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ABSTRACT: This paper examines crime, deviance and delinquency and their diversifying theoretical narratives; the objective is to provide an empirical basis for appropriate framework to allow for better explanations of the phenomena in the contemporary society. In order to achieve this objective, the paper stresses the importance of empirical research by examining abstract theoretical postulates on crime, deviance and delinquency. This is achieved by employing a modified methodological approach to the research design with crucial elements of qualitative research, as content analysis are employed in integrated forms at different stages during this research. The paper discusses differential analysis of juvenile delinquency, young person’s offenders and adult criminal typology. It also looks at the apparatus to gauge crime, deviance and delinquency and its social relations to the basics about crime, deviance and delinquency, to what it means to a criminologist, other academics and to a layman. As a corollary to this, a new sociological and/or criminological definition of crime, deviance and delinquency is presented as finding during the cause of this research. More so, in order to have deeper understanding of the phenomena under review, diversifying theoretical narratives from socio-psychobiological dimensions to crime of the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon has been contextualized while Classical Social Tripodal Model provides thrust for such empirical research. Furthermore, in order to have a suitable framework for the analysis of the phenomena of crime, deviance and delinquency, different theoretical perspectives are reviewed ranging from the Mertonian Anomie Perspectives, Albert Cohen’s Delinquent Boys; Southerland’s Differential Association to Concentric Zone Perspectives of Shaw and McKay; Social Disorganization and/or Cultural Transmission and Cloward and Ohlin’s Differential Opportunity Structural Theoretical Perspective were reviewed including the Marxian political economy perspective to crime, deviance and delinquency. The biological and/or constitutional perspectives pioneered by Cesare Lombroso’s Theory of ‘Atavistic Stigmata’ and Sheldon’s ‘Theory of Somatotypes’ are also discussed. Following this, within the biological school, the paper examines the XY Chromosomes model, heredity versus crime, deviance and delinquency with a view to setting a framework that would allow for better explanation of the nature of crime, deviance and delinquency in the contemporary social milieu. The research concludes with an examination of the premise of psycho-dynamic or psycho-analytic frame work to crime deviance and delinquency.


INTRODUCTION

In the realm of the social scientific community, the interwoven tripod of crime, deviance and delinquency are regarded as social phenomena; they are value-laden concepts which are relative, in another sense, from time to time, place to place and person to person. These
phenomena are contextual and circumstantial when trying to situate them in a complex and
dynamic cultural, social, economic and political system. Crime, deviance and delinquency are
variously defined in many different ways and therefore can be situated within a particular
context for better understanding. However, the commission of crime, deviance and delinquency
together with their prevention and control are largely the product of the society and each has
to be evidential. Crime prevention and control must be evidence-based for any meaningful
impact on implementation of policies and should also meet international benchmarks as
prerequisites for a sustainable social system as the new policy on crime prevention and control
integrates with other policies in the ecosystem. Crime as a social phenomenon is any wrong
done involving breach of a legal order; it has criminal consequences attached to it and the
possibility of punishment being imposed on the wrong doer.

Generally speaking, however, all societies have certain norms, values, belief systems, customs
and traditions which are socially constructed and implicitly accepted by its members as
conducive for their well-being and the sustainability of the ecosystem. Infringement of these
cherished norms and customs is labelled anti-social; deviant behavior and/or crime in some
respects, and all depend on the context in which the individual offence happened. In deviant
behavior, the act committed must be witnessed by people who after witnessing and perceiving
the act to be deviant must report to others. The persons whom they report to must also label
the act as deviant. In contrast to crime, the legal dimension defines crime as any form of conduct
which is declared to be socially harmful by a state and as such forbidden by the law under threat
of some punishment.

Differential Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency, Young Person Offenders and Adult
Criminal Typology

Delinquency and young person’s offences can be understood within the strategic context of the
Juvenile and Young Person’s Act, and the findings from a study conducted by Hirschi (1969).
Hirschi’s social control theory provided evidence that juvenile delinquency is associated with
weak attachments to parents, weak performance in school and family strain generating
numerous social problems causing disharmony among family so labelled as ‘broken home’.
Another cause of juvenile delinquency is less attachment and integration to conventional
institutions and lines of actions. Hirsch’s theory of social control has been supported by many
studies such as that of Gray (1970).

However, the Juvenile and Young Person’s Act clearly defines a child, juvenile or a young
person as different from an adult, and also provides for their protection within the purview of
legal frame work. Again, when a child is mentioned what readily comes to mind is Sigmund
Freud, a psychoanalyst and a medical doctor, who postulated the theory of child development
and personality structure, in stages to describe the growth and development of a child and the
possibility of criminal tendencies that may appear at a later time i.e. adulthood due to short
comings and social dynamics of inculcating societal values and expected cultural standards
during the process of socialization Hare (1993). He mentioned oral stage, anal stage, oedipal
stage and phallic stages of child development, which runs between 0-7yrs, and each stage is
distinct from each other in terms of the child’s progression and social dynamics in relation to
his interaction with members of the society that defines crime, deviance and delinquency at
adult stage.
So from this sense, a child is someone who is between the ages of 0-7 years and a juvenile is one who is aged less than 18; and they are fully protected by the law. However, a young person is someone above the age of 18 but less than 20yrs. An adult is someone above the age of 20.

A serious wrongful act committed at this stage could be considered a crime rather than delinquent behaviour. Delinquent behaviour is that is unruly deprived character, that the child cannot be safely so detained, while crime is an act committed by either a young person or an adult.

Similarly, John E. Conklin (1998) posits that a study of juvenile delinquency carried out by Lamar Empey and Steven Lubeck (1971) found some support for social control theory of juvenile delinquency by Hirsch which they reinforced. It found some group of boys who had been labelled ‘delinquent’ in juvenile court and another group of boys who had not been so labelled. They combined the two groups then searched for the common factors that distinguished the delinquent from non-delinquent boys. This kind of study is called ‘comparative study’ and it may also take the form of experimentation in social scientific investigation. Empey and Lubeck concluded their study by deducing that lower class status reduces school attachment which produces strains that eventually lead to identification with peers and this in turn draw boys into delinquency. Lack of integration into institutions such as family and low performance in schools coupled with lack of harmony at family levels and broken homes are likely factors that lead to juvenile delinquency as noted by Conklin (1998). If a juvenile, supposedly under the age of 18 years, is apprehended for delinquent behaviour with or without warrant, he/she cannot be brought before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction (In English Law, this refers to a court of law that has jurisdiction over a summary proceeding, meaning that the court has the authority to issue a “judgment” or “order” without the necessity of a trial or other processes requiring referral to a superior court). Usually, the police officer in charge of the police station where such a juvenile or young offender is brought would detain him in a place of detention provided under the law for such delinquent behaviour. The designation ‘juvenile delinquency’ is also applied to those who commit status offences, act such as underage drinking, running away from home or truancy. However, the juvenile courts were originally designed as informal welfare agencies that offered counselling and therapy which were tailored to suits the needs of the juvenile delinquent offenders.

However, around 1967, in California, USA, there was overwhelming public support for a juvenile justice system separate from adult criminals with rehabilitation as its primary goal which signalled the emergence of juvenile court. Similarly, in 1988 following the Supreme Court’s decision, the juvenile court became more formal, much like a scaled down criminal court. One case, worthy of note, involved a twelve year old juvenile offender from Florida. The boy was arrested for his fifty-seventh offence in 1993, according to Kantor (1994), the juvenile offender, over the previous four years had been arrested almost twelve times for car theft, ten times for burglary and three times for armed robbery.

When a juvenile or young person commits an offence and the court is satisfied of his/her guilt, it may proceed, under the provision of section ten (10) of the Juvenile and Young Persons Act, to remand the offender in prison custody (remand home). Notwithstanding the provision of sub-sections 2 and 3 of section eleven, sub- sections two and three of the same act, which states that the young offender may be ordered to be whipped, detained or imprisoned.

Furthermore, Conklin (1998), like Kazdin (1989), noted that sometimes there are implicit neurological and psychological problems entrenched in some juvenile offenders that may not
have been properly managed or established before conviction. For instance, in 1987, in the US, about 14 juveniles were condemned to death following various cases presented before the supreme court on murders committed when they were between the ages of fifteen and seventeen years. In a related development, another set of juvenile offenders numbering twenty-three were under sentence of death for crime committed as juveniles. A close look at the criminological considerations from neurological and biological perspectives showed that the juveniles had suffered from a number of clinical socio-psycho-physiological consequences:

i. Eight out of the thirty-seven juveniles condemned to death had suffered some degree of injury in their central nervous system that was severe enough to result in hospitalisation and/or indentation of their cranium.

ii. Nine of the juvenile offenders sentenced to death had major neurological impairments.

iii. Seven were psychotic or had been diagnosed as psychotic earlier in their childhood; four had histories indicating severe mood disorders and another three experienced occasional paranoid ideation.

iv. Among the thirty-seven juveniles condemned to death in the USA, three were discovered to have IQ (intelligence quotient) levels below average, and another three out of the thirty-seven had above average reading abilities.

v. Twelve had been brutally battered at tender ages, physically injured and abused, while five had been sodomized by older relatives.

Empirical research which revealed the characteristics of ‘delinquent boys and young person offenders’ was found in the works of John E. Conklin (1998) and Siegel et al (2006) who characterised delinquency as an ‘identity crisis’. Although, Siegel et al (2006) has been criticised by Shoemaker (2005), on the basis of empirical testing of the term ‘inner crisis’ which is difficult to test empirically. The utility of psychoanalytic theory to explain complex, delinquent and young person offences is limited by lack of evidence to support his findings. However, from the study conducted by Glueck et al (1952) with 500 boys, his findings reveal certain characteristics of the young persons and delinquent boys as delinquency is significantly correlative with personality types. While interpretative findings of the study indicate that when compared to none delinquents, the delinquent boys were less cooperative, more suspicious, more destructive, more defensive, and had conscious or unconscious hostile impulses. In addition, they reported more severe mental pathology in the young persons and the delinquent boys Glueck et al (1952). Their work, however, has been criticized for its inexact methods which inspired other researchers to examine personality and psychiatric disorders in relation to self esteem as it concerned delinquency and young person offences Moffitt et al (2005).

**Apparatus to Gauge Crime/Deviance and Delinquency and its Social Relations**

There are certain characteristics of a crime that can be likened to deviance and delinquency as previously discussed. Paranjape (2011) pointed out that crime is an unlawful act or omission which constitutes an offence punishable under the law of the land. The main apparatus to gauge crime encompasses the following:

**External Consequences**: crime always has a harmful impact on the society, be it social, personal, emotional or mental.

**An Act and/or Actus-reus**: there should be an act or omission to constitute a crime. Essentially, *actus-reus* is the force applied to either cause pain, breakage, it is a forceful act that is labelled as negative antisocial behaviour. *Actus-reus* alone shall not constitute a crime unless it is
accompanied by some external or overt action. Generally, committing to do something would not amount to actus-reus of an offence; the criminal law usually punishes individuals for conduct and not inaction.

