanied by a marked increase in various forms of deviant behavior. Urban life has produced what some people have called the mass society. It has greatly increased social differentiation, the clash between norms and social roles, and the breakdown of interpersonal relations. In the current chapter, a brief elucidation of the relationship between deviance and urbanization will be made.

3.1 City as a Source of Deviant Behavior

Since Greek and Roman times writers have contrasted the immorality of the city with the morality of rural areas. On the whole, modern cities, as compared with rural areas, do appear to have higher rates of crime, illegal drug usage, heavy drinking and alcoholism, homosexual behavior and mental disorder. Official crime rates are generally much lower in rural area as it was indicated in various studies. This increase is almost all due to the accelerated urbanization that has accompanied industrialization and the migration to the cities of the rural youth.

While some criminal acts committed in rural areas are informally handled and are not officially reported and while cities undoubtedly offer more opportunities to commit offenses, the differences between rural and urban crime rates are so great. Also, there is little evidence that the city attracts deviants from rural areas.

The reason for this high crime rates in urban areas is justified as: the lack of intimate ties, plus the protective cover of impersonality and anonymity, radically reduces both the internal and external control of criminal behavior. The city offers greater opportunities for theft and greater possibilities of collaboration with other offenders and with 'fences' for the disposal of stolen

goods. Urban areas generate the motivation, rationalization, skill and low risk of detection of crime.

3.2 Urban Areas: Norm Conflicts and Sub-Cultures

The greater diversity of interests and backgrounds of persons living in close contact with one another is a major characteristic of urbanism. Urban residents vary in age, race, ethnic background and occupation as well as in interests, attitudes and values. Everywhere urban life is characterized by contrasts in wealth, abilities and class structure. Large cities are really cities within cities, each area often with its own subculture, religious affiliation or racial characteristics. Often groups have different customs as well as separate languages. This heterogeneity of the population, the complex division of labour, the class structure, and apparently, the simple physical dimension of population size, generally produce divergent group norms and values as well as conflicting social roles.

Precisely because of the nature of urban life and the multiplicity of social groups in urban settings, urban experiences are not easily classified into types. So differentiated and so conflicting have become the ends sought by different groups in these modern urban societies that individuals often do not know the conventional ways of behaving and suitable social rules in many areas of their lives. The simple fact that there are more people providing social expectations results in difficulties in fulfilling role obligations. Thus, urban residents tend not to agree about norms, show a tendency to ignore traditional norms and often are not restrained by the social controls that have traditionally characterized rural areas. The behavioral result is often crime, high rates of mental disorder, drug addiction, alcoholism, suicide and other forms of deviance.

Urban life also tends to foster increased individual freedom of normative choice. Norm and role conflicts or diversities of norms and behavioral standards, create situations in which no single standard is likely to be upheld and in which deviation from it is not met with penalizing sanctions. Individuals who have been taught to accept the supremacy of a single rule may become skeptical of its validity when they discover, under urban conditions, that breaking the rule does not bring the social ostracism or the censure they had supposed.

The end result of urbanism is the creation and the strengthening of a variety of subcultures and the norms of these subcultures are often conducive to deviance. The city does not always destroy social groups and subcultures; instead, it often tends to create them. These sub-cultural groups

become differentiated one from another by distinctive sets of beliefs and ways of living. Many of them are conventional but others are considered to be deviant because of their lack of commitment to dominant social order, their particular normative structure and their unconventional types of behavior. Subcultures may be conventional: they may be considered only a bit “odd”—such as artists, missionaries of new religious sects, and certain types of intellectuals—or perhaps outright deviant—such as delinquent gangs, professional criminals, drug addicts and peddlers and homosexuals. These groups can develop in the city due to the city’s significant social diversity; the subcultures reflect this diversity. Rather than the destruction of social groups the urban process creates new ones; the city not only creates these groups but fosters and intensifies them. It is only with a large and complex population that certain of these subcultures can form and grow; the urban areas provide many groups the very opportunity to exist and to become stronger as persons are provided contacts with others of like interests, as well as with the opportunity for sustained interaction.

It is, then, the process by which these groups or subcultures are created and developed that indicates how deviance comes about, through processes of learning and support from others. The large city populations provide what is termed the “*critical mass*” of deviants as well as the opportunity to commit deviant acts. The following major features of urbanization provide conducive opportunities for city residents to commit various types of deviant acts:

A. **Rapid cultural change:** rapid social and cultural change and disregard for the importance of stability through the generations also generally characterize urban life. Consequently, elements that are traditional or “sacred” dwindle in importance. Sometimes the practical exigencies of urban life produce these changes; at other times, they seem to be outgrowth of the failure of informal controls to uphold and to maintain the older values and ideologies.

These changes create a fertile ground for individuals to involve in various types of deviant behavior

B. **High mobility:** it has been said that less than a century or more ago a person might live a lifetime without ever going far from home and without seeing more than a handful of strangers: today the picture is quite different. Modern transportation, particularly in urban areas, enables persons to move about rapidly and to have frequent contacts with many different people. People move again and again into strange localities.

As persons become more mobile they come into contact with many different norms and they begin to understand that other codes of behavior differ from their own. Mobility often means the loss of such personal relationships as kinship and neighborhood ties and fewer close friendships. For child and adult alike, it may be necessary to acquire new friends and new norms, to change social roles and to reconcile old norms and roles with new ones. As a result of these factors, social controls and also legal controls are weakened. Data on the effects of extensive mobility strongly point to a definite relationship between disrupted or anonymous life patterns and deviance.

C. **Materialism:** external appearances and material possessions have become of primary importance in modern urban society, where people are more often known for their gadgets than for themselves. People increasingly come to judge others by how they display their wealth, a display Veblen termed “*conspicuous consumption*”. Under urban conditions the types of clothes a person wears or the automobile he drives, the costliness of his home and its furnishings, the exclusiveness of the club or association to which he belongs and the knowledge of his salary or the amount of his financial assets are the sole means others have of judging him or his success in life. Because of the status money and material goods provide, criminality, both in the lower and upper classes, becomes higher in urban areas.

