

## An overview of criminological theories.

Jon Walter\*

Department of Criminal Justice, Kutztown University, United States

### Introduction

Criminology, the study of crime and criminal behavior, encompasses a wide array of theories that seek to explain why individuals engage in deviant acts and how societies respond to these behaviors. From classical perspectives to contemporary approaches, criminological theories provide frameworks for understanding the complex interplay of individual, social, and structural factors that shape criminal conduct. This article offers an overview of some of the most prominent criminological theories, examining their key concepts, historical development, and relevance in contemporary discourse [1].

Classical criminology emerged in the 18th century with the works of Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham, who emphasized the rationality of human behavior and the importance of deterrence in preventing crime. According to classical theorists, individuals weigh the potential costs and benefits of criminal behavior and are deterred by the threat of punishment. The principle of proportionality, which advocates for punishment to be swift, certain, and proportionate to the crime, underpins classical approaches to criminal justice [2].

Lombroso's theory of the "born criminal" posited that certain physical characteristics distinguish innate criminals from the general population, while Ferri emphasized the role of social and economic conditions in shaping criminal conduct [3].

Differential association theory, a key component of social learning theory, posits that individuals are more likely to engage in criminal behavior if they are exposed to favorable attitudes and definitions of crime within their social networks [4].

Strain theory, formulated by Robert Merton in the 1930s, examines the relationship between social structure and crime, emphasizing the role of societal pressures and inequalities in driving individuals to commit deviant acts. According to strain theory, individuals experience strain or pressure when they are unable to achieve culturally prescribed goals through legitimate means. This strain can lead to various forms of adaptation, including conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, or rebellion, depending on an individual's access to legitimate opportunities and resources [5].

Labeling theory, developed in the 1960s by theorists such as Howard Becker and Edwin Lemert, focuses on the social processes through which individuals come to be labeled

as deviant or criminal. According to labeling theory, the application of stigmatizing labels by authorities or societal institutions can amplify and perpetuate deviant behavior by shaping individuals' self-concepts and social identities. The theory emphasizes the importance of societal reactions to deviance in perpetuating cycles of criminality and social exclusion [6].

Control theory, proposed by Travis Hirschi in the 1960s, explores the factors that inhibit or constrain individuals from engaging in criminal behavior. According to control theory, individuals are naturally inclined towards deviance, but social bonds and attachments serve as protective factors that deter criminal conduct. These social bonds include attachment to conventional institutions, commitment to conventional goals, involvement in conventional activities, and belief in the legitimacy of social norms and laws [7].

Critical criminology, rooted in Marxist and conflict perspectives, challenges traditional approaches to crime and criminal justice by examining the structural inequalities and power dynamics that underlie criminal behavior and societal responses to crime. Critical criminologists argue that crime is a product of social, economic, and political structures that perpetuate oppression, exploitation, and marginalization. Critical approaches advocate for social justice, equity, and transformative change to address the root causes of crime and promote alternatives to punitive responses [8].

Positivist criminology arose in the late 19th century, challenging the rational choice assumptions of classical theory and emphasizing the scientific study of crime. Positivist theorists, such as Cesare Lombroso and Enrico Ferri, argued that criminal behavior is determined by biological, psychological, and social factors beyond an individual's control [9].

Social learning theory, developed by Edwin Sutherland in the mid-20th century, focuses on the role of socialization and peer influences in shaping criminal behavior. According to social learning theory, individuals learn deviant behaviors through interaction with others, particularly within intimate social groups such as family, peers, and subcultures [10].

### Conclusion

Criminological theories offer diverse perspectives on the causes and consequences of crime, ranging from individual psychological factors to broader social, economic, and structural influences. While each theory provides valuable

---

\*Correspondence to: Jon Walter, Department of Criminal Justice, Kutztown University, United States. E-mail: [jon.w@kutztown.edu](mailto:jon.w@kutztown.edu)

Received: 02-Feb-2024, Manuscript No. AARA-24-129728; Editor assigned: 03-Feb-2024, PreQC No. AARA-24-129728 (PQ); Reviewed: 17-Feb-2024, QC No. AARA-24-129728;

Revised: 22-Feb-2024, Manuscript No. AARA-24-129728 (R); Published: 29-Feb-2024, DOI: 10.35841/aara-7.1.188

---

insights into different aspects of criminal behavior, none offers a comprehensive explanation on its own. Instead, criminological theories are complementary, offering complementary lenses through which to understand the complexities of crime and inform strategies for prevention, intervention, and social change. By integrating insights from multiple theories and disciplines, criminologists can develop more nuanced understandings of crime and contribute to the development of more effective and equitable responses to criminal behavior in contemporary society.

## References

1. Kethineni S, Cao Y. The rise in popularity of cryptocurrency and associated criminal activity. *Int Crim Justice Rev.* 2020;30(3):325-44.
2. Pyrooz DC, Decker SH, Moule Jr RK. Criminal and routine activities in online settings: Gangs, offenders, and the Internet. *Justice Q.* 2015;32(3):471-99.
3. Phelps A, Watt A. I shop online—recreationally! Internet anonymity and Silk Road enabling drug use in Australia. *Digit Investig.* 2014;11(4):261-72.
4. Barratt MJ, Lenton S, Allen M. Internet content regulation, public drug websites and the growth in hidden Internet services. *Drugs: Educ Prev Policy.* 2013;20(3):195-202.
5. Kruisbergen EW, Leukfeldt ER, Kleemans ER, et al. Money talks money laundering choices of organized crime offenders in a digital age. *J. Crim Justice.* 2019;42(5):569-81.
6. Shahzad K, Muller AR. An integrative conceptualization of organizational compassion and organizational justice: A sensemaking perspective. *Bus Ethics Eur Rev.* 2016;25(2):144-58.
7. Whitebrook M. Compassion as a political virtue. *Political Stud.* 2002;50(3):529-44.
8. Braithwaite J. Narrative and “compulsory compassion”. *Law Soc Inq.* 2006;31(2):425-46.
9. Bandes SA. Compassion and the rule of law. *Int J Law.* 2017;13(2):184-96.
10. Gregory J. Engineering compassion: The institutional structure of virtue. *J Soc Policy.* 2015;44(2):339-56.