**Mens-rea and/or Guilty Mind:** Mens-rea is one of the essential ingredients of a crime. It may, however, be direct or implied. The implied mens-rea is otherwise termed constructive mens-rea. Mens-rea implies that there must be a state of mind with respect to an actus-reus, that is, an intention to act in a prescribed fashion. It is, however, important to distinguish ‘mens-rea’ from ‘motive’. For instance, if a person steals a loaf of bread from someone's bakery to feed a child who is dying of hunger, the motive for stealing here is more honourable and understandable. The mens-rea being to commit the theft and the person would be convicted for it, but his motive may be taken into consideration in sentencing and he may be less severely punished because of his motive of saving a life. In short, motive should be taken into consideration at the sentencing stage and not at the time of deciding the question of mens-rea as observed by Paranjape (2011)

**Prohibited Act:** The act should be prohibited or forbidden under the existing penal law. An act, however immoral, shall not be an offence unless it is prohibited by law of the land.

**Punishment:** The act in order to constitute a crime should not only be prohibited by the law but should also be punishable by the state. The punishment is usually set out in terms of a maximum, and the actual punishment in any particular case is left to the discretion of the judge. Both the defence and the prosecution have a right to appeal against the quantum of sentence.

**Sin and Crime:** the concept of sin and crime are interrelated but radically different in their scope, consequence, variable content and environment. The concept of sin emanates from religion and can be understood from the perspective of a higher being and expectation, whereas crime is a legal proposition in organised and rules-based societies by humans. Sin results in the violation of rules of religion or morality while crime involves a breach of the law. A sinner is punished by God but a criminal is punished by the state. There may or may not be a direct injury or harm in case of a sin but a crime necessarily involves some kind of direct injury. The remedy for a sin is to forfeit or make apologies where as a person who commits a crime is subjected to a term of sentence by the law court.

**Crime and Morality:** the word ‘crime’ is derived from the Latin word ‘KRIMOS’ which means to accuse. It covers those acts which are against social order and deserve disapprobation and condemnation by the society.

**The Basics about Crime, Deviance and Delinquency; What Does It Means to a Criminologist, other Academics and to a Layman**
The concepts of crime, deviance and delinquency have been variously defined by many scholars; however, no one definition is all encompassing. Therefore, consideration has to be given to the strategic context of continuous series of critical encounters between a person’s growing capacity and the society’s changing pressure i.e. the nature of an individual’s socialization process and the social relation to institutions and groups. What defines an individual or groups of individuals as criminal or delinquent, Paranjape (2011), noted is the intention to and motive for causing injury or inability of a citizen to conform to the standards set by the society and their violations which is defined as either crime or delinquency. In other words, when a person’s actions or inaction undermines the grand norms governing a given
society such action may be tantamount to violation of the social contract and mutual consensus entered into by the members of the society. It follows therefore, that perception about crime and what constitutes it may be viewed in a cluster of dimensions thus: the socio-psychobiological perception of crime, deviance and delinquency, the legal perception, the moral and the layman’s perception Bandura (1986).

Similarly, as a corollary to the above notion, Salmound (1967), has defined crime as the violation of a set of rules of action regulating the conduct of an individual in the society. The conducts which are prohibited by law at any given time and place are known as wrongful acts of crime, deviance and/or delinquency, In contrast, those which are permissible under the law are treated as lawful acts. The wrongdoer found guilty of committing a crime would be punished under the criminal law of the land. Furthermore, crime, according to Tappan (1953), is “an intentional act or justification penalized by the law as either felony or misdemeanour”. While, Kenny (1842), defined crime as “wrongs whose sanctions are punitive and are in no way remissible by any private person, but is remissible by the crown alone, if remissible at all”. From another perspective, Roscoe Pound (1976) commented that a final definition of a crime is impossible because law is a living and changing thing which may at one time be based on sovereign will and at another time on juristic science which may at one time be uniform, and at another time give much room for judicial discretion Eysenck (1964). Again, it may at one time be “more specific in its prescription and at another time much more general” (i.e. the relative nature of crime, deviance and delinquency). From a legal stand, Cross and Jones (2011), define crime as a “legal wrong, the remedy for which is punishment of the offenders at the instance of the state”. On the harmful nature of crime to the social system, John Gullin’s definition of crime is “an act that has been shown to be actually harmful to the society or that is believed to be socially harmful by a group of people that has power to enforce its beliefs, and that places such an act upon the ban of positive penalties”, thus, he considered crime “as an offence against the law of the land” Feldman (1977).

While crime is also seen as a social condition that actually undermines public rights and duties as, Blackstone (2011) like Paranjape (2011), defined crime as an act committed or omitted in violation of a public law either forbidding or commanding it. He later realized that this definition may prove to be misleading because it limited the scope of crime to violation of a public law, which normally covers political offences such as offence against the state. Therefore, he modified his definition of crime and stated that “crime is a violation of the public rights and duties due to the whole community”. Thus, both Blackstone (2011) and Stephen (2011) stressed that crimes are breaches of those laws which injure the community. Stephen further added that crime is an act which is both forbidden by law and repellent to the moral sentiments of the society. Moreover, rejecting the judicial concept of crime, a well-known Italian criminologist, Raffeale Garafalo (2011) as reflected in Paranjape (2011), preferred a sociological definition of crime and stated that, “crime is an act which offends the basic sentiment of ‘pity’ and ‘probity’ same has been agreed by Harachi (2008).

While in support of Garafalo (2011), Edward Sutherland (1946) characterizes crime as a ‘symptom of social disorganization’. The tendency of modern sociological penologists is, therefore, to treat crime as a ‘social phenomenon’ which receives disapprobation of the society. The importance of punishment as a deterrent for crime commission has been emphasised by Halsbury in Paranjape (2011), who defines crime as an “unlawful act which is an offence against the public and the perpetrator of that act is liable to legal punishment”. There are, however, some notable exceptions for crime commission. For example, a police officer may
have a duty to act to prevent a crime situation, and if he does not, will be liable to be punished under the law. To a layman, crime is an anti-social behaviour which is injurious to the society and by extension tramples on the individual’s personal interest or may have some physical threat or damage to others such as neighbours or members of his immediate community.

**Criticisms and New Definition of Crime, Deviance and Delinquency**: Criminology of everyday life forms the cornerstone of ‘working criminology ’ and it should be of concern to every sociologist and criminologist in the making. Significant number of the definitions aforementioned and consequently discussed in this paper was somewhat narrow because they failed to recognize the strategic context of the subject matter which denotes ‘social’ in their definitions of crime, deviance and delinquency. The definitions also failed to recognize the significance of sociological concepts, variable contents and criminological constructs, probably, due largely to their value orientation. Therefore, the condition of opposing ‘social’ has undermined sociological imperatives in their conceptions of crime defined and methodological claims for theorizing the same on side of seeking knowledge on sociological and/or criminological definitions of crime, deviance and delinquency. To this end, none of these definitions may stand within the context of the subject matter of this paper as far as sociology of crime, deviance and delinquency is concerned. To a larger extent, the definitions above can serve as good resource materials for reviewing the concept of crime event though, they appear to be in isolation of the subject matter which denotes ‘social’.

However, they remain in isolation of the subject matter of sociology which is social action of individuals and groups to crime, deviance and delinquency in the human society. As students of criminology what we see and consider of paramount importance, as far as the definition of crime, deviance and delinquency in relation to society is concerned, is the approach of the writer and his sociological or criminological mindset geared towards sociological concepts and its integration to the phenomena of crime, deviance and delinquency as social problems in the society and so the approach ought to be scientific.

The need for ‘sociological concepts (social and cultural) and their integration’ in the definition of the concept of crime, deviance and delinquency, in the society has been emphasized by contemporary criminologists Sa’ad (1995) and Ibrahim, et al (2010). Fusion and emphasis on social and cultural factors underpinning traditional beliefs and values systems embedded in diverse socio-cultural pluralistic societies has been re-echoed for its sociological imperatives in any definition of crime, deviance and delinquency. Sa’ad (1995) and Ibrahim, et al (2010) in their separate theses on ‘understanding the concept of deviance and crime in the society today’, presented an in-depth analysis by giving characterization to the legal definition of crime and deviance. They afterwards, jointly and in same voice, labelled severe criticism on the legal perspective to crime and deviance.

Sa’ad (1995) and Ibrahim, et al (2010) traced and exposed inadequacies of the legal definition of crime and deviance by giving its rightful attribute: there is no need to talk about crime where there is no state; where there is no law; where there is no capacity; where there is no intention and summed it up by saying that, there is no crime where the act is not justified by the criminal justice system. Even if the act is committed, they added, unless the accused person is convicted and sentenced, that person is presumed innocent until proven guilty. Also, it is right to consider how the writer displays dexterity in juxtaposing sociological and/or criminological concepts and variables in the definition of crime and/or deviance. We are equally concerned with the methodological indices underpinning a given set of definitions of crime and/or deviance with
a view to giving the definition some sort of intellectual sociological and/or criminological credence. Any definition that fails to give a comprehensive coverage of all or nearly all aspects of the society in relation to violation of law to establish crime and criminality falls short and is, therefore, inadequate. This will be the subject matter for analytical examination now and in subsequent presentations.

Nevertheless, a crime is said to have occurred when the components of actus-reus and mens-rea are established, these two elements form the basis for the definition of crime and remain its integral components. From this angle, two things are preponderated here: one is ‘positive conduct’ and two ‘inaction’, in other words, latent and manifest action as championed by Robert K. Merton (1956). Manifest actions denote actus-reus and latent actions denote mens-rea. The former is ‘empirically verifiable while the latter is vulnerable to subjective interpretation. Actus-reus, which denotes positive conduct, can be established, but mens-rea, which is inaction is subjectively loaded and lacks contact with reality and therefore, cannot be adequately and empirically measured and/or verified and therefore is of no effect’. The effectiveness of mens-rea is at the prerogative of the presiding judge. In these dialectics of actus-reus, mens-rea with crime as its synthesis, the concept of ‘crime’ is said to be a dynamic antisocial behaviour which encompasses two fundamental elements one of which has manifest positive line of actions which can be verified and measured empirically (actus-reus), while the other element has latent subjective line of actions (mens-rea) which is subjectively loaded and thus lacks contact with reality. Similarly, on mens-rea, having considered the complexities and dynamics of the legal proceedings and the social circumstances surrounding the nature, pattern and trend of the crime so committed and its implications on the society, it is the prerogative of the judge to gauge or measure and to equally quantify and to further situate the element of mens-rea at the sentencing stage. From these two components of actus-reus ‘positive conduct’ and mens-rea ‘inaction’, coupled with the definitions by the legal jurists, sociologists, criminologists and penologists. A new sociological and/or criminological definition of crime, deviance and delinquency is presented below.

A New Sociological and/or Criminological Definition of Crime and/or Deviance: Crime and/or deviance can be defined as “an act against the public or the state with negative consequences that requires fuller establishment of offence committed beyond any reasonable doubt”. It is a rather complex and dynamic antisocial behaviour as opposed to static situations and relatively contextual as deviance or delinquent behaviour. Crime involves practical application of force with the intent and motive of either compelling or inflicting pain on members of the society, thereby, creating scenarios capable of disrupting the stable socio-politico sub and super-structures of the society, capable of undermining the collective sentiments and representation of the members of that society. Crime is a 'social phenomenon, sui generis' to the society for which the laws were made.