D. **Individualism:** urban persons tend to regard their own interests and self-expression as paramount in their social relations. The “I” feelings come to replace much of the feeling of corporate characteristic of rural life. People increasingly feel that they must look after their own interests and increase their status through their own efforts. The urban person’s strong belief in *hedonism* or *personal happiness* as the ultimate goal of life is increasingly seen.

Completion has also been intensified as individualism has increased in urban society or at least with that part of the society in which he operates. The intensity with which a person strives for goals is, generally, in proportion to the values he attaches to them and the extent to which these goals can satisfy his socially induced needs. The extreme individualism and the completion of urban areas account, in part, for their higher rates of crime, alcoholism, suicide and mental disorder.

3.3 THE SLUM AS A WAY OF LIFE

Almost universally people react to city slums in a negative manner, as if they represented something dark, evil and strange. In fact, the very word “slum” is thought to be derived from

“slumber” because slums were thought by most people to be “known, back streets or alleys, wrongly presumed to be sleeping and quiet”. Even today emotional attitudes toward the slum are reflected in popular definitions that emphasize the filth and squalor of the slum, the poor social conditions existing there and the presence there of “*vicious and dangerous persons*”. The slum population largely defined is a “street, alley, court etc., situated in a crowded district or town or city and inhabited by people of a low class or by the very poor or as a number of these streets or courts forming a thickly populated neighborhood or district of a squalid and wretched character”. Because of this general characterization of the slum, the word has sometimes been avoided in recent years and other terms have been substituted such as “blighted”, “deteriorated”, “lowincome”, or “inner-core area” or “lower class neighborhood”. Hunter has pointed out; however, that “slum” is still a good word that carries real meaning. A widely used term with strong emotional connotations is “ghetto” which originally referred to segregated urban Jewish areas and now refers to black slums.

Characteristics of Urban Slums

Urban slums are typically characterized by the following features:

1. Physical characteristics of the slum

Of all the characteristics of a slum, the physical conditions have been most often emphasized:

A. ***Housing conditions:*** slums have commonly been defined as those portions of a city where housing is crowded, neglected, deteriorated and often obsolete. These inadequate housing conditions are in large part the result of poorly arranged structures, inadequate light and circulation, poor design, lack of sanitary facilities, overcrowding and insufficient maintenance. Yet it must be recognized that the housing conditions of a slum area are often a product of neglect and sometimes willful destruction associated with the way of life found there.

B. ***Overcrowding and congestion:*** a slum may be overcrowded with buildings or the buildings overcrowded with people, or both. High density is not the same as overcrowding: areas may have high densities, as in high-rise apartment but not be overcrowded. Congestion may be so great that a judgment about the physical condition of the building must often be made in terms of the high density per block, acre, or the square mile.

C. ***Poor sanitation and health:*** slums are dirty places; they often are infested with rats, cockroaches and other pests that complicate health and sanitation problems. In combating these problems a basic problem is the distribution of medical resources. That is, the distribution of

medical resources is unrelated to various population characteristics reflecting burning health needs.

2. Social characteristics of the slum

The social behavior of the slum can be analyzed in terms of its social organization, its social isolation and its cultural patterns.

A. ***Social organization:*** detailed descriptive studies of slum communities often reveal a considerable degree of organization with systematic and persisting features of social behavior.

Rather than being “disorganized”, the slum often simply has its own organization, usually a type judged by the middle class to be unconventional. Miller states that lower-class culture is a cultural system in its own, with its own integrity, set of practices, focal concerns and way of behaving systematically related to one another rather than to corresponding features of middle-class culture.

B. ***Cultural patterns:*** the slum has a culture of its own. The slum way of life is learned and passes from generation to generation, in the process developing rationale, structure and even defense mechanisms which provide means of continuation in spite of deprivations and difficulties. While all slum residents are influenced in some degree by this slum culture, all do not become a real part of it. For example, in parts of the world some members of the intellectual classes, including students and artists, choose to live in the slum yet, they do not become slum dwellers in the full cultural sense.

Certain patterns or styles of life are typical of the slum culture. Life is usually gregarious and centered, for the most part, in the immediate area. Confusion and noise seldom abate: life has more spontaneity and behavior is more unrestrained than in the middle-class environment, whether in the home or on the street corner. Fried and Levin have cited some of the striking characteristics of social relations in the working-class slum community. “Continuity of contact with the same people over long periods of time, spatial contiguity of residence, frequent interaction in a variety of circumstances, informality of contact in daily activities”. It is these factors that operate to create the context wherein “extremely close, mutually dependent” relationships develop among clusters of people.

C. ***Social isolation:*** a slum represents an image in the eyes of the larger community which involves a negative societal reaction to slum dwellers. The non-slum dweller often associates the

physical appearance and difficult living conditions of the slum with a belief in the “*natural inferiority*” of those who live there: because the slum is an inferior place, those who live there are also inferior. This reaction has important consequences for the social isolation of slum dwellers and their exclusion from power and participation in urban society. The slums of virtually every city harbor, in alarming amounts, not only physical deprivation and spiritual despair but also doubt downright cynicism about the relevance of the outside world’s institutions and the sincerity of efforts to close the gap. Those who live in the slum lack an effective means of communication with the outside world because of apathy, lack of experience in communication with outsiders or their own powerlessness to make their voices “heard”. The common denominator of the slum is submerged aspect and its detachment from the city as a whole...The life of the slum is lived almost entirely without the conventional world.

3.4 Slum and Deviant Behavior

One reason for the concern of eliminating urban slums is that, there exist high incidence of deviant behavior-violence, property crime, prostitution, drunkenness, drug abuse, mental disorder, suicide, illegitimacy-is associated with slum living. Yet, one should not over exaggerate the slum as a producer of deviance, for in middle and upper-class suburbia there is also extensive white-collar crime, increasing youth crime, particularly vandalism, drug abuse, drunkenness and alcoholism and various types of mental disorders. In general, however, overt crime is more pronounced in slum areas.

