

1955

## Theories of Criminality and Problems of Prediction

S. Kirson Weinberg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

S. Kirson Weinberg, Theories of Criminality and Problems of Prediction, 45 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 412 (1954-1955)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

# THEORIES OF CRIMINALITY AND PROBLEMS OF PREDICTION

S. KIRSON WEINBERG

The author is associated with the departments of sociology and psychology and the Research Center for Social Psychology at Roosevelt University. He has taught Sociology and Social Psychology at the University of Minnesota; was co-director of a study of the mental hospital at Columbus, Ohio and has been a clinical psychologist in the army. One of his chief interests has been personality development and its disorders. He is author of a systematic treatise on this subject, entitled "Society and Personality Disorders," and has completed preparation of a forthcoming book, "Incest: The Universal Crime,"—EDITOR.

The aims of this paper are 1) to appraise the group and individual approaches to criminal behavior, 2) to seek a tentative theory of criminal behavior which reconciles these differences and 3) to relate theories of criminal behavior to the prediction of criminal behavior.

Although sometimes overlooked in actuarial studies, theory and prediction have an integral relationship in a scientific endeavor. The function of theory is to explain the processes which contribute to or cause criminal behavior. The function of prediction is to test the theory by relating the processes to outcome for a series of cases. Since different theories emphasize diverse processes in the causation of crime, prediction studies should be able to test these theories. But many prediction studies have been so separated from theory that they have not been concerned with testing specific theories. In order to relate prediction to theory we shall first elaborate on the varying theories of criminal behavior, see to what extent these theories have been tested by prediction techniques and how these theories can aid in predicting criminal behavior.

Of the various theories of criminal behavior, we shall consider 1) the sociological version which deals with criminality as a product of learning and acculturation, and 2) the individualistic versions which explain criminality in terms of distinct personality traits.

## I

Modern sociological theories of criminal behavior arose during the decline of social Darwinism. Human behavior was explained by learning and acculturation, and explanations based upon instincts and innate characteristics were repudiated.<sup>1</sup> The person generally was defined as a subjective aspect of his culture and as a cultural type.<sup>2</sup> The criminal, from this perspective was viewed as a product of a deviant subculture within the urban community.<sup>3</sup> The criminal, was a deviant type who became

<sup>1</sup> KARPFF, FAY B.: AMERICAN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1932. FARIS, ELLSWORTH: THE NATURE OF HUMAN NATURE, 1937.

<sup>2</sup> See THOMAS, WILLIAM I. AND ZNANIECKI, FLORIAN: THE POLISH PEASANT IN EUROPE AND AMERICA, 1927.

<sup>3</sup> SHAW, CLIFFORD R., EDITOR: THE NATURAL HISTORY OF A DELINQUENT CAREER 1931. SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H.: PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY, 4th ed., 1947.

acculturated to a special behavior system in a learning process by association with other criminals.

Sociologists drew these inferences primarily from delinquents in high rate delinquency areas, and from confirmed adult offenders. Later they extended these theories to upper-class and middle-class persons, specifically to white-collar criminals.<sup>4</sup> The delinquents who were studied were in urban areas where the criminal culture was dominant, and where a network of relations extended from adult criminals to pre-delinquent children.<sup>5</sup> The other subjects, who were usually confirmed criminals, were also characterized as having a minimal opportunity to select conventional orientations. Although these inquiries have demonstrated conclusively that criminality is learned instead of inborn behavior, sociologists left unanswered why the individual selected, accepted, and executed his criminal behavior, except for certain delinquents in very high rate areas where conventional alternatives of behavior are few. But this left open the well-known questions why non-delinquents exist in very high delinquency areas where alternatives for conventional behavior are few; or why in low-rate delinquency areas, where the middle class conventional peer group and culture predominate, the juvenile seeks and selects delinquent associates. These aspects of criminal development are integral aspects of a total learning process. Despite the voluminous literature on delinquency and crime, these questions have not been answered adequately, except for two studies. One study has shown that many non-delinquents are actually undetected delinquents; the other study has sifted out the pre-schizophrenics who were dominated by their mothers and who were too timid to participate in delinquent peer groups.<sup>6</sup>