Laws to control crimes in any given society revolve on the pivot of mutual consensus and ideological principles of: social solidarity, probity, pity and social cohesion. The perpetrator of an offence must be liable for his actions so established by a court of competent jurisdiction, and he/she receives legitimate punishment as a deterrent for infringing on the rights and privileges of members of the society and for posing existential threat to the peaceful co-existence of a highly heterogeneous human setting recognized by the laws of the land. This is so because both the victim and the perpetrator live within a geographical area known to have state laws and recognized as such” Bintube (2017). The definition above seems loaded with sociological and criminological content, in the sense that, crime, law and society are mutually
connected in a tripodal perspective, and the interplay of these 3 conditions has adverse effects on social structures and relationships in the society.

Crime, Deviance and Delinquency: Its Diversifying Narratives and Dimensions on Theoretical Positions

Recent studies in the fields of psychology, sociology and other behavioural sciences have brought in their wake corresponding changes in criminological trends and thus, opened new vistas in the comprehension of human behaviour in consideration of crime, deviance and delinquency. It has generally been accepted that crime is a product of various factors which cannot always be explained on the basis of hedonistic calculus of pain and pleasure as propounded by Bentham (1847). There is the need to improve criminogenic influences of improvised correctional techniques so as to bring out re-socialization and reformation of the offenders.

Summing up the following generalizations regarding the concept of crime and /or deviance, may prove useful in comprehending subsequent developments in the field of criminology and penology. Crime and social policy are inter-related and the concept of crime and punishment depends largely on the social values, accepted norms, and behavioural patterns of a particular society at a given time.

Like the society, crimes are also a varying content, changing with the changes in social structures. What constitutes crime today may become a permissible conduct tomorrow and vice versa. For instance, abortion which was considered a heinous crime, because of the immorality involved, is no longer an offence under certain circumstances consequent to the enactment of laws legalizing abortion.

Crime is a relative term; therefore, what is wrongful and regarded as crime in one place may not necessarily be so in another place. For example, adultery is a criminal offence in Indian society but in England it is merely a civil wrong derisible by payment of compensation.

The moral tune of the society can easily be gauged from the law on crimes enforced in that society at a given time. In other words, it means that criminal law is an index of the social progress of a given society.

The emergence of law of crime and criminological knowledge has been through a definite process of progression corresponding to different phases of social evolution. For instance, before now, there wasn't anything like the anti-terrorism act in Nigeria, but in recent times due to the evolution of the human society and its attendant social problems and the quest for a solution, there are acts of parliament to curtail the excesses of insurgency and terrorism in many countries.

The modern complexities of human life have contributed to the rising incidence of crime, but this rising trend is not surprising. In fact, it is a myth to think of a crimeless society. Modern criminologists have even gone to the extent of reckoning on an increase in crime as a symptom of social progress. With the passage of time, the emphasis has shifted from ‘crime’ to ‘criminal’. The modern view regarding penal policy favours individualization of the offender through clinical treatment methods. This has led to the emergence of the reformatory era in the
field of penology, thus, rendering the earlier deterrent, retributive and retaliatory methods completely obsolete and outdated in the approach to crime prevention and control.

**Socio-psychobiological Theories of Crime Deviance and Delinquency**

The hallmark of the sociological perspective places emphasis more on the structure of the society. According to the exponents of the sociological school, society and culture exert pressure on members of the society to commit crime. Crime, they argued, is the product of the society, contrary to the beliefs of biological and psychological paradigms who were of the view that, crime is understood from the point of view of individual pathological disorder, excessive chromosome or somatotype. In other words, it is differential body make-up or physical looks and genetic characteristics and their transfer from parent to off-spring, were reasons for crime and/or deviance as the biological theorists want us to believe. In contrast to the sociological and biological schools, the psychological or Psychodynamic theories attribute crime, deviance and delinquency to the compositions of an individual personality profile.

Drawing from the sociological dimension, Emile Durkheim (1897) has carried out extensive research work, gathering mass data to give sufficient explanation on the nature of crime and deviance and how the social phenomena of crime is trending as the society integrates and differentiates to give room for social dynamics. This would be discussed at length within the frame work of the Durkheimian explanatory theory of suicide while analysing the crime of the Boko Haram suicide attacks as a contemporary social phenomenon within the realm of criminology. Durkheim saw suicide as a social phenomenon, the suicide rate, according to him, had significant correlation with excessive or a decline in the rate of social integration and regulation of the institutions as well as socio-cultural norms and value system of a given society. Excessive regulations may lead to differentiation and the pressure emanating thereof leads to frustration, which makes individual members of the society react and such reactions may be in tandem with the expected behavioural patterns and tendencies that should be exhibited by members of that society. Institutions are there to decide if such negative actions can be labelled crime, deviance or delinquency. Now, let us examine the crime of Boko Haram suicide phenomenon within the context of Durkheimian explanatory theory on the crime of suicide.

**Sociological and/or Criminological Theories of Crime, Deviance and Delinquency: The Crime of Boko Haram Suicide Phenomenon**

The best way to approach the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon is by aligning thoughts to the strategic context of the Durkheimian dialectics of explanatory crime of suicide in relation to the explanation of crime and deviance in the society. Durkheim (1897), in his argument, posits that the crime of suicide can be understood and handled in five ways, the fifth item is of interest to the objective of this paper: his application of the theory of suicide to the diagnosis of the ills of the society and suggestions on how to remedy them. To leading authorities, Lacroze (1960), Giddens (1965) and Douglass (1967), this fifth element has been of interest and subsequently reinforced by them in their separate literature on suicide.

Drawing from the fifth item of Durkheim’s notion of the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon as a social problem of crime, deviance, and, at some level, delinquency that has been bedevilling large scale populations, and the need to examine this phenomenon as crime and deviance of the contemporary modern day 21st century, suicide attacks by the Boko Haram members can be analysed within the theoretical frame work of the Durkheimian explanatory theory of Suicide. It was originally treated by Durkheim (1897) himself as a periodic transition to moral
crisis in the 18th century and which Crocker (1952) noted in his thesis on ‘Suicide in the Eighteenth Century’ reflected in the Journal of the History of Ideas’ (1952). As a result, the concept of suicide has become a problematic one, especially among sociologists, criminologists and other social scientists alike in furthering its research in relation to crime deviance and delinquency. Researches conducted tried to obtain sufficient statistical and interpretive explanations on how suicide is relevant to the explanation of crime, especially in the 19th century and beyond as reported in Durkheim (1897) and intellectual research reflected in Giddens (1965) and Adophe (1967).

Definition of Suicide: Durkheim defined ‘suicide’ as every case of death which results directly or indirectly from a positive or negative act accomplished by the victim himself, which he/she knows must produce death as a consequence of his actions Durkheim (1897). The idea of suicide was derived from the Durkheimian theory of morality and has greater implications on social solidarity rendered to social groups’ ideological hegemony as advanced by the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon. Their suicide attacks can best be described as crime in the complex organic society influenced by ‘suicidogenic’ tendencies, adding cases of death to existing crime statistics. The reasons for such ‘missions’ were beyond the immediate comprehension of the ‘chosen’ member of the group; the person carrying out the suicide attack could not justify, directly or indirectly, the action for which he rendered life, including his own, meaningless by dying in a suicide mission. This is what Swart (1964) referred to as the sense of decadence in the 19th century France. Halbwachs (1898, 1930), Bayet (1922) argued in similar manner that those who carried out the crime of suicide, either altruistic, egoistic or anomie-fatalism, do not have convincing reasons, either positive or negative, about the underlying feelings employed in commission of crime of suicide. This was evident in the series of the recorded cases of members of the group arrested before the commission of suicide attacks. Boko Haram suicide phenomenon is the act of worthlessly giving of self and others as victims to advance the cause of its philosophy that cannot adequately be defined with sufficient reasons as to the exact purpose.

An attempt, however, will be made to give perspective to deaths caused by the individual member of the Boko Haram sub-cultural group, knowing full well that the consequence(s) of the decision to carry out such an attack is illegal and would ultimately lead to loss of not only his life but that of others in the commission of the act of suicide. Gibbs (1968) and Martin (1978), were in support of Durkheim (1897), who employed a highly statistically driven correlation as a method of analyzing the phenomenon of suicide by eliminating logical argument to systematically arrive at some principal factors liable to have an influence on suicide.

First is the organico-psychic disposition, which according to Durkheim, is internal to the individual member of the Boko Haram. Normal and abnormal factors trigger crimes of suicide as advanced by the psychological school of crime, deviance and delinquency, which is similar to the psychodynamic construct of id, ego and superego frame work in the understanding of crime and delinquency. Secondly, features of the physical environment in which Boko Haram suicide phenomenon is a crime, and by extension delinquency, as juvenile and young persons partake in the group’s activities, is a consideration best described by the Concentric Zone theory of crime, deviance and delinquency of the Chicago School. Thirdly, the process of imitation, in other words, the micro-sociological analysis to crime, deviance and delinquency from the perspectives of Phenomenological School of American and European Traditions as qualifier of the action by the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon as a crime of the modern day.
According to Wilson (1963) and Weiss (1964) Durkheim’s method of identifying these characteristics of suicide phenomenon was by a combination of methods, thus, elimination through statistical proof and dialectical argument as noted by Sainsbury (1955).

According to Durkheim (1897), suicide was neither an indication of insanity (nor clinical monomania on clinical and psychological grounds) nor a specific symptom of insanity, since suicide is by definition both deliberate and based on non-hallucinatory sense-impressions nor correlated with various forms of nervous disorders. Durkheim’s notion, in this context, has fewer imperatives to the psycho-biological school of criminology that based their argument of crime, deviance and delinquency on mental disorder and biological dispositions as causes of crime and criminality in the society. As a contradiction to Durkheim’s explanation of the crime of suicide and as antithesis to his theoretical postulates and dialectical explanatory theory of suicide, available statistics and qualitative data have supported the psycho-biological school of criminology on the Boko Haram suicide attackers arrested. Captured Boko Haram members showed high degrees of symptoms of mental illness due to consumption of hard drugs capable of leading to pathological disorders such as psychosis and neurosis mental imbalance. In support of this criticism against Durkheim’s dialectics on suicides as modern day crime, Glencoe (1954) and Wiener (1973) raised spacio-temporal related issues in their separate writings as major impediments to the Durkheim theory of explanatory suicide.

Nevertheless, Durkheim’s (1897) conclusion was based on the correlations of suicide base on the demographic characteristics of the population during his time or period which was greatly in variance with the prevailing crime of suicide phenomenon in the 21st century relative to his epoch. Again, Durkheim’s (1897) predictions have been tempered by spatiotemporal dynamic social differentiation of what he referred to as both organico-psyhic dispositions, which is internal to normal and abnormal individuals, and the very social environment as an influencer capable of changing causes of crime of suicide. All of these are factors exposing suicide as crimes are relatively and in variance from one society to the next Villemain (1843), Mayer (1951). Durkheim (1897) concluded that there is no positive correlation between suicide and insanity tested for age, sex, religion, country and degree of civilization has no proof. The suicide phenomenon of Boko Haram has some degree of positive correlation to insanity or mental illness caused by severe deprivation of the basics necessities of life and indoctrination with hard drugs; this, in itself, is a crime and an influencer to commission of the crime of suicide. However, he did not reject the fact that there is psychological field for the influence of causes which can lead to suicide.