Crime and delinquency: in nearly all countries, there is strong evidence that the slum neighborhood, rather than the suburban, provides the milieu for juvenile delinquency and crime: it is here stolen goods are sold and attitudes of antagonism toward the police and outside authorities are developed. Gang delinquency in the form of theft or assault may be a natural means of adjusting not only to the social roles, behavior patterns and norms of the groups but also to the slum neighborhood to which the gang delinquents belong. In developing countries the “criminalizing” effect of slums is potentially strongest on younger persons who migrate to areas with high crime rates.

Drug use: drug addiction is heavily concentrated in the slums of large cities. Drug use for “kicks” is more common among teenagers and youth, partly because drugs are more readily available in these areas. There is also much talk about drugs. Within recent years drug use has been spreading into middle-class areas and into suburbia; when this problem existed almost

entirely in the slum, middle-class people were much less concerned about drug use among adolescents

Sexual deviant behavior: early initiation to sexual intercourse is a common phenomenon for youngsters living in slum areas. Studies on slum sexual behavior indicate that there is more illegal abortion, the practice of prostitution and spread of HIV/AIDS among slum girls than those girls in middle class families.

Mental disorder: a disproportionate amount of schizophrenic mental disorder appears to come from slum areas. A survey of the prevalence of mental disorder in many cities revealed a higher rate among the lower class slum residents.

However, great is the extent of certain forms of deviance in the slum, it is essential to reiterate that not all slum dwellers engage in them. In any slum area there exist, simultaneously, strong conventional value systems carried through certain individuals, schools, churches and other sources. The interaction of the conventional and unconventional value systems, such as delinquent and criminal values may have differential impact on those who live in these areas.

Moreover, it is also important to recognize the extensive nature of youth crime, drug usage, mental disorder, alcoholism and suicide among middle and upper class groups. Among these groups are persons in business, lawyers and physicians who commit white collar crimes, most of which may be far more serious to the total society in the long run. Those who engage in such activities as price fixing, embezzlement and bribery of public officials come from middle or upper class areas. The discussion of deviance in the slums, even though, as stated above, the forms of deviance under discussion here are disproportionately slum-based.

Chapter Four

Deviant Behavior

There are different forms of deviant behaviors in contemporary time. In this short chapter, it is not possible to discuss them all. Hence, only the common form of deviant behaviors such as drug use, crime, alcoholism, sexual deviance, mental disorder and suicide shall be dealt with.

4.1 Drug Use and Addiction

Drugs are any substances other than those required for the normal maintenance of health, such as food, which affect the structure or the function of the body.

Drugs have been used for centuries and for various reasons. They are used in medicine to treat disease, to ease pain, or to control the appetite in dieting; they are used for sedation, for social relaxation and for relief from tensions, boredom, and anxiety; they are used for pleasure, to satisfy curiosity and to open the mind to new feelings of sensitivity; they are used to create a bond of fellowship, to increase sexual performance and to give more meaning to life. For whatever reason drugs are used, it is important to understand the nature of drugs, their use and abuse, as well as the societal reaction towards drug abuse.

Types of drugs

From the standpoint of physiological effect, drugs fall roughly into two categories, *the depressants* and *the stimulants*. As their names imply, depressants decrease mental and physical activity in varying degrees, depending upon the dosage, whereas the stimulants excite and sustain activity and diminish symptoms of fatigue.

The depressants: the most important depressant drugs are morphine, heroin, opiates, methadone and marijuana.

The opiates, heroin and morphine, white powdered substances derived from opium are most frequently taken by injection, either subcutaneously or directly into the vein. Almost immediately after the injection of either drug the person becomes drowsy and relaxed and enters a state of reverie (daydream). Soon this state of euphoria is reached only with larger injections of the drug. Thus, the addict builds up his tolerance for the drug as well as his dependence upon it.

As this tolerance builds up, the addict becomes comparatively immune to the toxic manifestations of the drug. With morphine, for example, the tolerance may be as high as 78 grains in 16 hours, a dosage strong enough to kill 12 or more un-addicted persons. The safe

therapeutic dosage of morphine given in hospitals is usually considered to be about one grain in the same period of time (i.e., in 16 hours).

The opiates, heroin or morphine addict becomes dependent upon his injections over a varying length of time, usually quite short, the addiction increasing slowly in intensity thereafter.

Authorities are generally agreed that this dependence is favored more by the regularity of administration than by the amount of the drug or the method of administration. The addict becomes as dependent on drugs as he is on food and if he is receiving his usual daily supply he is not readily recognized as an addict. Even intimate friends and family may not know of the addiction. If the individual does not receive this daily supply, however, clear characteristic of symptoms, referred to as *withdrawal distress* or *the abstinence syndrome*, will appear within approximately 10-12 hours. He may become nervous and restless, he may develop acute stomach cramps, and his eyes may water and his nose runs. Later, he/she may stop eating; may vomit frequently, develop diarrhea, lose weight, and suffer muscular pains in the back and legs. During this period the “shakes” may develop, and if the addict cannot get relief by obtaining drugs he is in for considerable mental and physical distress. Consequently, an addict will go to almost any lengths to obtain a supply of drugs to relieve the suffering of withdrawal distress. Once the drugs are obtained, he appears normal again within about 30 minutes.

The physiological and psychological dependence on opiate drugs, with the stage always set for the withdrawal syndrome, makes this drug addict a particularly serious problem both for him and for society. As tolerance for the drug is developed and more and more must be taken to relieve the physiological and psychological symptoms of withdrawal distress, the habit is well established. It is difficult to break the habit.

Methadone (dolophine) is a synthetic narcotic painkiller which was originally developed in Germany during World War II. It is a strong, long lasting narcotic which comes in pill, injectable liquid or oral liquid form. It has the same physiological and psychological effect as heroin, morphine and opiate.

Marijuana is a depressant drug taken in the form of smoking. When one uses marijuana for pleasure, one must first learn to conceive of the drug as something that can produce pleasurable sensations. The user must learn three things: (1) how to smoke the drug in a way that will produce certain effects; (2) how to recognize these effects and to connect the drug with them; and (3) finally, how to enjoy the sensations. After marijuana is taken in the form of smoking a

person feel dizzy, feel thirsty, misjudge distance and develop a wrong perception of things around him.