Seemingly, this limitation in the sociological theory of crime resulted from a limiting theory of personality. First, since the individual reflected his culture or his role in the group, the dynamisms as to why he selected or did not select a singular organization of attitudes and meanings, were not explained adequately, and, in some instances, were not considered necessary for explanation. Hence singular motives, meanings, and aspirations of the criminal were muted in these descriptions in order to emphasize the shared behavior of the criminal as a cultural participant. Second, the process of selecting criminal or conventional norms of behavior was analyzed in terms of preferring one alternative from a series of alternatives as a means of renewing interrupted or disrupted action. This preference process, in turn, was explained by the theory of differential associations. Third, this theory of differential association was based upon a rational psychology, reminiscent of utilitarian psychology, and it conceived of preferred alternatives of behavior in terms of quantity and rational deliberation. From this approach, a given person would accept criminality because his contacts and definitions favoring violating the law exceeded his definitions and contacts favoring conforming to the law.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H.: *WHITE COLLAR CRIME*, 1949. ELLIOTT, MABEL A.: *CRIME IN MODERN SOCIETY*, 1952.

<sup>5</sup> SHAW, CLIFFORD R., ET AL. EDITORS: *BROTHERS IN CRIME*, 1938.

<sup>6</sup> KOBRIN, SOLOMON, *The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas* AMER. SOCIOLOGICAL REV., 16, October, 1951, pp. 653-661. DUNHAM H. WARREN, *The Social Personality of the Catatonic Schizophrenic* AMER. JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, 12, May, 1944, pp. 574-576.

<sup>7</sup> SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H.: *PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY*, 4th ed. 1947, Pp. 6-9.

But it is evident that the attachments and aversions, the diffuse and focused kinds of hostility, are acquired from past relations and experiences, and can affect contemporary decisions. In this respect, an individual may select criminal associates for reasons which he does not understand and of which he is unaware. This point is too frequently dismissed by claiming a fortuitous or adventitious theory of crime based upon chance association or upon chance combination of circumstances. The process of deciding upon, accepting, and incorporating criminal behavior means that an individual has internalized certain norms because of attachments to one or a series of persons who might be called reference points or reference groups.<sup>8</sup> These interpersonal attachments and the needs for social approval as bases for selecting and accepting motives and ideas, are not functions of frequency of association, and are not fortuitous, but are based upon emotional security, feelings of self-enhancement, or upon expressive behavior and conflict solution.

For example, one aspect of delinquent behavior during the 1920's concerned American born delinquents who rejected their parents' immigrant culture as inferior and who accepted their American peer culture as status-enhancing and superior.<sup>9</sup> This rejection of the parents' values by the children sometimes meant also rejecting the parents as role-models and hence accepting delinquents as role-models. Although the parents of many contemporary delinquents are natives, still the juveniles prefer the youth culture because of its prestige in our youth-oriented society. In the discontinuity of generations between parents and children, conformity to adults becomes mitigated by the peer group. Schachtel found that defiance of adult authority was one crucial symptom of delinquent behavior. He stated:<sup>10</sup>

The most important consideration in answering (whether a boy would or would not become delinquent) was whether or not the boy showed much dependence on or fear of authority. The more such fear and dependence has become part of the character structure and the prohibitions of the significant authoritative adults had been internalized, the more likely it seemed to me that the boy would not become delinquent.

It might also be pointed out the potential schizophrenics from high rate delinquency areas identify with the adult culture and tend to reject the peer culture or are rejected by their peers. In fact, in the Glueck study many indicators seem to point to some non-delinquents in their control group as potential schizophrenics: they were extremely ectomorphic, dependent upon others, had vague feelings of anxiety and felt overwhelmed and helpless.<sup>11</sup>

Clearly when youths are more attached to an adult conventional culture than to a peer delinquent culture they will not necessarily resort to delinquent behavior even though they have learned delinquent techniques and experienced some relationships

<sup>8</sup> NEWCOMB, THEODORE M.: *SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY*, 1950, Pp. 240-243. ZUCKER, HERBERT J.: *Affectional Identification and Delinquency* ARCHIVES OF PSYCHOLOGY, 286, 1943.

<sup>9</sup> See SELLIN, THORSTEN, *CULTURE CONFLICT AND CRIME*, 1938.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted in GLUECK, SHELDON AND ELEANOR: *UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*, 1950, P. 217.

<sup>11</sup> GLUECK, SHELDON AND ELEANOR: *UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*, 1950. Pp. 193, 221, 222, 224, 225.