The basic theme of crime of Boko Haram suicide phenomenon, according Durkheim (1897), is the way in which social bonds of the society are weakened and ultimately break down in modern societies. This was corroborated by Douglers (1957) and is relevant to the study of crime, deviance and delinquency as antisocial behavior and in understanding social pathology in the biological school of criminology as is dominant in the works of Lambrosso Atavism and Scheldon Somatotype. Durkheim’s (1897) explanatory theory of suicide was the classifications of three theoretically interrelated types of social causes of suicide, each type represents what he held to be common to a particular set of social factors associated with relatively high or rising rates of the crime of suicide due to slackened social bonds, lack of proper integration and excess regulation of the social system. Halbwachs (1930) argued that the theoretical frame work relating to these types of social causes of suicide as enumerated by Durkheim (1897), are: egoism suicide; altruism suicide and anomic suicide.
Durkheim’s theory of suicide was derived from his conception of morality and its relation to social solidarity. He saw suicide as the individual antithesis to social solidarity of the larger society seen as deviation from the conventional standards regulating members of that society, subsequently leading to a high rate of crime of suicide. This is as an index of moral decadence caused by inadequate and effective social bonds of members to the larger society to allow for proper integration, as members subsequently decline social regulation. These assertions are in consonance with Selvin (1958) and Nisbet’s (1965) explanations of the crime of suicide in industrial societies. In the context of the Boko Haram phenomenon, Durkheim, saw social bonds as essentially relating to the group rather than the larger society where conventional value systems were preponderated as opposed to the sub-cultural values of the Boko Haram. The phenomenon of crime of suicide, according to Durkheim, happened in two ways: attaching members of the Boko Haram society to socially given purposes as group ideals, which regulate the individual member’s desires and aspiration to be rewarded with a promise of paradise as a result of committing crime of suicide. For Mawson (1970) and Johnson (1965), egoism and its opposite altruism suicide ties an individual to socially given ideals and purposes. Durkheim (1897) and Mauss (1966) pointed out that anomie suicide and its shadowy opposite, fatalism, occur as a result of excessive social regulations, subsequently leading members of the society to commit crimes of suicide, a viewpoint reinforced by Arieli (1964).

**Egoism Suicide:** The bonds attaching members of the Boko Haram to life in the society slacken because the bond which attaches individual members to the larger society is in itself ab initio slackened. The Boko Haram member, in the first instance, is ready to commit suicide due to inadequate reinforcement of his socialization, and thus, remains vulnerable to committing crime. According to Durkheim (1897), such a person remains isolated because the social bonds uniting him with other human beings in the society are broken he is not sufficiently integrated into society at the point where he is in contact with the Boko Haram philosophy which includes giving up his life for the ‘cause’. Mawson (1970) like Durkheim, agreed with his explanation of the crime of suicide in this social context and has challenged the larger society, especially the governance structure of the region (where crime of Boko Haram blossoms), the political system and social and political institutions including arrangement for its inadequacies to integrate members who partake in the activities of the social institutions of the society, and as reaction they commit crime. Lammeais (1825) and Swart (1964) as a corollary to the Durkheimian notion of egoism suicide, believe that the suicide phenomenon of Boko Haram was a reflection of the failure of the larger society and its institutional arrangements, as the bonds that ordinarily should have connected members of the group to the wider society were in short supply. This probably was due to failure and lack of relations of individual members to the functional prerequisites of the institution to recreate social bonds hitherto slackened so as to integrate its members into the ecosystem in line with Bougle’s (1896) narratives on solutions to the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon.

**Altruism Suicide:** This exists where the individual Boko Haram member is too strongly integrated into the group’s ideology to the extent that he no longer considers his own life or the lives of others to be of any value. He becomes so entrenched in the group’s ideals and aspirations that he loses his own identity. Consequently, Weiss (1964) argued that the individual’s life was no longer autonomous but fused into something more superior than himself i.e. the goals of Boko Haram and its suicide agenda. Durkheim (1897) called this the ‘Lepole’ of ‘Haramism’ group activities and behavior, members let go of their own lives in group solidarity in an altruistic setting. The power to determine who commits crime of suicide, altruistic suicide, was situated outside the member himself and therefore he could not place any
value on his own life nor control the social action of the group’s goals and aspirations and thus cannot free himself of the crime of suicide. He has become integrated into the group; a walking shadow of crime being a group member of the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon Mawson, (1970), Mayer (1951).

Anomie Suicide: Anomie suicide differs from egoism and altruism suicide in the sense that it depends not only on how individuals are attached to society but how the society excessively regulates them to commit crime and eventually give up their lives for the severity of the social system. According to Durkheim (1897), egoistic suicide occurs when an individual member of the society no longer sees any justification for life and living (life becomes worthless); while in altruistic suicide, the individual member of Boko Haram’s justification to commit suicide went beyond life in itself. However, in anomie suicide, the group’s activities were severely regulated and therefore they suffer death as a consequence, as reported by Halbwachs (1930). Both egoism and anomie mark society’s insufficient presence in the individual meeting his objectives and to find meaning out of it as a member of the larger society, eventually resorting to commit crime of suicide. Hence, he gives his life in a system that denied him the basic necessities for survival and attachment to the rest of the society in genuinely collective activity. Fatalism is the reverse of anomie, and consists of an excess regulation; such a crime is found among subjects whose futures are relentlessly blocked and whose passions are violently repressed by oppressive disciplines. Mawson (1970) noted such a crime occurs as unavoidable and inflexible character of a rule over which one is powerless for his action to overcome the forces that galvanized him to commit such a crime.

In summary, the two dimensions of anomic-fatalism and egoistic-altruism suicide represent the two sides of the notion of the social bonds and the root causes of the crime of suicide as justified by Boko Haram. This is made clear in Durkheim’s first two elements of morality: (1) spirit of discipline and (2) the attachment to group’s goals and aspirations respectively as Boko Haram members portrayed. Durkheim used these categories of egoism-altruism and anomie to distinguish different suicidogenic currents affecting different groups and classes in the society, and corresponding to the states of different social environments as a function of which the crime of suicide varies. Bougle (1896) talks on suicide and proffering solutions to the crime of Boko Haram suicide phenomenon and maintains that these kinds of crimes have adverse effects on human capital development in Nigeria, and by extension the whole of West African sub-region.

The effects of Boko Haram suicide phenomenon on the psyche of the citizens poses serious threats, with national and global implications, on foreign direct investments due to insecurity and lack of enabling business environments which affects the gross domestic product (GDP) of that country. The suicide attacks of the Boko Haram undermine national imperatives, brings about a decline in trust among citizens of the country, thereby creating problems of national unity and integration, displacing families and subsequently creating broken homes while rendering social bonds ineffective and posing existential threats to and eroding family values and creating numerous social ills.

As a solution to the menace of Boko Haram, typical Durkheimian argument cautioned that the proposed remedies should come directly from the data collected in an attempt to diagnosis and proffer solutions to the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon, as crimes involving periodic attacks and bombing included causalties and social forces that generated the same social phenomenon. It is important to first conduct scientific examinations by way of analysis and interpretations of
data as control channels and solutions to the social ills of crime of the Boko Haram Suicide Phenomenon. Durkheim (1897) further added that solutions to end the suicide phenomenon must be traced to chief suicidogenic currents in egoism and altruism and anomic-fatalism suicide dialectics. He advanced that these were, in his view, the growing points of social dissolution in modern societies. Durkheim (1897), further argued that neither repressive legislation, nor education, nor the revival of political loyalties or religion or even the role of the family were effective and feasible solutions to ending the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon.

The only solution to Durkheim’s understanding of state of crisis and perturbation of crime with regard to the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon, he maintained, was to organize economic life around occupational groups, which would tighten and strengthen the social fabric of the society thereby providing individuals with centers of attachment for integration and equilibrium regulations as proper channels. It would also seek to make the conjugal family more dissoluble, while enhancing the status of women and children, so as to increase the moral benefits they derived from marriage as some of the feasible remedies to the crime of suicide. The proposed remedies followed from the diagnosis and the diagnosis from the interpretations of data collected on the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon. This data was formulated into evidence based on policy for integration and regulation with a view to overcoming the incidences of Boko Haram suicide attacks for sustainable development of the entire ecosystem.

However, the sociological understanding of the individual accused of crime, deviance or delinquency, as perceived by Daniel Glaser (1968), is of someone having vested interest in causing harm, having the ability to harm and the means of self justification to deceive in order to jump out of harm’s way as evident through his relations with others. He made this observation clear in his analysis of ‘Sociological Approach to Crime and Correction’. Glaser, however, pointed out that this assumption is in sharp contrast to the position of psychodynamic or psychoanalytic understanding of crime, deviance and delinquency and at the same time with that of the biological school whose understanding of the phenomena of crime, deviance and delinquency is the expression of innate impulses which the criminal himself has not learned to control and therefore, is beyond his power to get rid of.

The sociological understanding of crime, deviance and delinquency, in the recent past, has received popular support from other disciplines that align much of their understanding of these phenomena to sociology in their attempt to familiarize themselves with the dynamics and complexities underpinning crime, deviance and delinquency in different countries, cities, neighborhoods, occupations, races, social groups, classes and other sets of people with their socio-cultural norms and value systems, and array of group activities. Again, there are sharp distinctions among psychiatrists, criminologists, psychologists and the biological school in the explanation of crime deviance and delinquency. Based on their diagnoses, these disciplines viewed criminals, deviants and delinquents as separate abnormal individuals with high degrees of social vulnerability to commit periodic offences, and therefore, deserved to be corrected and integrated back into the society.

Variations among offenders was due to the differential cases reported, as they seemed to exhibit a number of early warning signals, ranging from emotional instability to other psychological defects. According to Daniel Glaser (1845), sociologists are interested in establishing crime, deviance and delinquency by examining intergroup differences in relation to crime in which their behavioral patterns were understandable only if they were seen as consequences of the
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cultures in which individuals are reared. A culture, however, is seen as understandable only in terms of its history, which pre-dates any single individual. The sociologist, he further noted, explained the prevalence of criminal, deviant and delinquent behavior in one group and non-criminal, deviant or delinquent behavior in another, attributable to the fact that people reared in urban slums have a higher chance of becoming criminals, deviants or delinquents than those raised in a highly urbanized, ordered and integrated city settlement.

It is fundamentally difficult, if not impossible, to think of a crime-free society, in fact, there can be no society without the problem of crime and criminality. Alluding to Emile Durkheim’s postulation of functional imperatives of crime will make us appreciate the functions of the occurrence of crime in the society. The existence of crime made the establishment of the criminal justice system, police, court and prison. This theoretical position has reinforced the view point of Thomas Hobbes and John Luck in ‘State of Nature’ and the need to heed their calls for the emergence of a government to deal with the excesses and shortcomings of human beings to be law abiding for the smooth functioning and well-being of the society as a whole. The social order of all existing societies is built on the foundation of mutual trust, and therefore crime prevention and control are mutually connected. Law enforcement officers are charged with the task of keeping law and ensuring social order and peaceful co-existence of a given society for sustainable development. Similarly, social order of a given society is ensured when the internal working mechanisms of that society are buoyant enough to allow for integration of the policies on crime prevention and control. Talcott Parsons postulated on adaptation, goal attainment, integration, latency and/or pattern maintenance (AGILS) to ensure the functional integration of policies on crime to maintain order and stability in the society. In as much as we are dealing with such crimes as cybercrime, insurgency and terrorism, money laundering and advanced fee fraud, kidnapping and pipeline vandalism, among other sophisticated crimes, the complexities of the modern day society, structural scrutiny of the society, on the one hand, and the enabling social system for the perpetration of such crime, on the other, are fundamental and sacrosanct to the understanding of the complexities and dynamics of crime and criminality.