Stimulant drugs: the most common types of stimulant drugs include cocaine, tobacco, tea, coffee, chat and hashish. Since, most of the stimulant drugs listed here are familiar to you, only a brief discussion on cocaine will be made here.

Cocaine, the best-known stimulant drug, is most commonly inhaled or “snorted” through the nose. Cocaine is considered a recreational drug and one that facilitates social interaction. It produces euphoria; a sense of intense stimulation and a sense of psychic and physical well-being accompanied by reduce fatigue. Illegal cocaine is sold as a white crystalline powder frequently diluted to about half its volume by other ingredients, particularly sugar. Cocaine is extremely expensive; its current street price ranges from \$150 to \$200 a gram. The combination of the high price and the exotic properties attributed to it has provided cocaine the name *status drug*.

Restlessness, anxiety, hyperirritability and paranoia are among the major effects of cocaine drug.

Legal drug usage

Not the use of all drugs is deviant behavior. The frequency and amount taken, from where it is obtained and the purpose of taking it, is what make it deviant or non-deviant behavior. The use of illegal drugs such as heroin and marijuana, while disapproved, have their widely used counterparts in such legally approved drugs as alcohol, cigarettes, tranquilizer for relaxation, barbiturates for sleeping and relaxing and other minor pain-killing drugs such as aspirin. Coffee and tea also drug stimulants which can have considerable effect when consumed regularly in large quantities. Much scientific literature has clearly established that caffeine is a stimulant whose actions fairly closely resemble those of the amphetamines. While most persons use it in such moderation that no ill effects are suffered, an occasional person drinks so much coffee that he develops symptoms of sleeplessness, nervousness, elevated blood pressure and hyperirritability that can be produced by equivalent doses of amphetamine. Thus, taking drugs that could obtained illegally (not prescribed by professionals) in large amount (over dosage) for purpose rather than medical values is what we call *drug abuse*.

Societal reaction

Drug use and the societal reaction to it have varied extensively in time and in place; drug usage has not always been regarded as deviant behavior. In fact, in terms of a relative view of deviance, there is little reason to doubt that much marijuana and opiate use is not regarded as being

deviant. However, this relative view of drug abuse is not acceptable in most cases for the possibility that it will lead to a high crime rate.

The use of narcotics is so expensive that an addict must often engage in various illegal activities to maintain his supply. As noted earlier, once an individual becomes addicted to a narcotic drug like heroin, his dependence upon a continuous supply usually becomes the most important single feature of his daily life. As tolerance to the drug is increased and the addict requires larger and larger doses, the daily expenditure is generally more than he can earn legitimately, moreover, since the addict's life is centered around obtaining drugs and getting high, the addict has little time for those occupations that would support the habit, were he qualified. For these reasons, the addict employs hustle to obtain money for drug.

In addition to the effect mentioned in the above paragraph, drugs have also the potential to seriously hamper the physiological function of the addicts. As a result, drug addicts are extremely disapproved and considered as deviant. All most all nations have a legislation that prohibits illegal drugs usage and trafficking.

4.2 Crime: Its Definition;

The nature of a crime or a criminal act may be examined in two ways, as a violation of the criminal law or as a violation of any law punished by the state, depending upon how one approaches illegal behavior.

Sociologically a crime is any act that violates social norms and that is considered to be socially injurious.

From a strictly legal standpoint, an act is a crime only when the statutes so specify; these statutes and their subsequent interpretations by the courts, constitute *the criminal law*. The criminal law may be defined as a body of specialized rules of a politically organized society that contains provisions for punishment to be administered in the name of the political state when a violation has been substantiated through the judicial process.

Many criminal laws develop from social conflict. Conflicts are inevitable in any society—conflicts between states, between groups and between cultural units; they are the normal consequences of social life. Group cohesion is assured by some form of coercion and constraint through the criminal law as exercised by certain persons and groups who have the power to determine the conduct of others.

Types of criminal behavior

Criminal offenders can be classified according to the degree to which they are career criminals.

A criminal career can be distinguished from a noncriminal career by the extent to which the person has developed criminal norms that lead to criminal acts and by how the person views the criminal behavior. As distinguished from a noncriminal career, a criminal career involves a life organization of roles built around criminal activities such as: (1) identification with crime; (2) conception of self as a criminal; (3) extensive association with criminal activities and with other criminals; and finally, (4) a progression in crime that involves the acquisition of more complex techniques and more frequent offenses.

Offender can be divided into the following types along a continuum from non-career to career and embodying the nature of the group support, the relation to noncriminal values and the societal reaction. Most personal offenders are of the non-career type, or primary criminal deviants, whereas property offenders are more likely to be of the career or secondary type. At one end of the continuum are violent personal criminal offenders and occasional property offenders; at the other end are organized and professional offenders. In between are political offenders, occupational criminals, corporate violators and conventional criminal offenders.

1. Violent personal crimes: violent personal crimes are of two types: collective *personal violence* and *individual personal violence*. Collective violence has been common in the past and in contemporary society in the form of wars, civil riots and violent demonstrations. This violence involves thousands of individual acts of assault, murder, arson, vandalism and theft.

War is a good example of collective violence. During World War I, 1.7 million soldiers were killed or missing in battle and there were 20 million civilian deaths; in World War II, 10 million soldiers were killed or missing in battle and 43 million civilians were killed. The Nazi control of Europe resulted in the brutal extermination of 6 million Jews.

On the other hand, individual acts of violence such as criminal homicide, assault (physical attack), and forcible rape, which are designated as violent personal offenses. All involve the accomplishment of an objective through violence, whether it is an argument, a personal dispute, or sexual intercourse.

2. Occasional Property offenders: many offenders have criminal records consisting of little more than an occasional or infrequent property offense such as illegal auto “joy riding”, simple (naïve) check forgery, misuse of credit cards, shoplifting, and employee theft. Such crimes are

incidental to the way of life of occasional property offenders and in no way do such offenders make a living from crime nor do they play a criminal role. This type of criminal behavior is usually of a fortuitous nature and occasional property offenders do not conceive of themselves as criminals.

