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| 3. Learning table on non-sociological explanations of crime & deviance |
| **Key assumptions** They accept OCS and therefore take them at face value.They make use of the comparative method by comparing the biological and psychological characteristics of criminals and non-criminals.They offer a positivist **causal** explanation of crime & deviance.  |
| **Physiological explanations** | **Psychological explanations** | **Evaluation** | **Synoptic links** |
| **Outline**These see deviance in terms of the biological make-up of individuals. Inherited abnormalities are said to predispose certain individuals towards deviance. Lombroso (1876) - atavistic stigmataLombroso compared the physical characteristics of convicted criminals with non-criminals and found key differences. He discovered biological characteristics e.g. (large jaws, long arms and extra nipples) were outward signs of an inborn criminal nature and propelled such ‘atavistic’ individuals into crime.http://www.crimeculture.com/images/Vict-lombroso.jpg**Moir & Jessel (1997**) Explain crime & deviance in terms of chemical imbalances in the brain. They link ADHD to low levels of serotonin in the brain. The anti-social behaviour associated with people with ADHD makes them more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour.  | **Outline**These maintain that the causes of deviance lie within a faulty mind.**Eysenck (1964**)Explains deviance in terms of personality types, which he believed were largely inherited. Eysenck suggested that extroverts were more likely to commit crime. He believed that this was because they take more risks and take longer to learn society’s norms. **Bowlby (1946)**http://parenting.families.com/Assets/Encyclopedias/chdv_01_img0021.jpgExplains deviance in terms of childhood socialisation, specifically maternal deprivation. He found that children who lacked a loving relationship with their natural mother during their early years were more likely to develop psychopathic personalities and commit crime. | WeaknessPhysiological and psychological explanations have been criticised on a theoretical level. Sociologists would argue that the whole approach individualises deviance and blames the victim. The social causes of deviance such as poverty are ignored. This suggests that non-sociological explanations only offer a partial view on crime & deviance.http://www.glasgowarchitecture.co.uk/jpgs/glasgow_housing_towers_278.jpg | Theories/perspectivesYou could use non-sociological theories for answering exam questions on positivistic explanations of crime & deviance, or questions that are set on theories that blame the individual.Other topics**Health**All of the explanations covered relate to matters of biology or psychology and therefore are good examples of how crime & deviance relates to health - atavistic stigmata, low serotonin levels/ADHD, extroverts, and psychopathic personalities. http://www.filmreference.com/images/sjff_01_img0453.jpg |
| **In conclusion** sociologists reject physiological and psychological explanations. This is because they do not take into account social factors. However, some sociologists are supportive of **biosocial** explanations which recognise the interaction between biology (e.g. low IQ) and social factors (e.g. hanging around with people who have similar IQs) in attempting to explain crime. |
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