Talcott Parsons (1946), who in his thesis, viewed the larger society from the strategic context of AGILS, was of the opinion that the internal working mechanisms of the society needed to be measured or gauged in order to understand how functional and ordered the people are and this is largely determined by the level of individual adaptation, integration, goal attainment and latency and/or pattern maintenance that would give a sense of the nature of social order prevailing within a social system and the nature of crime that exists in the same society. This was echoed by Emile Durkheim in the anomie condition and later simplified by Robert K. Merton’s mode of adaptation which rests on conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism and rebellion in the illustration as shown below:

Robert K. Merton’s Mode of Adaptation argued that there are legitimate and illegitimate means of attaining societal goals; opportunities are there in the cities, hence, he identified ways in which people attain their goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Conformity</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Innovation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Ritualism</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Retreatism</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Rebellion</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these are mentioned here in an attempt to understand order and stability in the human society vis-a-vis the prevailing crimes bedevilling the social system in that society.

An integrated society maintains balance between means and goals, on the one hand, and the social order and stability, on the other. This assertion may help ab initio to determine the nature of the society and its level of integration in relation to occurrences of crime and criminality. However, crime and delinquency are significantly correlated but can be distinguished in terms of the demographic variable of the actor in terms of his age and the nature of crime committed. The sense of mutual respect and trust for the rights of others regulates the conducts of the members of the society to ensure order for stability in a social system.

Similarly, some people believe in the ‘live and let live’ principle, while few others, who for one reason or the other, deviate from the normal behavioural pattern and associate themselves with anti-social elements in the society. Any action or pattern of behaviour which deviates from the conventional mutual standard capable of creating or inflicting pain on the structure of the society obviously signals and triggers an obligation by the state to maintain law and order to ensure safety of lives and property. Thus, in Nigeria, for instance, insurgency and vandalism informed the enactment of laws to ensure the maintenance of normalcy due to the problems of Boko Haram bedevilling the north east, the avengers in the south-south and herdsmen in the north central parts of the country. The onus falls upon the state to protect law abiding citizens and punish those who deviate from the mutual consensus built by the members of the society to ensure law and order.

Those who break the law or disobey the grand norms generated through this mutual consensus are called ‘law breakers’ and in a way pathological criminals who should be punished by the state through instrumentality of law. From a theoretical position, commenting on crime in his analysis, Durkheim in his treatise “Crime as a normal Phenomenon”, noted that a society composed of persons even with angelic qualities would not be free from deviation of the norms. In fact, crime is a dynamic concept that changes with social transformation which occurred due to the variation in social conditions during the evolutionary stages of human society. He therefore, argued that, crime is a necessary feature of every society as it is a fundamental condition of social organization.

Classical Social Tripodal Model; Providing Thrust for Empirical Research on Crime, Deviance and Delinquency
There are a number of theories, models, approaches, themes and perspectives in sociology that can be used to explain crime, deviance and delinquency in a tripodal fashion as a social phenomena, however, three broad dimensions are more pronounced, these are: the sociological, biological/constitutional and psychological theories. Although no single theory is adequate to explain a particular social phenomenon, especially crime, deviance and delinquency of insurgent groups, Smah (2008), notes that there is the need to appreciate the dominance of information technology in today’s globalised world. Globalisation, he noted has increasingly made social contacts easier and instantaneous via wireless Internet, Email, Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp and other social media. These developments, he further added, have greater effects on and have exposed the weaknesses of most of the traditional social cum criminological theories, hence, the need for something more creative to address the phenomena of crime, deviance and delinquency in our contemporary society like that of the Boko Haram insurgency. Therefore, the researcher suggests a model that better explains crime, deviance and delinquency behaviour of insurgents with greater efficiency in today’s world of emerging
dominant western-paradigms, swallowing conflicting traditional-paradigms as it celebrates the ushering in of a New World Order occasioned by globalisation. Hence, Classical Social Tripodal Insurgency Model, which this research developed, emerged and revolves around three critical but interdependent conditions namely: knowledge, reality and the society to further enhance our understanding of crime, deviance and delinquent behaviour and its causal effects. Logical connection of these three variables was not established by some of the traditional sociological, psychological, biological and criminological theories in their examination of the social phenomena of crime, deviance and delinquency of insurgency in these contemporary times.

Theoretical Roots and Branches of Classical Social Tripodal Model Emerged as critique of Sociological and Criminological Theories of Crime, Deviance and Delinquency: The sociological explanation of crime and deviance was championed within numerous perspectives and frame works for better understanding, thus, there is evolutionary perspective to crime, deviance and delinquency, same as there is structural functionalist analysis and the Marxian approach to crime, the symbolic interactionist (phenomenology) perspective and the conflict perspectives to crime, deviance and delinquency. However, a number of critics have emerged in the recent past to challenge those perspectives and their enveloped theoretical postulates or propositions on the basis of their inadequacy to properly situate the phenomenon of crime, deviance and delinquency in the contemporary social world as they occur in our immediate social milieu.

The classical social tripodal model as a contemporary approach to crime, deviance and juvenile delinquency emerged as a critique, and was developed out of the weaknesses of the traditional sociological theories: Merton’s (1957) ‘Theory of Anomie’, Southerlander’s (1939) ‘Differential Association Theory’ (which is one of the social learning theories), Shaw and McKay’s (1929) ‘Social Disorganization or Cultural Transmission’ and Cohen’s (1955) ‘The Delinquent Boys’. Critical examination of the tenets of these theories was too short to provide logical connections among three critical but interdependent conditions of knowledge, reality and the society that led to the contemporary problems of Boko Haram’s antisocial behaviour of committing violent crimes at one level, deviant behaviour at another and juvenile delinquency as the composition of the insurgents’ demography suggests. Classical social tripodal model suggests that the interplay of these three conditions negatively affects the Nigerian society and calls for rapid response by sociologists and criminologists to proffer solutions.

Moreover, drawing from the inadequacies of the traditional theories that were postulates of 17th, 18th and 19th Century, and or before 21st Century, in giving comprehensive explanations of contemporary social phenomenon of crime, deviance and juvenile delinquency within the context of insurgency, Benjamin R. Berber (1992) supported Smah’s (2008) notion of weaknesses of traditional theories. Berber in his work, “Jihad versus McWorld: How Globalization and Tribalism are Reshaping the World” described the year 1993 as a terminal year for most traditional social theories, hence, their collapse with the emergence of information technology. The turn of the 19th Century witnessed the emergence of computer and information technology that limited the intellectual strength of most traditional social theories across borders. Nevertheless, this section examines some selected traditional theories out of which, emphasis would be placed on social tripodal insurgency model in an attempt to have a better understanding of crime, deviance and delinquent behaviour from manifest action’s of the insurgents.
Crime, Deviance and Delinquency from the Perspective of Merton’s Anomie Theory (1957): Robert K. Merton (1957) draws the basis of his structural analysis of the anomie condition from the Durkheimian school of thought. Merton like Durkheim argued that an integrated society maintains balance between social structure and culture i.e. approved means and cultural goals. Drawing from this, Maiduguri, the Borno State capital and stronghold of the *Boko Haram*, had been known for absolute peace and stability for decades despite its composition as highly heterogeneous, partly homogeneous and dominated by the Kanuri cultural groups.

Norms and values of the society were respected, and adherence to law and order, brought about by modern institutions as products of an industrialised society. There was balance between cultural means and goals as Merton wants one to believe. He went on to say that when there is disjuncture between goals and means of achieving them, the society will begin to malfunction, descend into an anomie conditions, creating a niche for crime deviance and delinquency. Robert K. Merton’s (1957) theory has no precision to give to the structural understanding of crime and delinquency as is can be seen in the *Boko Haram* antisocial behaviour. There was also no logical explanation for insurgent activities and little is said about the nature of crime or insurgents attacks in terms of the frequency, nature and types of periodic bombing and the pattern of killings categorised as serial or high profile assassinations as the classical social tripodal insurgency model argues.

Harold Gafinkel (1968), unlike Robert K. Merton’s (1957) anomie condition posits that when the inbuilt control mechanisms that binds people to eschew violence and appreciate their differences is seen to be failing and not to be nipped in the bud, social conditions will make the society malfunction. However, neither Gafinkel nor Merton offer convincing arguments on how the *Boko Haram’s* cultural background knowledge malfunctioned and knowledge differentiated to call for war against humanity in the name of Jihad and by way of egoistic suicide missions. When the *Boko Haram* came up with their ideological hegemony aimed at establishing a regime in 1992, perhaps Harold Gafinkel’s (1968) “inbuilt internal workings of the society” was blind to it. Merton’s anomie theory, though postulated in America, can be used to explain society and human social action in any society, but has its limitations in explaining crime and delinquency in today’s globalised society. Merton held that there are opportunities in society which all classes of people are exposed to; what he referred to as ‘the American dream’. Equal opportunities are there for all; however, the reality is that predominantly lower groups do not have equal access to such opportunities and their social conditions galvanised them into committing crime or become delinquent.

Opportunities are motivated by one’s ability to acquire basic education and become socialised, since the society failed to give adequate socialisation to its members those who are denied look for a remedy and resort to adopting a crime-based philosophy such as that of the *Boko Haram*, and subsequently the gullible younger ones are deceived into engaging in delinquent behaviour with the false promise of rewards in the hereafter. The *Boko Haram* in their utterances always, and at most times, preached against injustice and social inequality among the people and such segregation of the poor made them revolt against societal expectations, their actions are defined by institutions as either criminal or delinquent behaviour.

Members of the society are socialised through Western education, as far as modern society is concerned, to aspire to greater opportunities, but the lower class or minority groups are relatively blocked from getting free conventional education, good occupations and basic social amenities, health care and other basic needs required to achieve legitimate goals. Hence, it is
the lower class, who feeling alienated by society, engage in crime and delinquency. The Boko Haram insurgency group can be viewed in this light. Having been denied these basics needs, many youths lost confidence in the system, and as a reaction to the structure of the society that failed and denied them these needs, formed a radical group that could never see anything good in the Western laws and its philosophical impositions that supposedly created inequality and also moved their hitherto relatively mechanical solidarity (traditional) society where members were more or less the same to a more dominant institutionalised and highly competitive capitalist (organic solidarity) society where everybody was for himself. Hence, the emergence of the Boko Haram radical group is what Robert K. Merton (1957) in his classification of criminals and deviance referred to as ‘Rebellious groups’ committing egoistic suicide for their entrenched dogmatic belief system, sometimes their ‘sacrifices’ could be described as altruistic suicide rendering solidarity to the sub-cultural society of Boko Haram, as rightly observed by Durkheim.