3. Political Criminal Offenders: political crime exists wherever the state invokes its laws to punish those who present a threat to the government and where, for alleged reasons of state, governments themselves violate the law. *Crimes against the government* involve attempts to protest, to express beliefs about or alter in some way the existing social structure. Included in political crime is a wide range of acts-treason, sedition, sabotage, assassination, hijacking, violation of military draft laws, civil rights violations, violations resulting from the advocacy and support of “radical” ideas and actions, and failure to conform to certain laws. *Crimes by government and its agents* include violations of citizens’ right and their civil liberties, such as the violations of constitutional guarantees and civil rights legislation by various government officials; criminal assault and murder of citizens by the police and among prison officials; and violations condoned by governments such as conspiracy to obscure justice, perjury, acceptance or solicitation of bribe and other forms of political corruption.

4. Occupational Offenders: some persons commit crimes in connection with their occupations. This includes employees who commit crimes against their employers. These offenses occur in all legitimate occupations such as repair services of all types (automobile, television, and other appliances), small and large businesses, political offices, government, the medical, legal and pharmaceutical professions, and many others. There are few occupations, in fact, in which there are no some law violations. For those occupations of particularly high social and economic status, the term **white-collar crime** is used as a subdivision of occupational crime.

White-collar crime is an offense committed by a person of respectability and high social status in the course of an occupation. Examples of white-collar crime include restrain trade, misrepresentation in advertising, infringement of patents, unfair labour practices, rebates, financial fraud, tax evasion and crimes of the medical profession: illegal sales of alcohol and narcotics, abortion, illegal services to criminals, fraudulent reports in accident cases, fraud in income tax returns, unnecessary treatment and surgical operations, false claims to be specialist and fee splitting.

5. *Corporate criminal Behavior:* large corporations are huge conglomerates with assets and sales often totaling in the billions of dollars and with enormous economic and political power. The total sales of many of them exceed the gross national product of most nations.

Corporate crimes are those crimes committed by such huge corporations. Such corporate criminal behavior include restraint of trade (price fixing and monopoly control); fraudulent sales; illegal financial manipulation; misrepresentation in advertising; issuance of fraudulent securities; income tax violations; misuse of patents, trademarks and copyrights; manufacture of unsafe foods and drugs; illegal rebates; unfair labour practices and environmental pollution. The enforcement of regulations designed to control these practices rests largely with administrative agencies like the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Consumer Products Safety Commission. Although only corporation officers can be sent to prison, corporate liability is increasingly common under criminal law and corporations are being punished by heavy fines under this law. Generally, however, corporate violations are dealt with by more administrative and civil enforcement actions such as consent orders and agreement not to repeat the violation, seizure or recall of the commodity and court injunctions to refrain from further violations.

6. *Conventional Criminal Careers:* conventional criminal offenders represent the stereotyped idea of a “criminal” to most persons. They move progressively from youth gang offenses, primarily theft, to adult criminal behavior of a more serious type, chiefly burglary or robbery.

Their careers involve early group experience with delinquent behavior patterns as gang members. They adapt to a number of social roles and achieve high status through their gang activities. They continuously acquire techniques and develop rationalizations to explain their crimes as they move from petty to more serious offenses. During this progression, they have many experiences with official agencies, including the police, courts, juvenile authorities and institutions, reformatories and, finally, prison. Institutional experiences add to their status and sophistication and help mold the conceptions they have of themselves as criminals.

7. *Organized Crime and Criminals:* like conventional offenders, members of organized criminal syndicates earn their living through their criminal activities. Often groups of conventional offenders unite to engage in a wide range of criminal activities. The groups of criminals organized for international drug trafficking in Latin America can provide a classic example of such crime. Organized crime is characterized by the following main features:

- A. Hierarchical structure involving a system of specifically defined relationships with mutual understandings, obligations and privileges
- B. Unlimited political or geographic boundaries-intracity or intercity; intrastate or interstate
- C. Dependent upon: (1) the possible use of force and violence to maintain internal control and restrain competition, and (2) securing and maintaining permanent immunity from interference from law enforcement and other agencies of government
- D. Criminal operations directed at large financial gains and specializing in one or more combinations of enterprises that fall into the areas of social deviation where public opinion is divided
- E. Establishment of monopolistic control or establishment of spheres of influence between or among different criminal organizations

4.3 Drunkenness and Alcoholism

Alcohol Defined:

Alcohol is a chemical substance derived through the process of fermentation or by distillation.

Although the process of distillation of alcoholic beverages from barley, corn, wheat and other grains is of fairly recent origin, nearly all societies have made some form of fermented beverages such as wine and similar products for thousands of years.

Although increased concern has been expressed about the use of “drugs” by large segments of the public and through the mass media, alcohol is often not regarded as a drug. Excessive drinking and alcoholism actually present far greater problems numerically than the use of other drugs and the total effects upon individual behavior and decreased physical and psychological functioning as a result of alcohol use are more serious.

Alcoholism

A large proportion of drinking is done in a group context in public drinking houses, which are found in most of the world today under a variety of names; American taverns and bars, British pubs, French bistros, Germany beer halls, Italian wine houses, and African or Japanese bar.

Public drinking houses are more than places where alcoholic beverages are sold for consumption on the premises. They have several important characteristics: (1) they involve group drinking; (2) this drinking is commercial in the sense that anyone can buy drink as contrasted to bars of private clubs; (3) they serve alcohol and can thus be distinguished from the coffee houses of the

Middle East or the teahouses of the Orient; (4) their bartenders or “tavern-keepers” serve as functionaries of the institution and around them, in part, the drinking gravitates; (5) many customs are connected with them including the physical surroundings, types of drinks, and the hours of sale.