<sup>12</sup> HEALY, WILLIAM AND BRONNER, AUGUSTA: *NEW LIGHT ON DELINQUENCY AND ITS TREATMENT*, 1936, Pp. 135, 136.

with delinquents. Healy and Bronner have specified that the criminal ideology is very pervasive and that the individual should have slight difficulty in acquiring criminal techniques.<sup>12</sup> But sociologists have, for this very reason, emphasized that criminal influences stem from direct association with other delinquents.<sup>13</sup> Hence they have stressed that delinquency usually arises from this direct association and not from indirect sources. Consistent with the reference group theory, however, association is necessary but is not sufficient as an explanation for accepting delinquent behavior; for the individual internalizes the types of behavior from persons with whom he has definite rapport and to whom he is attracted and frequently attached emotionally. The mode of relationships with a given person in a total content of person's modes of relationships will indicate the direction of his influences towards delinquent or towards conventional behavior.

In this respect, parent-child conflict means not only displaced hostility from a parent to another person but also the possible rejection of the parent as a role-model and the search for other approving role models. Frequently, these other role-models can be delinquents or criminals. Also, the individual who has ambivalent attitudes towards his parents, may have certain guilt-ridden reactions to crime which are residual from past attachments. Thus, the selection of delinquent values is a resultant process of social relations.<sup>14</sup>

In short, the sociologists have isolated delinquents and criminals as cultural types. They have limited their explicit theories either to persistent juvenile offenders or to systematic adult property criminals. They have demonstrated that this behavior is learned in an acculturation process by association with other criminals. They have stressed the shared techniques and attitudes which the criminal expresses in the criminal culture. But they have not explicitly integrated the rise of criminal behavior of the singular person with the individualized meanings which go into the selection and acceptance of criminal behavior. Sometimes, the person has been analyzed as a passive rather than as a dynamic participant, by the contention of the fortuitous nature of his crime, and second, by the theory of culture conflict in which the individual is described as being pulled by two forces which create polar influences that he can not dispel or resolve.<sup>15</sup> But the active phase of individual selection emerges from accepting the attitudes of those persons to whom one becomes attracted and attached. The incomplete part in this learning process is that personal attachment was not acknowledged as affecting the acceptance of one set of attitudes and practices in preference to another set of attitudes and practices.<sup>16</sup> The cultural approach has explained one dimension of delinquency and adult crime. It has explained one type of delinquent or criminal who has experienced a minimal set of alternatives in selecting his criminal behavior. Thus the sociologists have formulated a framework for understanding the development of crime as learned behavior. They have made this causal formulation from subjects who were already delinquents and criminals. But these processes which

<sup>12</sup> SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H.: *PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY*, 1947, Pp. 6-9.

<sup>14</sup> RECKLESS, WALTER: *THE ETIOLOGY OF DELINQUENT AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR*, 1943. WEINBERG, S. KIRSON: *SOCIETY AND PERSONALITY DISORDERS*, 1952. Pp. 290-295.

<sup>15</sup> This "fortuitous process" would be very difficult to verify.

<sup>16</sup> For a discussion of role-taking and learning, see MEAD, GEORGE H.: *MIND, SELF AND SOCIETY*, 1935, Pp. 73-81.

lead to delinquent and criminal behavior, as we shall see, can also be used as predictors of potential criminals.

## II

The gap which pertains to the development of criminal behavior has been supplemented by studies of the criminal as an individual. Nonetheless, these clinical studies have not answered these questions within a theoretical framework of learning and acculturation and inter-personal relations. Aichhorn recognized the gap of development in criminality when he stated:<sup>17</sup>

When I ask parents how they account for the dissocial behavior of their children, I usually receive the answer that it is the result of bad company and running around on the streets. To a certain extent this is true, but thousands of other children grow up under the same unfavorable circumstances and still are not delinquent. There must be something in the child himself which the environment brings out in the form of delinquency.

The Gluecks have been more explicit when they said:<sup>18</sup>

They (the Sociologists) do not explain why the deleterious influences of even the most extreme delinquency area fail to turn the great majority of its boys into persistent delinquents. They do not disclose whether the children who do not succumb to the evil and disruptive neighborhood influences differ from those who become delinquents, and, if so, in what respects.

Healy and Bronner, among others, have recognized these facets of delinquent behavior as points of departure, although this does not necessarily mean that they have produced a conclusive answer.<sup>19</sup>

Since both personality maturation and character structure theories seek something physically, temperamentally, or emotionally distinctive in the delinquent's or criminal's personality make-up, then how does the person acquire these distinctive characteristics which lead to criminal activity?