As far as the element of Merton’s theory is concerned, the socio-political structure of Maiduguri as a society has suffered injury, such a situation, Merton believes produces frustration, pressure and, of course, strain on the lower class to use whatever means possible even if such means are illegitimate in finding solutions to blocked opportunities, hence, the commission of crime. This, again, is what Robert K. Merton referred to as ‘anomie condition’.

**Crime, Deviance and Delinquency from the Perspective of Albert Cohen’s Theory of Delinquents Boys (1955):** Albert Cohen’s (1955) lower class delinquency creates more conflict youth sub-cultures as exemplified by the Boko Haram whose ages ranged from 12 to 35. The theory assumed that sub-cultures, the likes of the Boko Haram, always viewed the upper class culture dominated by Western values as discriminating against the lower class minority culture. In their effort to strive to close the gap deliberately created by the elite who had acquired Western education, the theory noted, they sought for a means to become accepted and end up committing crime and exhibiting delinquent behaviour, since their socialisation had not prepared them for such challenges. This is what Cohen (1955) called ‘cultural deprivation,’ capable of generating delinquency in the society, hence, the youths became ‘status frustrated’ and revolted against the society. Their reaction to being alienated has been defined as deviance and/or crime.

Although, ‘cultural deprivation’ for Cohen, may induce frustration, it is part of everyday social life and is inherent in human existence. Even though many youth who were strongly socialised also experienced frustration under some unpleasant conditions they did not join the crusade of insurgency. Albert Cohen’s (1955) would have one believe that frustration due to cultural deprivation causes crime and deviant behaviour. However, social tripodal insurgency model argues that how well you know by acquiring knowledge determines how you see or know of the workings of the society, and what affects the society, either positively or negatively, has been the corner stone of this model. Majority of the Boko Haram members were from minority groups and were frustrated by Western cultural deprivation. Cultural deprivation here means that they did not go to Western schools to understand and appreciate core values needed to respect the intrinsic differences that abound in a nation. The theory believes that ‘sub-culture’ is one in which certain forms of anti-social activity are essential for the performance of dominant roles as supported by the Boko Haram, for instance, they react to Western education, Western values such as feminism which has given ‘excessive’ power to women, democracy, and theories of evolution, among other things. Boko Haram, the theory believes, is therefore waging a war to put an end to so-called ‘Westernisation’.
The theory also recognises that the Boko Haram sub-culture believes in their ideological commitments including the norms and values which they adhere to. Albert Cohen’s (1995) theory is therefore was a critique of Merton’s social anomie theory. This sub-culture successfully created their strong-hold, Markas and/or Ibn-Thaimiya. Furthermore, both Robert K. Merton (1957) and Albert Cohen’s (1995) in their separate analyses of deviance, crime and delinquency were not clear in making identifications to bridge historical happenings and events of the lower class background knowledge, including their body of thought and belief system. Both the anomie theory and crime and delinquency explanations of Merton and Cohen were silent of the extent to which the insurgent’s background knowledge was affected by spatio-temporal events in the historical existence of the insurgents. The two prominent positions of Merton and Cohen in sociological domain did not also provide any platform for the understanding of the kind of crime and deviant behaviour of the Boko Haram, including their background knowledge and how it was synthesised to build revolutionary tendencies and hatred against Western cultural values that exemplified the West and westernisation as Haram (sin), its practitioners as ‘taghuts’ (infidels) and the Western dominant phenomenon like globalisation as ‘toxic’ (Westoxication).

The sub-culture of the insurgents, Albert Cohen further reiterated, had goals that also helped in them get social solidarity among the oppressed lower working class youths by making the upper class elites who were favoured by Western education, including the law enforcement agents, who protect the grand norms of the nation (the Constitution), their common enemies; hence their social reality is defined as either a crime or deviant behaviour. Cohen described this sub-culture as ‘non-utilitarian’ delinquency, such as creating trouble, causing conflicts and fighting, and by so doing those who successfully attained these goals would gain recognition and prestige in the eyes of their sub-culture peers and regarded as heroes.

Unlike Merton (1957), Albert Cohen (1955) argues that it is not the inability of insurgents (such as the Boko Haram) to achieve material gains or success as a result of means or goals but rather it is the members’ inability to gain status equal to those members of society who were favoured by Western education and have their status acceptable in conventional society that produces the ‘strain’ as exhibited in the struggle of the Boko Haram to overthrow constituted authority that culminated in the ‘anomie condition’ as their ‘status were frustrated’. The Boko Haram sub-culture, the theory assumes is culturally disadvantaged, deprived and this is deeply rooted in their background, therefore, they lack the capabilities to overcome their ‘status deprivation’, which produces frustration that leads to a vicious cycle of misplaced perception to commit crimes of killing by way of suicide bombings, wanton destruction of infrastructure in the North Eastern States of Nigeria, namely: Borno, Yobe, Adamawa, Taraba, Bauchi and Gombe which came under severe attacks by the insurgents who ran a parallel government to the government in power.

Crime, Deviance and Delinquency from the Perspective of Edward Southerland’s Differential Association Theory (1939): Differential Association Theory and/or Social Learning Theory postulated by Edward Southerland (1939), emphasises that crime, deviance and delinquency of Boko Haram, like other social behaviours, are learned in the environment where it is being practiced more frequently and is learned through a process of association. The theory concentrates mostly on how people learn to become criminals or delinquent while placing less emphasis on the ‘why’ and ‘how’ they learned. Furthermore, contact with intimate sub-group members of, for instance, the Boko Haram exposes their preference to go against
societal expectations rather than conformity to such expectations, which makes a neutral member of the society with radical views join the sub-group. Southerland also believes that the amount of time one spends with such groups also enhances one’s chances of becoming a member (as in the driving force behind the *Boko Haram*) by imitating and gradually assimilating their philosophical ideas. Southerland was silent of how members learned the following kinds of antisocial behaviours that were defined as criminal or delinquent behaviour which the classical social tripodal insurgency model advanced: suicide missions and periodic attacks like massacres, armed group attacks, suicide missions, banditry, bank robberies, looting, prison breaks, serial killings, high profile assassinations and destruction of critical public infrastructure, particularly in the North Eastern region of Nigeria. Southerland, therefore, argues that such movements draw some members of the society who eventually adopt the beliefs of the sub-group through interaction with primary groups of like minds i.e. friends and peer groups and eventually end up as criminals themselves.

Learning criminal or delinquent behaviour involves learning the ‘techniques’, ‘motives’, and ‘attitudes’ which conform to the sub-culture’s ‘values system’, a person becomes a *Boko Haram* member because of what the theory believes are ‘excesses in definition favourable to violation of laws and orders, over definition unfavourable to violation of law and order of the society’. Again, the process of learning potential *Boko Haram* activity, the theory suggests, is by association with their members and involves all it can take in any other learning process. Smah (2008) in his constructive contribution to Sutherland’s understanding of social learning pointed out that the nature of the socialisation process of how to learn to become a ‘peace-maker’ is also challenged by the social learning paradigm. Parents, government and affiliated institutions concerned with ensuring adequate upbringing of the members of society are also challenged for failing to live up to their expectations in helping to avoid crime and delinquency in the society.

**Crime, Deviance and Delinquency from the Perspective of Shaw and McKay’s Social Disorganization and/or Cultural Transmission Theory (1929): The Chicago School (Concentric Zone Theory):** Cultural Transmission Social Disorganization and Ecological Theory and/or Concentric Zone theory are developed in the same large network of researches Burgess, R. *et al* (1966). Ecological theory emphasized that where criminals and delinquents boys live affects their persistence in breaking laws and orders. This is the hallmark of the cultural transmission theory of Shaw and McKay (1942), in their work “Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Area” and Burges and Parks’ (1935) “Theory of Urban Zonation”. The theory explains that there are cities, such as Maiduguri, where there are traditional rulers at the core (centre) informally controlling the affairs of their subjects. The theory explains cities in a concentric manner, gives explanations to each layer and points out where high crime rates and/or deviant behaviour are prevalent.

In criminological parlance, the concentric is further classified as lower crime delinquency rate area and higher crime delinquency rate area. Irrespective of individual positions on the strata of social inequality, the theory emphasises that once a person lives where the criminals converge and go about their deviant or delinquent behaviour, one may likely learn to become one of them. Criminals and delinquents mostly informally practice their ideological beliefs and values, and this usually dominates the lower class including some middle class and they have a conventional value system of law and order practiced within a semi-formalised framework. The theory holds that the *Boko Haram* most likely live in the countryside where they successfully transmit their norms and values from one individual to another and also move into
the downtown metropolitan neighbourhood to impact same. The victims of the Boko Haram, the ecological theory holds, were products of the slums that lacked values and sufficient socialisation to prepare them to be law abiding.

There are also institutions that support their activities and have conflicting moral value systems, which create favourable enabling environments for them to continue to breed more members. The criminal gangs and juvenile offenders, according to the theory, have a hierarchical leadership-like structure. Upon joining the Boko Haram, for instance, there is an organised pattern of activities which one is trained to have knowledge of and taught how to carry out. Differential opportunity structure theory cum ecological theory also recognised orientation through institutional norms and values; what the society considers odd behaviour is normal to the Boko Haram. The structure is made up of learning and performance. The theory also recognised their point of congregation and/or strong-hold as a ‘Dark-hole’.

In the 20th century, sociologists emphasis on cultural influence in the explanation of crime, deviance and delinquency was so pronounced in the work of Clifford R. Shaw and his contemporary, Henry D. McKay, who studied crime, deviance and delinquency utilizing statistics and case studies and histories of crime deviance and delinquency. Among their prominent findings on the studies on delinquency in Chicago were the following:

Delinquency is concentrated in deteriorated slums located in those portions of a city which once were residential but are changing to commercial and industrial districts.

These areas always have the highest delinquency rates, even after their population changes almost completely in national descent or race.

Organized vice, political corruption, and most other social problems are concentrated in these areas, and case study analysis indicates that this is because social control breaks down there owing to the low social status of the residents, their newness to the urban scene, and the unattractiveness of the area for new residential investment and development.

As residents of these areas move elsewhere in the city, the delinquency rates of their children decrease.

Delinquents from the high delinquency areas have higher recidivism rates than other delinquents.

Delinquency is usually group behavior from the outset and becomes group behavior to a greater extent as youth become more advanced in delinquency.

Gangs are traditional in the streets of the high-delinquency areas, and youth are acculturated into delinquency in the normal course of growing up in these areas.

**Crime, Deviance and Delinquency from the Perspective of Cloward and Ohlin’s Differential Opportunity Structure Theory (1960):** Cloward and Ohlin (1960) in their postulation of Differential Opportunity Structure Theory, explain how the structure of the society and cultural orientation gives more opportunity for the youth in Borno to go into Boko Haram, to deviate from the normal standard and descend into a chaotic situation.
Crime, Deviance and Delinquency from the Marxian Political Economy Perspective: The Marxian notion of crime and delinquency and the emergence of Boko Haram rested upon the premises of social relation to production and resource allocation. It argues that as a result of sharing of resources in a society, there is the probability of struggle between the upper and lower class. This, according to Karl Marx, lead to class struggle and class conflict between those in power and the alienated Boko Haram members which may at last lead to class revolution, where the lower class, the Boko Haram, take up arms against the upper class with the intent and motive of violently overthrowing the elitist regime and installing in its place a government of the ‘commoners for the commoners’ and that their struggle in the liberation was interpreted as either crime or delinquent behaviour.