Alcoholics are persons whose frequent and repeated drinking of alcoholic beverages is in excess of the dietary and social usages of the community and are of such an extent that it interferes with health or social or economic functioning. The alcoholic is unable to control consistently or to stop at will the drinking of alcohol. Of particular importance are such other characteristics as solitary drinking, morning drinking and general physical deterioration. The presence of one or more of the following major criteria indicates alcoholism:

1. Withdrawal symptoms-gross tremor, hallucination, seizure or delirium tremens when deprived of alcohol
2. Tolerance-high blood levels of alcohol without gross evidence of intoxication; daily consumption of a fifth of a gallon of whiskey or an equivalent intake of beer or wine, by an individual
3. Continued drinking in the face of strong penalties-medical warnings, loss of job, disruption of marriage, arrest for drunkenness or drunken driving
4. Major illness-fatal degeneration, alcoholic hepatitis, cirrhosis, pancreatitis and a number of other syndromes and ailments associated with alcohol

Physiological, Psychological and Economic aspects of alcohol

The effect of alcohol is determined by the rate of its absorption into the body; this depends upon the kind of beverage consumed, the proportion of alcohol contained, the speed with which it is drunk and the amount and type of food in the stomach as well as on certain individual physiological differences.

The physiological effect of alcohol is often dangerous. Following the intake of alcoholic beverages, a certain amount of alcohol is absorbed into the small intestine. It is carried in the blood to the liver and then disseminated in diluted form to every part of the body. This can indirectly cause organic brain damage, corroding or dissolving. Because there shouldn't be more than 1 percent of alcohol in the bloodstream and any amount more than 1 percent can affect the physiological function of the body. In moderate quantities, alcohol has relatively little effect on a

person but large quantities disturb the activity in the organs controlled by brain and cause the phenomenon known as “*drunkenness*”.

Alcohol produces a number of psychological effects on emotional and overt behavior. The believe that the use of alcohol can lessen tension and worry and in general ease the fatigue associated with anxiety will leads to the individual’s psychological dependency on alcohol. This can further reinforce alcoholism. There is general agreement that alcohol produces euphoria and a warm glow of optimism. Feelings of loneliness are dulled as are feelings of social inadequacies. But these psychological perceptions are not actual and exist only for short period of time. As one skid row alcoholics described: “*Alcohol is marvelous at removing obstacles for a while. Everyone gets to the point where he is just fed up and scared and worried. He doesn’t know where to turn. Alcohol takes care of that. Soon after, the important becomes unimportant. Your problems aren’t anywhere near what you thought*”.

The economic cost of alcoholism may come in two forms: first, the price of alcoholism to individual is too great. In addition to the actual costs of the beverages, alcoholics face loss of wages, medical care costs, court costs and fines, the loss of home or business furnishings and equipment, and many other personal expenses. Second, industry loses large sums of money due to excessive alcohol consumption in the form of absenteeism, inefficiency on the job and accidents. According to International Labour Organization (2004), the annual occupational cost of alcohol-related problems is roughly estimated at 785 billion dollars at the global level.

4.4 Sexual Deviance

Probably more than any other form of human behavior, the sex act has in all societies been surrounded by all types of formalities and restrictions. This situation may well epitomize the famous remark that *while man was born free everywhere, everywhere he is found in chains*-in his culture and in his society and his state of having “enchained” his most basic desire. Throughout the history of humanity the sex act has constituted a natural part of human existence; in addition to its fundamental purpose of procreation, it is one of the most pleasurable sensations of all human experience. Sexual deviance, therefore, presents particularly difficult problems for definition and analysis. The recognized need of sexual behavior, according to Gagnon, makes the problem of establishing “*cutoff point*”-beyond which the interaction of persons, their acts, and the context of their behavior may be defined as being deviant-“even more obscure than it is in

other areas of behavior". While negative sanctions are frequently expressed for the majority of sexually deviant acts only sporadically are they enforced by formal means such as the law.

Broadly speaking, *it may be said that, a sexual deviation is an act contrary to the sexual mores of the society in which it occurs.*

Common types of sexual deviance

Sex deviations involve many different types of behavior, some of which are proscribed by law and some of which are negatively reacted to in other ways. They have in common the fact that they may violate the formal norms of certain groups or legal codes, or both. The most common types of sexual deviance include: homosexuality, prostitution and pornography shall be briefly considered.

1. Homosexuality

Homosexual deviance: it represents sex relations with members of one's own sex, whether male or female. Persons, who engage in homosexual behavior; males or females, may come from all social classes, having varying degrees of education, have a wide range of occupations and professions, have varied interests and avocations and may be single or married.

Most societies have what are termed sexually appropriate and sexually inappropriate roles according to a person's age, social status, and other criteria. In some societies homosexual roles and behavior are considered inappropriate for one's sex and in others they are condoned or even approved. There is simple evidence that cultural attitudes toward homosexual or one-sex behavior have differed from one period in history to another. Homosexual behavior can come in two forms:

A. *Gay:* the term gay refers to those males that maintain sexual relation to each other. Between males sex can be carried out physically in a number of ways: sodomy (anal), mouth (oral) and mutual masturbation.

For male homosexuals who live together as partners in a more or less permanent union the homosexual relation may be quite stable, their sexuality having become integrated into long standing affectional, personal and social patterns. The majority of male homosexuals, however, are likely to have a widespread sexual life, their relations with other homosexuals confined generally to brief and relatively transitory sexual encounters. Permanent relationship for them are likely to be infrequent but even less lengthy affectional-sexual ties in homosexual life are

inclined to be overshadowed by the predominant pattern of cruising and relatively impersonal one-night stands. Because of the relatively impersonal nature of such sex relations, certain male juveniles, who are likely not to be homosexuals themselves, offer their services on a monetary basis. Transitory sex relations can also be arranged with the homosexual prostitutes, the “hustler” for other homosexuals who provides, particularly for those who are less attractive physically and older, those services that might be difficult to obtain without great effort. The adult homosexual prostitute is a part of homosexual life; he learns his behavior role-such as gestures, vocabulary, clothing and even makeup-in the same sense that heterosexual prostitutes become a part of heterosexual life.