The biopsychological maturation theorists, such as Sheldon, Seltzer, and Glueck, emphasized the constitution-temperament trait couplet as predisposing the youths to selecting and to accepting criminal behavior.<sup>20</sup> The individual with a tightly-knit muscular, predominantly mesomorphic constitution, has an aggressive, outgoing temperament, and will be attracted to activities that may defy or oppose conventional constraints. Hence he becomes delinquent because his mode of expression differs from that of the non-delinquent who, at the extreme, predominates as an ectomorphic body-type. Of course, physical anthropologists and constitutional biologists do not explain why so many conventional children with similar physiques and temperament do not become delinquent. This approach may impute to constitutional factors what also is a product of a particular peer culture. The constitution-temperament trait-couplet seems to imply a built-in kind of delinquent potential. It does not explain

<sup>17</sup> AICHORN, AUGUST: *WAYWARD YOUTH*, 1939, Pp. 39, 40.

<sup>18</sup> GLUECK, SHELDON AND ELEANOR: *UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*, 1950, P. 5.

<sup>19</sup> HEALY, WILLIAM AND BRONNER, AUGUSTA: *NEW LIGHT ON DELINQUENCY AND ITS TREATMENT*, 1936, Pp. 68, 69.

<sup>20</sup> SHELDON, WILLIAM H.: *VARIETIES OF DELINQUENT YOUTH*, 1949. SELTZER, C. C. *Body Disproportions and Dominant Personality Traits*. *PSYCHOSOMATIC MEDICINE*, 8, 1946, Pp. 75-97. GLUECK, SHELDON AND ELEANOR: *UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*, 1950, Chapters 15, 21, Appendix C.

the manner in which selection of the delinquent or criminal norms of behavior occurs, although it does show that the majority of delinquents, fit this body type. In brief, does body-type and temperament have a bearing upon predicting criminal behavior.

The clinicians who advocate indirect learning and fixation in early life as the basis of a potential delinquent character structure, have tried to show that these roots of personality difficulties are the anti-social tendencies. The most pervasively distinct characteristic in these studies has been the outgoing aggressive behavior among delinquents in contrast to non-delinquents. They minimize the effects of learning from the delinquent peer-group in a tolerant neighborhood situation. When they preclude the probability of a stable person becoming delinquent, they make criminality coincide with character disorders, such as Abrahamsen or, Healy and Bronner who specifically assert that delinquency results from "thwarted wishes in early life" or the Gluecks who conclude that delinquency is a "character disease". They see in these early predispositions the bases for selecting and accepting delinquent behavior.<sup>21</sup> While the Healy and Bronner study does not specify the given community areas, the Gluecks' study did identify the high rate delinquency areas.

But the clinicians have difficulty in differentiating between the anti-social person and the criminal. The characteristics of outgoing hostility, defiance, destructiveness, and impulsive aggression, are not the same as criminal behavior. An anti-social person may engage in random acting-out behavior, and still not violate the law—or he may engage in stealing. This view errs in dismissing the learning process in criminal behavior or in appraising it as of slight importance. Boys who are behavior problems in conventional middle-class areas do not necessarily become delinquents or criminals, but boys in lower-class areas frequently become delinquents. This approach somehow attributes an inevitability to the selection of delinquent associates and to the learning of crime when the early frustrations and subsequent hostility are present. But connecting the sequence between predisposition towards and acceptance of delinquent behavior remains to be demonstrated. On the other hand, it must be recognized too that the process of social definition is important. The lower-class juveniles may be defined and arrested as delinquent, whereas middle-class boys for somewhat similar activities, might be spared from arrest.<sup>22</sup>

The theory of character disorders as the crucial causal basis of behavior does not explain the different distribution of delinquents and criminals in different areas of the city by diverse childhood training techniques, or even by constitutional temperamental types. Seemingly, the most plausible explanation is the concentration of delinquent traditions in these areas of the urban community. Since lower-class juvenile and adolescent males participate in perhaps one of the most unrestrained and aggressive peer sub-cultures of any society in the world, if rated by unrestrained individual fighting as well as by unsupervised inter-group fighting, then an emotionally normal boy who associates with his peers would become aggressive by sheer

<sup>21</sup> HEALY, WILLIAM AND BRONNER, AUGUSTA: NEW LIGHT ON DELINQUENCY AND ITS TREATMENT, 1936, P. 133. GLUECK, SHELDON AND ELEANOR: UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, 1950, P. 289. ABRAHAMSEN, DAVID: WHO ARE THE GUILTY? 1952, Pp. 26-28. EISSLER, K. R.: *General Problems of Delinquency*. SEARCHLIGHTS ON DELINQUENCY, Edited by EISSLER, K. R., 1949, Pp. 3-25.