In short, Marx argued, the first socialist revolution would take place in the most advanced capitalist state where the exploitation of the poor by the rich was at its peak. The Marxian political economy, however, is silent in establishing a link among knowledge, reality and the society as the three elements capable of giving rise to the phenomenon of Boko Haram. Nevertheless, critics of the Marxian theory of class struggle and the attendant consequences on a bourgeoisie state, point out that there is a huge lacuna in the theory, more especially when one considers the fact that the first capitalist revolution took place in the then most backward capitalist state of Russia, also known as the Soviet Union. This lead to the birth of the new idea of Leninism which oversaw the end of the bourgeoisie inclined Tsarist Regime, through the Bolshevik Revolution.

Another pointer to the lacuna in the Marxist theory of revolution is the emergence of Maoism in China through the peasant revolution which Mao Tse-tung spearheaded in the name of communism. According to Marx, peasants will never spearhead a revolution because of their backwardness, however, the success of Maoism in China and Boko Haram in Nigeria proved Marx wrong. Marx generally portrayed states and capitalism as two agents of mass exploitation and advocated for the overthrow of capitalism through a socialist revolution and withering away of state to pave way for communism. He argued that armed struggle in any community was as a result of class exploitation in relation to controlling the means of production. However, critical examination of the tenets of these theories are too short to provide logical connections among the three critical but interdependent conditions of knowledge, reality and the society that led to the phenomenon of Boko Haram insurgency and how the interplay of these three conditions is negatively affecting the Nigerian society, hence, the social root of social tripodal insurgency model. The model seeks to bridge the disconnect between the grand and the second middle range theoretical positions above and logical connections among knowledge, reality and society that led to the phenomenon of Boko Haram insurgency and how the interplay of these three conditions is negatively affecting the North Eastern region of Nigeria.

The Biological or Constitutional Theories of Crime, Deviance and Delinquency
The biological and/or constitutional dimensions of crime and deviance proposed that the offender is different from the non-offender in some physiological or anatomical make up. This approach sees the criminal as a ‘sick’ person rather than ‘bad’ person John, E. Conklin (1998). The ‘medicalizing’ of crime and deviance by the biological school, raised enormous concerns for rehabilitation of the criminals and delinquent boys and began the search for a constitutional make up of traits that define a criminal. The ‘medicalization’ of crime has also emphasised the need to conduct careful and thorough analysis of the individual criminal or delinquent and what constitutes biological dispositions. Moreover, the criminal or delinquent is better understood when tripodal perspectives of sociological, biological and psychological connectedness are.
employed, as it plays an important role in determining how the criminal justice system responds to the understanding of criminals from a socio-psycho-biological Tripodal view point.

The biological perspective, according to John, E. Conklin (1998), can be traced back to 1750. However, with the rise of modern psychology and psychiatry in the 20th century, the biological perspective lost influence in criminology. 1750 and 1850 witnessed the emergence of physiognomy and phrenology, which tried to show links between criminal behaviour and biological factors such as facial features (shape of the ears or the eyes), and sought to correlate this with criminal behaviour and characteristics. The phrenologist, John, E. Conklin (1998) pointed out, stressed the relationship between the external shape of the skull and the individual’s propensity to engage in crime, deviance or delinquent behaviour. Studying the shape of individual’s skull, according to the biological school of criminology, enable them to explain which area of a person’s brain is dominated by negative tendencies and the possibility of committing crime and/or delinquent behaviour. Modern biological research by physiognomy and phrenology indicates that certain areas of the brain do control particular types of behaviour, and can stimulate it to incite violent behaviour socially defined as crime or delinquency.

**Lombroso Theory of Atavistic Stigmata:** Cesare Lombroso’s (1911) theory on the study of notorious Italian criminals is one of many theories celebrated within biological school of criminology Conklin (1998). Lombroso, unlike Sheldon (1943), theorised on three body types of criminals: endomorph, mesomorph and ectomorph, he, however, argued and maintained that, criminals, deviants and delinquent were atavistic people who were ‘born out of time’ or ‘throw backs’, similar to primitive people or lower animals in their biological composition. Lombroso’s notion has some sort of methodological influence to the claim by Charles Darwin evolutionism; positivistic organism believing that people could revert to an early stage of evolutionary development. This, however, has received severe criticism within the domain of the intellectuals. Conklin (1998), like Blackburn (1998), argued that Lombroso, C. (1911), outlined the following as features discovered of notorious Italian criminals:

1. Enormous jaw
2. High cheek bones.
3. Prominent supracciliary arches having anatomical defects or distinct colour of eyebrow
4. Large ears.
5. Solitary lines in the palms which means they have dismal lines in their palms which can hardly be seen in and not same as that of others.
6. Extreme size of the orbits handled-shape.
7. Extra nipples, toes and fingers.
8. Sensitive ears.
9. Savagery and ape-like behaviour, meaning they are seems to be brutal, barbaric and not civilised.
10. Insensitivity to pain.
11. Extremely acute sight.
12. Excessive idleness.
15. The desire not only to extinguish life in the victims but to mutilate the corpse, tear its flesh and drink its blood.

As a corollary and building on the characteristics of inborn criminals, within the biological school, emerged a number of protagonists pioneered by Cesare Lombroso’s theory of Atavism; post-Lombroso researchers such as Goring and Hooton (1939), building on the work of
Lombroso (1911). There was also Sheldon’s theory of Somatotypes, in other words, differential in body types of criminals, deviants and the delinquents, thus correlating crime, deviance and delinquency to 3 body types as endomorphs, ectomorphs and Mesomorphs.

Sheldon’s Theory of Somatotypes: This theory focuses on the defences among individuals in embryonic development and claims that people with different body types have different temperaments that affect their propensity, or otherwise, to engage in crime and delinquency. Sheldon, an American psychologist and physician, developed a rating scheme to classify bodies as one of the three basic types with profound characteristics:

Endomorphs: these kinds of criminals are the ones with the following deformities or deficiencies: slow, soft, friendly, sociable, lovers of comfort, round and fat in their looks. Debunking the viewpoint of Lombroso’s criminal characteristics, Sheldon in his biological theorizing discovered no significant correlation between endomorphs exhibiting particular behavioural tendencies that can be equated to crime, deviance or delinquency.

Ectomorphs: these kinds of criminals are the ones who normally looked so skinny and fragile with light muscles.

Mesomorphs: are those with higher temperament, they look more aggressive and active with athletic body type. Sheldon’s findings disclosed that they were twice as common among delinquents as they were among the general population of criminals or secondary deviants.

Biological Approach to Crime: the XY Chromosomes Model; Heredity versus Crime, Deviance and Delinquency

A number of studies have been carried out in an attempt to discover how an individual’s hereditary tendencies galvanised him into committing crime, in an attempt to understand how individual heredity traits like chromosomes causes crime deviance and/or delinquency. To validate this claim, not less than thirty eight (38) different studies conducted in the biological school were compared by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) to know whether crime commission is hereditary or not. The findings from their research suggest that there was consistent significant association between various indices of heredity and crime, deviance and delinquency, but the actual magnitude of the relationship was modest and weak, and therefore, could not be generalised to the study population from which their sample was drawn to say that heredity causes crime, deviance and delinquent behaviour.

Similarly, Volavkaetal (1977), Witkinetal (1976) in their separate writings, while reinforcing the degree of association on heredity crime hypothesis, corroborated the view points of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) in noting that the XXY chromosome complements the possibility that abnormalities in the sex-determining chromosome could account for crime, deviance and delinquency. In the biological approach to crime, the XY chromosomes model on heredity versus crime, deviance and delinquency had engaged the attention of criminologists and had received much attention in the 1960s. The exponents of the biological paradigm noted that there are twenty three (23) pairs of chromosomes in the human bio-system, and one is the sex chromosome pair; the female usually has an XX pair and the male normally has an XY pair.

In the 1960s, there were series of heated debates among criminologists, particularly in biological school that men with the XYY chromosome were discovered to be more prone to...
aggressive and violent crimes. The hallmark of the idea was built on the reflection to postulate that if the Y chromosome in the sex-determining pair makes a person a male, then an extra Y chromosome added to the existing Y male should make that person a ‘super male’ hence, he would turn out to be more violent than the average male having only one Y chromosome. Witkin (1979) noted that earlier researches suggested that men with XYY chromosome are taller than average men with XY chromosome. The concern for proof of the biological approach to crime: the XY chromosomes model on heredity versus crime, deviance and delinquency, a research was conducted in Denmark, in the town of Copenhagen between 1944 and 1947 among 4,139 tall men with XYY chromosome from a group of 31,436 men. The findings suggest that, only 42% of the 12 XYY men had been convicted of at least one crime compared with only 9% of the XYs group of men. The finding of the XXYs chromosome validation research on the degree of association on heredity crime hypothesis further suggested that even if those with hereditary XY chromosome were associated with criminal behaviour, it could account for only relatively little percentage of the crime that is committed. Again, the XYY chromosome men showed significantly lower levels of intelligence than the XY chromosome men who had undergone the same level of educational attainment. Comparing the XYY men with the XYs men of similar levels in terms of intelligence, educational attainment, height and social status, the research found that the XYY chromosome men’s group was still more likely to have criminal records.

Nevertheless, a number of researches were carried out, and the one that stands out is the empirical research on ‘identical twins developed from a single female egg’ and the discovery of hereditary differences. The research was carried out between 1929 and 1962 in the United States, Japan and Europe to validate the claims of the biological school that inherited factors influence criminal behaviour. Charles Goring (1870-1919) had subjected the Lombroso theory of atavistic stigmata, which argued that the criminals, deviants and the delinquent have certain physical defects or anomalies, to rigorous study. Goring, in his conclusion, found no significant difference between criminals, deviants and delinquents and the groups in the general population in relation to skull shape, eyes colour, hair colour or various other physical traits, the only difference discovered as real among the criminals was differential in height and weight, which varied with that of groups from the general population.

The Psychological Theory of Crime, Deviance and Delinquency

The popular notion or unidirectional causation approach to the explanation of crime, deviance and delinquency advocated by the biological school, in the likes of Lombroso, Sheldon, Gottfredson and Hirschi, and believing that the criminal is biologically different was strongly contested and replaced during the 20th century. It was rejected on the basis of the idea that the criminal is somehow psychologically abnormal, which was properly situated by Sigmund Freud to say that the criminal is psychologically ill, which the cognitive theorists interpretively projected to claim that the deviants, delinquents boys and the adult criminals are perceived recipients of treatment.