B. Lesbian: the term lesbian refers to those females that maintain sexual relation to each other. Homosexual relations between women can consist of oral stimulation of the clitoris, mutual masturbation and the use of objects like vibrators or an artificial penis.

Lesbians are often stereotyped as masculine in aggressiveness, dress and manners: in the lesbian world this termed the “*butch*” role. Only a minority of lesbians are actually committed to such a role, even though some may experiment with it, particularly during the “identity crisis” period that takes place at the time of their own self-admission “of a deviant sexual commitment” or when they enter into the subculture.

It is important to distinguish between those primary homosexuals and secondary or career homosexuals. Primary homosexual is situational and may occur, for example, in one-sex communities like prisons, isolated military posts, naval ships and boarding schools, whereas secondary homosexual deviants tend to seek sexual gratification predominantly and continually with members of the same sex. They have developed a self-concept and play a homosexual role in connection with these acts.

2. Prostitution

Prostitution is a sexual intercourse on a promiscuous (immoral) and mercenary (monetary) basis with emotional indifference (without emotional attachment). The true prostitute is one who makes her living primarily by selling for money her sexual relation with an element of indifference (without interest). On the other hand, many women are promiscuous but are not prostitutes, for their sex relations have an element of affection, even if transitory. For example, when a customer “dates” a shop-girl for an evening dinner and show interest and later has sex relations with her, the relation is often on a mercenary basis, yet; the women may not be

considered nor consider herself a real prostitute. Such a woman may have a family and a job and may not make a practice of exchanging sex relations for an evening's entertainment.

With many prostitutes the sex act may be purchased in varied physical forms, other than the usual form of heterosexual relations, such as both oral and anal sex acts, as well as sadistic, masochistic and exhibitionist acts of intercourse. So indifferent are most prostitutes to the emotional aspect of sex relations that they rarely experience an orgasm with a customer although they frequently do with their "pimp" or male consort.

Although prostitution is virtually universal, it is generally disapproved in most societies. The extent of prostitution and the reaction to it has fluctuated over many years. Attitudes toward prostitution have varied historically and today vary in different countries. The attitude toward and the social status of the prostitute, as Davis has suggested, varies according to three conditions:

(1) if the prostitute practices a certain discrimination in her customers, (2) if the earnings are used for some socially desirable goal, and (3) if the prostitute combines with her sexual role others that are more acceptable.

Prostitution is opposed on many grounds because of the following reasons:

1. It involves a high degree of promiscuity, particularly with strangers, rather than being the exclusive possession of one man
2. The prostitute is willing to sell and commercialize her sexual participation with emotional indifference outside of marriage, one participating for pleasure and the other for money
3. The social effects on the women who engage in the profession are unwholesome
4. It is a threat to public health in that it facilitates the spread of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases
5. Sexual acts with a prostitute are generally such that there is no possibility of marriage and procreation and for this reason are different from ordinary premarital sex relations.

Types of Prostitutions

Prostitutes can generally be classified according to their methods of operation. The following are the common types of prostitutes:

A. **The streetwalker:** streetwalker prostitute operates on the streets and in such places as bars and hotel lobbies, taking her customers to a prearranged cheap rooming house or hotel

B. Organized houses of prostitution: like any other business, there are organized houses opened mainly to provide sexual service to the customers. Girls are recruited by the owner of the house to serve as prostitutes. New recruits are expected to learn the rules and regulations of the house, various sex techniques, how to handle large numbers of customers without running the risk of losing them as patrons, how to deal with different types of men and how to protect themselves against sexually transmitted diseases. They are often exploited by the house manager and high percentage of their earnings goes to the house managers.

C. The call girl: increasingly the call girl is the more common type of prostitute, partly because police and health authorities have become more effective in doing away with street soliciting and with the more visible type of prostitution. Rather than operating on the street or organized houses of prostitution, the call girl uses phone and other contact methods to arrange the sexual relation with her customers. The call girl has a list of patrons who come to her directly for sexual service.

D. Rent house prostitution: prostitutes rent cheap house usually in deteriorated (slum) areas of the city to provide sexual service for the customers. Divorced, poor women, migrant and illiterate women are common in such type of prostitution.

E. The independent professional prostitute: this is a woman who lives in her own apartment house, often in an expensive area of the city. Such type of prostitute leads luxurious life because she caters to middle and upper class patrons. Most of her clients are secured on an individual basis through referrals from customers.

Primary and secondary prostitution

An individual who engages in sex relations for monetary reasons, promiscuously and without much emotion, may still be a “primary prostitute”. The transition from primary deviation to professional or secondary deviation is accomplished as a person comes to acquire the self conception, social role, ideology and language of prostitution. It exists to the extent that the individual becomes identified with prostitution as a set of values and comes to accept the role definition accorded her by others.

3. Pornography

Pornography refers to any material or act that has erotic effect on the sexual behavior of an individual. These materials of what one might call “erotica” appear in the form of printed books, magazines, photographs, films, sound records and sex “devices”. While these materials are primarily for heterosexual persons, there is also “erotica” for the homosexual persons.

The effects of pornographic materials

Generally termed “*obscene*” (in legal terminology) and “*pornographic*” (in popular term), these materials are presumed to arouse a person sexually. Some people believe this leads to all kinds of negative consequences, such as premarital sexual relations, illegitimacy and sex crimes. Several studies have been conducted to try to determine the effects of exposure to erotic materials and to determine whether these effects support sufficiently the presumed reasons for the existence of the obscenity laws. The conclusion was reached that exposure to erotic materials does produce sexual arousal in a substantial proportion of males and females, the extent of the arousal; dependent on the particular characteristics of the viewer, age and type of the pornographic material. Younger persons are more likely to be aroused than older, those college educated, religiously inactive and sexually experienced more often reported arousal than those with the opposite characteristics. For the most part, conventional sexual behavior arouses more than does homosexual behavior, petting and coitus themes stimulate more than oral sexuality.