<sup>22</sup> PORTERFIELD, AUSTIN L. AND CLIFTON, C. STANLEY: YOUTH IN TROUBLE, 1946.

participation in the peer group.<sup>23</sup> Hence a person's aggression can be explained by one of three levels. Some boys become very aggressive, defiant and destructive from the influence of their peers. Other boys become very aggressive as a defensive formation from the helplessness and guilt in anxiety neurosis. Still other boys become very aggressive from psychopathic tendencies and minimal guilt. Seemingly, there has been no satisfactory differentiation of these levels of aggression in terms of their relevance to criminal behavior.

Aggressive behavior which is so pervasive among lower class boys cannot be explained satisfactorily by early child training except in a very general way. One difficulty in assessing the aggression as well as other traits of the delinquent boy results from the methods in the individualistic clinical inquiry. It does not see the boy as an integral part of his cultural context. Instead, it sees a series of actions which are abstracted away from the cultural context. Thus, it imputes certain rash actions as personality difficulties when these may possibly be expected reactions in the given cultural context. Frequently the clinician has a middle class bias in evaluating the behavior of the lower-class delinquent boy, particularly when his interpretations are based upon interviews. Furthermore, the boy's behavior acquired by participation in the peer group may resemble superficially behavior resulting from personality difficulties. As we shall see, these discrepant interpretations affect the kinds of predictors used in forecasting potential delinquent behavior.

A gang member may have the same lack of empathy for an out-group enemy that a psychopath has for another person. He may show the same lack of guilt by peer identification that the psychopath has. Many activities of delinquents which have been attributed to temperament or to early frustrations can be explained too by participation in and by learning from the peer group of lower-class boys in slum areas. What is considered early frustrated training may, in some instances, be the acquisition of the motivational emphases of a gang in a neighborhood milieu.

But from another vantage point, the individualistic clinical approach to criminal behavior has complemented the collective approach in the following ways: It has dealt with individualized meanings as distinct from shared attitudes. Hence criminal behavior has been viewed as symptomatic of, and as a defensive formation from, personality conflicts which are distinct from the shared norms and practices of a deviant group. Delinquents satisfied their individual needs and also responded to shared norms of behavior by their delinquent behavior. This means then that delinquency is a response not only to the social control of a deviant group but also is the activity stemming from private emotional needs.

Both sociologists and psychiatrists have recognized that delinquents become attracted to each other and cultivate socially intimate relations. Perhaps delinquents have certain predisposing attitudes which make for a certain inter-personal rapport among themselves and which non-delinquents do not share because they have different personal needs to satisfy in their social relationships. Still we cannot conceive of delinquents and non-delinquents as arrayed in two neat, separate rows as some of the matched studies of experimental and control samples implicitly and explicitly

<sup>23</sup> DAVIS, ALLISON AND DOLLARD, JOHN, *YOUTH IN BONDAGE*: 1940. WEINBERG, S. KIRSON, *Occupational Culture of the Boxer* AMER. JOUR. OF SOCIO., 57, March, 1952, Pp. 460-469.

may lead one to believe. In some high rate delinquency areas, the two groups may mingle but their relationships do not become sustained. These subtle aspects of the communicative process in social interaction must be considered along with the cultural view as a medium for transmitting and imparting criminal norms and techniques.

For the sociologists have emphasized the conjunctive relations among delinquent associates as tutelage media in transmitting crime. They have seen delinquency as a positive and rewarding form of behavior either in terms of thrill, peer group approval, or status enhancement, which reinforced the learned delinquent patterns of behavior. The psychiatrists have emphasized the disjunctive relations in the family as instrumental to delinquency; have seen delinquency as a negative form of behavior either in terms of residual hostility acquired from inter-personal relations in the family, or as compensatory association for parental or familial rejection or indifference. Thus the two views emphasize diverse aspects of learning. The sociologists, from a cultural approach, regard the criminal as acquiring and sharing symbols and actions in a variant sub-culture. Clinicians have emphasized the individual manner in which the criminal learns to execute his actions, to confront his difficulties, to relate with people, and to solve his conflicts, either as private defenses against anxiety or as the forms of hostility and of other perverse traits persisting from childhood. For example, two individuals may learn to drive an automobile, which is a new technique. One person may never have an accident; the other may have repeated accidents. Two individuals may learn to steal. One may never get caught. The other may get caught repeatedly. The mere learning of new behavior on a shared, rational level does not tell us how the individual will execute his knowledge in terms of the private meanings it has for him as an individual. These individualized meanings have been the preoccupation of the psychiatrist and psychologists who approached the delinquent as a unique person rather than as a cultural participant or as a social type. And these individualized meanings which may be witting and unwitting affect the manner in which the individual will learn and use his skills and socialized values. Thus the delinquent or criminal who conforms to a given socially deviant value system on a group level also uses these values as symptoms or as defenses to solve his personal conflicts on an individual level.