This viewpoint reinforced the fact that the offenders were ‘crazy’ or ‘unbalanced’ which underlies the philosophy of rehabilitation that leads to the counselling of offenders by psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists and social workers. The Logic of the psychological approach to crime, deviance and delinquency is that because only certain individuals commit crime, therefore, something must distinguish them from those who do not break the law.
The Psycho-dynamic or Psychoanalytic Perspective: Id, Ego and Super-Ego Frame Work to Crime, Deviance and Delinquency: The Psychoanalytic theory of crime, deviance and delinquency was developed by Sigmund Freud (1930, 1962, and 1933), August Aichhorn (1935, 1952). Freud propounded three (3) aspects of the personality structure in relation to crime deviance and delinquency causation, viz: Id, Ego and Super-Ego. The Id, he argued, is anti-social aspect of the human mind and is composed of instincts and drives that need immediate gratification; it is characterized as being unsocialized and unrestrained in an individual. The Super-Ego is the social authority or conscience and represents parental authority expressed in the individual as a continuing acceptance of cultural norms and values. The Ego is the mediating force that tries to adjust the Id drives with the demands of the Super-Ego by rechanneling and sublimating those drives. A state of balance conflict exists among the three elements in a healthy and integrated personality.

The Psychoanalytic theory believes that, at birth a child is ‘Tabularasa’, his mind is as good as a blank slate dominated by antisocial tendencies called the ‘Id’. The id, psychoanalytic theory argues, can only be destroyed through the socialisation process. Those who become criminals do so because of inadequate socialisation. The id, ego, super-ego psychoanalytic frame work believes that the super-ego is society’s conscience, and certain people commit crimes because of the guilt developed in childhood.

Furthermore, the psychodynamic or psychoanalytic perspective which rests on id, ego and super-ego frame work to crime deviance and delinquency is prominent in the recent research conducted by Taylor and Francis et al (2009), reflected in their writing on the psychological theories of crime, deviance and delinquency, while noting that the psychodynamic-psychoanalytic theory claimed that personality is developed early in life and is composed of three distinct parts. Taylor and Francis et al (2009), while alluding to the work of Siegel et al (2006) posits that the id represents the instinctual drives, the ego represents understood social norms that harness the id, and the superego is learned moral reasoning.

They further argued that crime, deviance or delinquent behaviour occurs as a result of imbalance between these three parts of one’s personality and is thought to be a symbolic way of meeting unconscious needs Siegel et al (2006). The internal conflicts, according to Taylor Taylor and Francis et al (2009), lead to crime, deviance and delinquency, usually resulting from a conflict between the id and societal norms understood by the ego, these are very painful to the individual, so the individual pushes them into the subconscious. Taylor and Francis’ et al (2009), viewpoints have been reinforced by Shoemaker (2005) who claims that the individual develops coping strategies called ‘defence mechanisms’ to cope with conflict situations, and these defence mechanisms can lead to problematic personality traits and problematic behaviours, such as crime, deviance and delinquency. In essence, crime, deviance and delinquent behaviour are seen as the external manifestation of an internal disease. Taylor and Francis et al (2009), brought to the fore, the position of Erikson who expanded on the id, ego and super-ego frame work to crime deviance and delinquency while describing the phenomenon as an ‘identity crisis’ created by inner turmoil Siegel, et al (2006).

As has been noted by many critics of the psychodynamic or psychoanalytic perspective, this identity crisis created by inner turmoil and is difficult to test empirically, the utilisation of psychodynamic theory to explain complexities and dynamics of crime, deviance and delinquency is limited by lack of evidence to support it Shoemaker (2005), Siegel et al (2006). However, Pfohl (1994) in Taylor and Francis et al (2009), claimed that crime, deviance and...
delinquency are the unconscious manifestations of pathology and are “inferred from behavior”. He further added that in the 1950s, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck conducted studies on 500 boys and highlighted the personality and delinquency links in some of their findings, the interpretation of which indicated that when compared with non-delinquents, the delinquent boys were ‘less cooperative’, more ‘suspicious’, ‘more destructive’, more ‘defensive’ and had ‘conscious or unconscious hostile impulses’. In addition, they reported more severe ‘mental pathology’ in the delinquent boys. Their work, although criticized for its inexact methods, inspired other researchers to examine personality and psychiatric disorders in connection with delinquency Shoemaker (2005). Others have attempted to link antisocial and aggressive behavior and low self-esteem to delinquency. The psychodynamic theory and the various personality trait theories attempt to identify common characteristics of criminal, deviants and delinquents.

The psychological school has also generated a number of hypotheses for crime, deviance and delinquency validation. However, it identified illnesses such as neurosis, psychosis, kleptomania and schizophrenia in their explanation of crime, deviance and delinquency. Neuroses are disorders in which a person has some difficulty in coping with everyday life. Neurotics usually seem nervous, inhibited and over-conforming rather than aggressive so their disorders are not probably linked to crime. Neurosis is seen as an alternative to juvenile delinquency rather than cause of it. However, neurosis which is associated with crime is called obsessive-compulsive neurosis, which can lead to certain aggressive crimes and to sexual perversions such as exhibitionism and fetishism. Thus, neurosis has also been linked to kleptomania, a compulsive form of stealing caused by desire for sexual excitement rather than financial gain Skinner (1963).

Psychosis is a disorder characterized by lack of contact with reality, sometimes it involves hallucinations that lead to violence but not all psychotics are dangerous criminals. Schizophrenia, according to Pavlov (2010), involves disordered thought patterns characterized by fantasy, delusion and utter incoherence. Schizophrenics are nervous and sensitive to interpersonal cues; they act out and primarily give reference to themselves. They demand much love from relations but often criticize them for lack of appreciation. Most times, the schizophrenic feels unfairly rejected by relations and others. Schizophrenia is at times associated with acts of violence including homicide against people who are thought to be a threat to the schizophrenic. A study of 97 delinquent boys in correctional institutions, found 82% of them had engaged in serious violent crimes such as murder and rape, exhibited symptoms of paranoia and/or neurological disorders and appeared to have historical background record of excessive physical abuse by parents during childhood, and as manifest of these shortcomings of inculcation of societal expectations exhibit criminal tendencies in adulthood.

**Justification For The Research**

The objective of this research is to provide an empirical basis for the study of the *Boko Haram* phenomenon, provide a frame work to allow for better explanation, and question the strength of most existing theoretical positions in providing an insight into all the elements of *Boko Haram* as a social phenomenon of the 21st century, and the need to improve on existing theories by creating platforms for intellectual debates that may consequently lead to the emergence of new theoretical models or perspectives. The research gauged diversified theoretical narratives and dimensions on crime, deviance and delinquency, and how suitable these traditional theories
are in giving adequate explanations to the *Boko Haram* phenomenon in the contemporary society.

Available literature suggests that no one theory has provided any coherent or logical explanation on the complexities of *Boko Haram* in this regard, therefore, this research revolves around the relationship among crime, deviance and delinquency. It is worth arguing that there is an explicit gap between the existing traditional theories and the emerging phenomenon of *Boko Haram*, especially suicide attacks as it involves children, juveniles and young persons.

There are so many issues that come into play on the issue of *Boko Haram* and terrorism as against juvenile delinquency or deviant behaviour in the society. The research also sought to provide a new frame work or model as the inadequacies of the traditional theories appeared to be apparent. In dealing with the issues of crime, deviance and delinquency and their recognition within the academic community, it is imperative to contextualize *Boko Haram* and accord it its relevant place in criminology as a field of study. The research tried to investigate the socio-psycho-physiological profiles of *Boko Haram* members from a theoretical position and ascertain whether or not they suffered from pathological disorders as consequence of the commission of crime, deviance and/or delinquency. The operations of *Boko Haram* needs to be looked at and understood by researchers, the public and the criminal justice system as crimes that have numerous interpretations as to its cause. Dealing with the *Boko Haram* phenomenon, the criminal justice system needs to determine this cause while dealing with the concept of *Boko Haram*, especially the suicide phenomenon as it has profound correlation with mental illnesses such as neurosis and psychosis.

However, in order to have a deeper understanding of the *Boko Haram* phenomenon, this paper would investigate the causes and implications of crime deviance and delinquency from the point of view of the social, biological, physiological and psychological dimensions. It is also believed that most members of the group suffered from neurological impairments and periodic paranoia as they were said to have excessively abused drugs; this fact has been established among *Boko Haram* rank and file.

Most of the available empirical research on crime, deviance and delinquency are either obsolete or archaic, hence this paper is a ground breaking research aimed at exposing the weaknesses of traditional theories and complexities of *Boko Haram* phenomenon.

**CONCLUSION**

It is imperative to note that crime, deviance and delinquency come into play as a result of complex social forces which occur during social interactions. It may also be argued that it is a learned behaviour through socialization, and this has been the notion of the social learning theory. The psychoanalytic or psychodynamics blame crime, deviance and delinquency for biological factors acquired through heredity unlike the sociological school which situates the causes of crime, deviance and delinquency on lack of adequate socialization and enormous pressure exerted on the members of the society by sub and super-structures of the society and cultural forces that galvanize individuals into criminal expeditions, coupled with in everyday life and deficits of functional imperatives of institutions as stabilizers of the entire social structure to ensure order and stability of the society, especially, the maladministration of the criminal justice system (CJS) that seems biased and selective.
This paper is instructive in demonstrating the apparatus to gauge crime, deviance and delinquency and its social relations to crime as relative concepts, which means that the phenomena means different things to different people, and therefore, should be understood from the perspective of what it means to a criminologist, other academics and to a layman. In an attempt to situate crime, deviance and delinquency within a particular context for better explanation, extensive and elaborate reviews were done and theoretical roots and branches of classical social tripodal insurgency model examined, which emerged as a critique to the sociological and criminological theoretical explanations of crime, deviance and delinquency in the understanding of the subject matter.

Hence, a new definition has been propounded and presented as one of the findings of this research based on the analytical review of literature and empirical research so far carried out. The subject matter of crime, deviance and delinquency has diversified dimensions on both theoretical, and to some lesser extent, empirical plane. On the empirical side, not much work has been done in the recent times, especially on contemporary social phenomenological empirical research, most of the existing literature and empirical research that were available were either archaic or obsoletes and thus lacked the strength to explain social realities of criminality and contemporary problem of crime in the 21st Century. This research unveiled the Boko Haram suicide phenomenon as a crime that has implications on contemporary social realities in relation to crime, deviance and delinquency. It presented suicide phenomenon in its proper context, in an attempt to allow for adequate explanations of the subject matter. However, the causes of crime, deviance and delinquency, according to most of the theoretical dimensions, approaches, model, themes and perspectives to crime, so far reviewed in this research, blame the phenomena of crime, deviance and delinquency on complex social, biological and environmental issues. The paper examined the socio-psychobiological theories of crime deviance and delinquency, the introductory part of the paper stressed the importance of the study and conducted an analysis to show distinctions of differentials models of juvenile delinquency, young person’s offenders and adult criminal typology.

Nonetheless, classical social tripodal model (STIM) has provided a thrust for empirical research on Boko Haram as a crime, deviance or delinquency and various perspectives were reviewed in this research which includes among others but not limited to; the psycho-dynamic or psychoanalytic perspective that, blame individual personality type acquired through heredity as course. On a final note, a new sociological and/or criminological definition of crime, and/or deviance was discovered and presented during the cause of this research. Crime prevention and control, this research argues, must be evidence-based for any meaningful impact on implementation of policies and has to meet international benchmarks as prerequisites for sustainable social system as the new policy on crime prevention and control is integrated with other policies within the ecosystem.
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