4.5 Mental Disorder

It is difficult to assess the deviant nature of mental disorder because what is meant both by mental health and, consequently, mental disorder, had not been adequately defined. Critique points out that, attempts to define mental illness in some precise fashion continue to be disappointing. While usually defined in terms of some deviation from normality, it is not a simple matter to define normality. Certainly some individuals behave in strange or inappropriate ways or they verbalize bizarre thoughts or rationales for their actions but they are frequently judged to be mentally ill by subjective standards.

Psychiatric definition

According to the conventional classification of psychiatry, there are two basic types of mental illness, those with an organic basis and the functional or non-organic disorders.

The organic disorder: are usually caused by some organism, by a brain injury, by some other physiological disorder, or in certain rare types of mental disorder possibly by some hereditary factors

The functional disorder: conventionally labeled as the neuroses, schizophrenia, the manic depressive psychoses, and paranoia. According to many psychiatrists, the functional or

nonorganic mental disorders “function” to adjust (adaptation to stress) the individual to his particular difficulties; hence the term “function”.

Sociological definition

Increasingly, sociologists and social anthropologists are giving their attention to the role played by social and cultural factors in the development and treatment, as well as the prevention of mental disorder.

Mental disorder can be viewed as residual rule breaking and the exhibition of certain types of behavior. A sociologist has pointed out the many characteristics that operate to varying degrees in minds considered to be disordered that a diagnosis of insanity had been made: *sense of inferiority, sublimination, imperceptions, illusion, hallucinations, delusions, disorders of judgment, disturbance of the train of thought, flight of ideas, non-essential ideas and thought, incoherence, disorders of orientation, disturbance of consciousness, clouding of consciousness, confusion, dream states, negativism, inaccessibility, obsession, fears, phobia, disorders of attention, disorders of memory, conflict, complexes, symbolization...etc.*

These characteristics, however, be viewed as normative behavior not only in and of itself but also in terms of the social context in which it occurs. The more closely a person’s behavior conforms to the expectations of other persons, the more favorably he is evaluated by those around him. On the other hand, when his behavior is not within the expected range, he is likely to be evaluated negatively. Thus it is not necessarily the severity of the disorder or the pathology of the behavior from a clinical viewpoint that leads to the rejection of mentally ill individuals but rather the social visibility of the behavior. Indeed, is generally agreed that many remain for long periods of time in the community without ever being “recognized” as “mentally ill”.

Playing the role of a mentally disordered person

A sociological theory of mental disorder in terms of playing the role of the mentally ill and labeling of the behavior has been set forth by Scheff. Normative violations that characterize mental disorder such as withdrawal, depression, compulsions, obsessions, and hallucinations are common and Scheff terms such norm violations “*residual rule breaking*” to distinguish them from the violations of the criminal law or social conventions such as etiquette.

The explicit identification and labeling of such residual behavior by others helps to organize the behavior into a “*role of being mentally ill*” that has been defined by and therefore learned from, the culture. People share conceptions of what is meant by insanity or what Scheff has termed the

“*social institution of insanity*”. Popular conceptions of mental illness or being insane are perpetuated and reaffirmed in everyday conversations and activities. One can learn from the culture the stereotyped imagery associated with being “insane”, “of one’s rocker”, or “crazy in the head”, even in childhood and children often play at being “crazy”. All adult persons probably know how to “act crazy”.

According to Scheff’s theory of mental disorder, three points are of special importance:

1. The normative definition in terms of residual norms
2. Persons becoming more aware of the relation of their behavior to these norms
3. The idea of mental disorders as a role-playing of the behavior expected of the mentally ill

Societal reaction to mental ill persons

Society, both collectively & as individual members, react differently to the mentally ill.

Because mental illness involves many intangible feelings and ideas that others often cannot comprehend or that many even make them fearful; attitudes toward the mentally ill may range from avoidance to ridicule and revulsion.

Mentally ill persons are also stigmatized because their behavior is often socially disruptive and unpredictable, even threatening or frightening to other persons.

5.6 Suicide

Suicide is the destruction of oneself-self killing or self murder in the legal sense. It can be intentional or it may result from a person’s failure to prevent death when it is threatened.

Suicide as deviant behavior

The act of self-destruction or self-killing is a deviant behavior because it is against the norms and values of the society. The predominant norms and values condemned the act of suicide. For example, the act of suicide is strongly condemned by Christianity. The holy bible expressly prohibits the act of killing (whether self-killing or killing other people) through the Ten Commandments. One of the Ten Commandments is; *one shall not kill*. Because suicide is guilty of a double offense: one it evade prerogative of the Almighty God. No one shall have a right to destruct a life that God generates. Second, it is against the Ten Commandment and therefore, a person shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.

The Islamic countries are also strongly condemn suicide; the holy Koran expressly condemns the act of self-destruction or self-killing and in actuality it rarely occurs there.

Sociological theories of suicide

Several attempts have been made to formulate a general theoretical explanation of suicide: social integration, degrees of social constraint, status integration and status frustration.

In his classic study, Durkheim stated that the suicide rate in any population could be explained not by the attributes of the individuals in the population but by the varying degrees of *social cohesion or social integration*. This view is still widely accepted today. Durkheim believed that suicide was related inversely to the stability and integration of social relations among people, whether religious, familial or other. Many examples were cited by Durkheim as evidence for this conclusion, including the lower suicide rates among Catholics as compared with Protestants, of married persons as compared with the single, divorced, or widowed, all of which he attributed to greater social integration. Somewhat related to Durkheim's theory of social integration is another sociological theory which links suicide to a particular pattern of *status occupancy* or the degree of *status integration* in a society. Suicide varies inversely with the degree of status integration in the population.

Fewer suicides occur in populations in which one status position is closely associated with other status positions; as a result, the members are less likely to experience role conflict and are more capable of conforming to the demands and expectations of others. In these situations they are also more capable of maintaining stable and durable social relations.

Several theoreticians have tried to link suicide within a framework of different adjustments to *status frustrations* which produce aggression. According to Henry and Short's theory of suicide, the aggression is directed at the self in suicide, whereas in homicides it is directed at others.

Thus, according to Henry and Short, suicide is a form of aggression against the self aroused by some frustration, the cause of which is perceived by the person as lying within the self.