### III. TYPES OF THEORIES

These diverse approaches to criminality describe different aspects of crime and place diverse emphases upon the factors which can predict criminal behavior. Since the first or cultural approach regards systematic crime as an acquisition by social participation, the criminal is viewed in a benign way in terms of his similarity to the conventional person: Both learn their behavior and abide by the norms peculiar to their respective groups. Both have similar goals—such as money, prestige, success. Although criminal and conventional norms differ, insofar as the criminal has acquired his behavior by social participation, he is basically not different in degree of stability or maturity than the conventional person. Hence the advocates of this approach stress the normality of the criminal, and disregard the personality differences as an explanation of crime. It is not surprising, then, that in one critical review of the

studies of personality attributes among criminal and conventional persons, the authors concluded that personality traits are distributed in the criminal population in about the same way as in the general population.<sup>24</sup> They write:<sup>25</sup>

"When the (test) results are considered chronologically, there is nothing to indicate that the personality components of criminal behavior are being established by this method. On the contrary, as often as not the evidence favored the view that personality traits are distributed in the criminal population in about the same way as in the general population."

The advocates of the individual approach who regard crime as deviant and non-conforming, view the criminal as an anti-social individual who cannot be restrained by conventional norms and who has a distinctive personality. Hence they search for the combination of personality traits which cause his deviation, and depict the criminal negatively as one who cannot participate successfully in conventional society.

Seemingly, these two images of the criminal as it has been thus far depicted have resulted from different implicit questions. The sociologists have asked: "Why does systematic criminality exist?" And their answer is that it is a group and cultural process that cannot be explained by individual differences. Then, how does the individual become a criminal? They answer: By learning. The psychiatrists and psychologists, as clinicians, have asked: "Why do individuals become criminals and not remain law-abiding persons?" Their answer is that the criminal has distinct traits, stemmin, either from personality maturation or early conditiong which differ from the traits of the conventional person.

#### IV. BASES FOR AN INTEGRATED HYPOTHESIS OF CRIMINALITY

From the foregoing discussion, can we synthesize the group and individual versions of delinquent behavior—as limited to systematic property offenses—within an integrated frame of reference? This does not mean arriving at a coordinate eclecticism in which diverse variables are juxtaposed to each other, but rather seeking an analysis of behavior within an integrated theoretical scheme.

If we begin with social relations as a way of learning new behavior, we would have to investigate the function of social relations upon the group and individual aspects of behavior. First, social relations vary by meanings, form, and motives. Thus, the meaning of social relations as pertinent to delinquency would vary for children who become delinquents and for adults who become criminals. The boy who values the companionship of his delinquent associates may steal to retain the approval of his companions rather than to get the monetary gain. On the other hand, the adult may consider the gain as foremost in his relationship with other criminals. Thus the salience—that is, the peripheral or central importance—of the attitudes in forming and retaining the relationship, varies for the two age-groups.

Second, the positions of the interactants in their relationships must be considered. Although an individual learns to become a criminal by the influence of his social relations, the criminal also can learn to become a conventional person by his relations with conventional persons. Thus the role of the person in the association process must

<sup>24</sup> SCHUESSLER, KARL F. AND CRESSEY, DONALD R.: *Personality Characteristics of Criminals*, AMER. JOUR. OF SOCIOLOGY, 55, March, 1950, Pp. 476-484.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* p. 483.

be explicitly defined. From the available evidence, it appears that the novice in crime tends to be emotionally dependent upon the criminal. Were the dependence upon a conventional person, such as a therapist, the influence would flow towards a conventional orientation.

Third, the individualized satisfactions in the inter-personal process lead to the attraction and rapport of persons whose needs are similar. These needs which may be verbalized and un verbalized, pertain to the selection of delinquent associates apparently by persons who seem to come from families and other groups that fail to provide these juveniles with definite feelings of personal security and that do not create the kinds of relationships by which the juvenile internalizes deep attitudes towards conventional behavior.

