

Examining biological and sociological criminological theories.

Lin Toohy*

Department of Sociology, University of Central Florida, USA

Introduction

The study of criminology encompasses various theories that seek to understand the root causes of criminal behavior and inform strategies for crime prevention and intervention. Among these theories, biological and sociological perspectives offer distinct lenses through which to examine the complex interplay of individual characteristics, social environments, and criminal conduct. This article explores both biological and sociological criminological theories, examining their key concepts, empirical evidence, and implications for understanding and addressing crime [1].

Biological criminological theories posit that biological factors, such as genetics, brain structure, and neurochemical imbalances, influence an individual's propensity for criminal behavior. These theories challenge traditional notions of criminality as solely a result of socialization and environmental factors. Instead, they highlight the role of biological predispositions in shaping behaviour [2].

One prominent biological theory is: Genetic theories of crime suggest that certain genetic traits or predispositions may increase the likelihood of engaging in criminal behavior. Twin and adoption studies have provided evidence for the heritability of criminality, indicating that genetic factors contribute to variations in criminal propensity. However, it is essential to recognize that genetics alone do not determine criminal behavior but interact with environmental influences [3].

In contrast to biological perspectives, sociological criminological theories focus on social, cultural, and structural factors that contribute to criminal behavior. These theories emphasize the role of socialization, social inequality, and environmental influences in shaping individuals' attitudes, values, and opportunities [4].

Several sociological theories have been proposed, including: Social learning theory posits that individuals acquire criminal behavior through observation, imitation, and reinforcement. According to this theory, exposure to deviant models, such as peers or media portrayals, increases the likelihood of adopting criminal attitudes and behaviors. Moreover, reinforcement of criminal behavior through rewards or reduced punishments reinforces its continuation [5].

Strain theory suggests that individuals engage in criminal behavior when they experience a disjunction between societal goals and the means available to achieve them. When

individuals are unable to attain culturally prescribed goals through legitimate means, such as education or employment, they may turn to alternative avenues, including crime, to achieve success or alleviate strain. Structural factors such as poverty, inequality, and limited opportunities exacerbate strain and contribute to higher crime rates in disadvantaged communities [6].

Social control theory proposes that the strength of social bonds and attachments influences individuals' propensity for deviant behavior. According to this theory, strong bonds to conventional social institutions, such as family, school, and community, act as protective factors against delinquency. Conversely, weak or disrupted bonds increase the likelihood of engaging in criminal behavior. Social control mechanisms, such as supervision, discipline, and support, play a crucial role in regulating individuals' conduct and deterring crime [7].

While biological and sociological criminological theories offer distinct perspectives on the etiology of crime, they are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they complement each other, highlighting the interplay of biological predispositions and social influences in shaping criminal behavior. Biological factors may predispose individuals to certain personality traits or impulsivity, which, when combined with adverse social environments or opportunities for criminality, increase the likelihood of offending. Similarly, social factors, such as peer associations or neighborhood characteristics, may interact with biological vulnerabilities to influence behaviour [8].

Understanding the interplay of biological and sociological factors in criminal behavior has significant implications for policy and practice. Interventions aimed at preventing and reducing crime must adopt a multidimensional approach that addresses both individual vulnerabilities and environmental risk factors. For instance: Early intervention programs that target at-risk individuals and provide support services, such as counseling, mentorship, and educational opportunities, can mitigate the impact of biological risk factors and social disadvantages [9].

Community-based initiatives that address underlying social determinants of crime, such as poverty, unemployment, and inadequate housing, can create environments conducive to positive socialization and reduce opportunities for criminal behaviour. Rehabilitation programs that incorporate both biological and social interventions, such as cognitive-behavioral therapy, substance abuse treatment, and vocational

*Correspondence to: Lin Toohy, Department of Sociology, University of Central Florida, USA. E-mail: lin.t@ucf.edu

Received: 02-Feb-2024, Manuscript No. AARA-24-129733; Editor assigned: 03-Feb-2024, PreQC No. AARA-24-129733 (PQ); Reviewed: 17-Feb-2024, QC No. AARA-24-129733; Revised: 22-Feb-2024, Manuscript No. AARA-24-129733 (R); Published: 29-Feb-2024, DOI: [10.35841/aara-7.1.190](https://doi.org/10.35841/aara-7.1.190)

training, can address the complex needs of offenders and facilitate their reintegration into society [10].

Conclusion

Biological and sociological criminological theories offer valuable insights into the multifaceted nature of criminal behavior. By examining the interplay of biological predispositions and social influences, researchers and practitioners can develop more comprehensive strategies for understanding and addressing crime. Moving forward, interdisciplinary approaches that integrate biological, sociological, and environmental perspectives are essential for advancing our understanding of crime and promoting safer, more resilient communities.

References

1. Larzelere RE, Patterson GR. Parental management: Mediator of the effect of socioeconomic status on early delinquency. *Criminol.* 1990;28(2):301-24.
2. Ling S, Umbach R, Raine A. Biological explanations of criminal behavior. *Psychol Crime Law.* 2019;25(6):626-40.
3. Freudenburg WR, Jones RE. Criminal behavior and rapid community growth: Examining the evidence 1. *Rural Sociol.* 1991 56(4):619-45.
4. Vila B. A general paradigm for understanding criminal behavior: Extending evolutionary ecological theory. *Criminol.* 1994;32(3):311-60.
5. Zhang J. The effect of welfare programs on criminal behavior: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Econ Inq.* 1997;35(1):120-37.
6. Braithwaite J. Setting standards for restorative justice. *Brit J Criminol.* 2002;42(3):563-77.
7. Paul GD, Borton IM. Exploring communities of facilitators: Orientations toward restorative justice. *Confl Resolut Q.* 2013 Dec;31(2):189-218.
8. Shapland J, Atkinson A, Atkinson H, et al. Situating restorative justice within criminal justice. *Theor Criminol.* 2006;10(4):505-32.
9. Laxminarayan M. The effect of retributive and restorative sentencing on psychological effects of criminal proceedings. *J Interpers Violence.* 2013;28(5):938-55.
10. Button M, McNaughton Nicholls C, Kerr J, et al. Online Fraud Victims in England and Wales: Victims' Views on Sentencing and the Opportunity for Restorative Justice?. *Howard J Crime Justice.* 2015;54(2):193-211.