Fourth, when these juveniles encounter accessible delinquent associates, they seem to prefer them as companions to more conventional persons, because these delinquents satisfy verbalized and un verbalized emotional needs. In this association process, the individual becomes responsive to accepting and sharing delinquent techniques and practices. But the situations leading to acceptance of crime vary considerably. The 6 year old boy who is initiated into crime by his older brothers has an entirely different problem of selection than the 16 year old boy who leaves conventional friends in his neighborhood to associate with delinquents in another neighborhood.

Fifth, when the delinquent group is not accessible, or when delinquent companions do not gratify the juvenile's individualized needs, then he will seek conventional outlets in a process of dynamic selection.

In short, we might suggest that criminal behavior as manifested among juveniles, arises when, for individualized purposes of emotional security, self-enhancement, or conflict-resolution, they seek and select accessible associates from whom they learn, accept, and express criminal attitudes.

By assessing the varying theories of delinquent and criminal behavior and by presenting a unified theory of criminal behavior, we shall have some gauges for checking the implicit and explicit theories in the prediction studies. From the individualistic approach, the emphasis would be upon the body-type, temperament, family relations, early personality development and personality structure of the potential delinquent. From the group approach, the emphasis would be upon the type of neighborhood, the kinds of accessible peers and perhaps the family relations. The unified approach would combine personality organization with accessible peer relations in a given cultural context.

## V. THEORY AND PREDICTION

The studies of prediction pertain not only to the potential delinquency of children but also to the reformation or recidivism of delinquents on probation and of adult criminals on parole. The methods used in formulating the theories of causation and those applied to prediction provide a commentary on the devious ways in which social science works.

The theories of causation are based mainly upon inductive analysis and typology. Thus Sutherland, Shaw and McKay, Cressey, Healy and Bronner, Abrahamsen

among others state their theories in a manner which account for all cases and which explain one level of reality whether it be the cultural, the social or the personal.<sup>26</sup>

The pertinent findings of prediction are based upon probability analysis and upon the testing of specified items of multi-dimensional levels by the actual outcome for a given sample of subjects. The theories of criminal behavior are usually within the scope of pure theory because they are non-utilitarian in purpose. The findings of prediction are designed usually for administrative purposes and are within the scope of applied theory. Theories of causation usually consider arrest or detection as superfluous in understanding criminal behavior. The findings of prediction—with the exception of work on potential delinquency—operate within the policy framework of probation or parole. Hence detection or arrest may be crucial. Also the predictive instrument does not always test personality dynamics and social dynamics but becomes a function of empirical trial and error outcome for specified items in terms of a given criterion, whether it be arrest or violation of parole or other action. Frequently, these items are taken from records in the files and have been recorded for purposes other than prediction. Hence these items become direct or indirect indexes at best of the pertinent behavioral dynamics of criminality. On the other hand, there has been an increasing recognition of the need to use items derived from a consistent theory and then applied to predictive tests.

Of the two types of theories of crime, namely crime as deviant behavior and crime as learned behavior, the theory of crime as deviant behavior is implicit or explicit in most predictive studies. Also, personality differences which are ignored or considered unimportant in the cultural approach to crime are considered relevant in most prediction instruments whether devised by clinicians or by sociologists. For example, Reiss has emphasized that delinquent recidivism is the result of failure of personal and/or social controls, whether in the family or in the local community.<sup>27</sup> But from a learning viewpoint of delinquency, the emphasis would have been upon accessibility to delinquent associates and upon the continued influence by delinquents as against conventional persons.

To illustrate the impact of personality differences upon potential delinquency in predictive inquiry, we find that the Hathaway-Monachesi studies of delinquency are based upon the scores of the items in the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory.<sup>28</sup> Thus the subjects with high scores in the "psychopathic deviate" category of behavior would portend a high probability of potential delinquency. In fact, almost twice as many subjects with high scores in the psychopathic deviate items were later arrested for delinquency than were the group as a whole.

Perhaps the most consistent attempts to apply sociological theory in which crime

<sup>26</sup> SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H.: *PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY*, 4th ed., 1947. Pp. 6-9. SHAW, CLIFFORD R. AND MCKAY, HENRY D.: *Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency* REPORT ON THE CAUSES OF CRIME, II, 13, 1931, pp. 222-257. CRESSEY, D. R.: *OTHER PEOPLES' MONEY*, 1953. HEALY, WILLIAM AND BRONNER, AUGUSTA: *NEW LIGHT ON DELINQUENCY AND ITS TREATMENT*, Pp. 273-282. ABRAHAMSEN, DAVID: *WHO ARE THE GUILTY?* 1952, Pp. 66-72.

<sup>27</sup> REISS, ALBERT JR.: *Delinquency As The Failure of Personal and Social Controls* AMER. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 16, April, 1951, Pp. 196-206.

<sup>28</sup> HATHAWAY, STARKE AND MONACHESI, ELIO D.: *The Prediction of Juvenile Delinquency Using the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory* AMER. JOUR. OF PSYCHIATRY, 108, 1951, Pp. 469-473.

is regarded as a form of acquisition have been the Ohlin-Glaser studies of prediction of paroled criminals.<sup>29</sup> This theory is based upon the process of differential identification which has been derived from Sutherland's theory of differential association. Since the Sutherland theory of differential association applies to the systematic property offender, this theory too would also pertain to the systematic property offender, and would not include other offenders, specifically sex offenders, whose crimes result from personality difficulties.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, the theory of differential association does not admit of individual differences in the causation of crime. Still in one item, called "social development pattern", the "respected citizen" category had 6.0 percent violators while the "socially maladjusted person" category had 60.6 percent violators.<sup>31</sup> Does this mean that personality differences are of slight importance in the causation of crime but are of decided importance in the renewal of crime? This may mean that the type of personality does influence the selectivity of associations in the process of reformation or recidivism. Indeed, it is difficult to see how the process of selective identification would work without considering the individualized needs of the person who does the selecting. Thus the theory of differential identification would perhaps be influenced by personality type, situational context or both in different degrees. The sensitivity of this point might possibly require further data from questionnaires as well as from information recorded in the files.

The Glueck study had the advantage of devising a prediction table based upon data gathered in a field study to verify certain specific hypotheses. From these data, the components of a multi-dimensional causal hypothesis were evolved and some of the components were used in a prediction study. In fact, they emphasize a multi-disciplinary inquiry, including constitutional, intellectual, emotional and social components, but devise a prediction table based upon the psychiatric aspects of personality only. Does this mean that a coordinate interdisciplinary approach to delinquency does not enhance the demonstration of predictive outcome for the factors considered? Seemingly, this study does not answer this question directly, but in predicting potential delinquency, it states that the constitutional approach is still controversial for ascertaining behavior of young children and that peer group influences do not begin in early childhood. Hence the Glueck study orients its predictive table about parent-child relations, and the formative character structure which emerges from these relations.<sup>32</sup> Their findings are highly consistent—causally considered—with the Healy-Bronner study. Both studies, emphasize the deviance theory of criminality and consider such character traits as defiance, suspicion, social assertion, aggression and outgoing destructiveness as indicative of potential delinquency. Still these traits may also be the learned and expected behavior of boys in lower-class gangs. Thus in some cases the behavior that is acquired from residually

<sup>29</sup> OHLIN, LOYD E.: SELECTION FOR PAROLE, 1951. OHLIN, LOYD E. AND LAWRENCE, R. A.: *Alternative Methods of Parole Prediction* AMER. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 17, June, 1952, p. 268-274.

<sup>30</sup> GLASER, DANIEL: *A Reconsideration of Some Parole Factors*, AMER. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 19, June, 1954, Pp. 335-341.

<sup>31</sup> GLASER, DANIEL: REPORT ON PONTIAC PAROLE PREDICTION STUDY (Mimeographed). Both percentages were very significant and as such had a high degree of selectivity.

<sup>32</sup> GLUECK, SHELDON AND ELEANOR: UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, 1950. Pp. 259-269, 273-282.

hostile relations in the family may also be acquired in the adjustment to peers in lower class areas.

From a cultural approach to delinquency, the crucial items which might predict potential delinquency would include: 1) the boy's capacity for group participation and for acceptance by other boys, 2) his relative accessibility to criminally-oriented boys and to conventionally-oriented boys, 3) his satisfaction or dissatisfaction with conventional interests and activities, 4) his attachment or aversion to conventional role-models, particularly in the family, 5) his need for being accepted by his peers even when their behavioral practices are delinquent.

Seemingly, the psychiatric and sociological approaches intersect in the discontinuity between the family and the peer group. In a synthesis of these approaches, the predictors of potential delinquency would include 1) the independent variables of family relations, capacity for peer relations, and accessibility of delinquent or conventional peers, and 2) the intervening variables of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with conventional role-models and of the search for delinquent or conventional companions or outlets, while 3) the dependent variable would be the uniformly specified criterion of property offences. In this manner, perhaps the use of interdisciplinary theory of the behavioral dynamics of delinquency could be tested concertedly by prediction of outcome.