The sociological trend remains one of the most powerful and commanding in the cognition and interpretation of crime. His main initial thesis is that criminals are not born but become. It was in the framework of this area that the provisions were formulated on the need of crime on the situations of the social setting, on the sustainability of the basic strictures of crime and on the possibility of predicting it in the future, on the essential to correct unlawful behavior and crime by primarily influencing external social factors.

The beginning of the history of this school is connected with the name of A. Quetelet and his famous method, according to which "society has in itself the germ of all crimes that have to be committed, because it comprises settings encouraging to their progress" (Zedner, 2007). At the same time, this school itself is far from homogeneous, since in some cases specialists emphasize (or exaggerate) attention on certain social factors of crime. In this regard, there are grounds in the framework of the sociological interpretation of crime to highlight the following basic theories:

 Economic theory, which, in turn, is also far from homogeneous, and connects crime with property relations, the distribution of labor and capital (K. Marx), low property status and poverty (V. Bogner), with considerations of the benefits of the benefits of crime in comparison with the costs of its commission (Zedner, 2007).

 The theory of anomie (E. Durkheim), which suggests that crime is a ordinary and unavoidable state of any society and that the issue of crime is not in itself, but in some situations its level and volume become unacceptably dangerous; such situations are connected with the crisis (or transitional) state of society, when previous social norms and standards no longer work, and new ones have not yet been developed or established;

The theory of tension (R. Merton), observing the reasons of deviant conduct in the gap among cultural rules and norms of society, on the one hand, and shaped prospects, means of attaining them, on the other (accepting or not accepting social standards, a person can behave either in compliance with them, either violating them or striving to change the standards of behavior themselves);

 The theory of conflict of cultures, according to which, since an individual all over his life vagaries his membership in several social sets, each of which has a convinced system of views, ideas, standards of behavior, etc., then any transition from one cultural coordinate systems to another (as well as any attempt to extend the norms of one culture to another) is go together with a conflict of cultures, which gives rise to deviant behavior (it is noted that non-standard behavior within one culture can be quite legalistic in another)(Stangor & Crandall, 2009).

The theory of differentiated association , the essence of which is that the crime is the result of the influence on the individual of those social groups with which he is in contact; in the process of this communication, the element of imitation becomes essential, as a result of which the individual develops an impulse to commit a crime: he learns the “technique” of criminal behavior, his disrespect for the law grows;

The theory of stigmatization, or symbolic interactionism (G. Mead, F. Zack), connecting criminal behavior with the fact that the person to whom the label (stigma) of the delinquent is officially attached begins to associate himself with the corresponding social group and behave in accordance with this designation, on the basis of what conclusions are drawn about the inadmissibility of "dramatization of evil", about a cautious approach to the official stigmatizing reaction.

Other directions and schools can be distinguished within the framework of a sociological approach to the interpretation of crime. The sociological school for a long time was practically the only one possible in determining factors in crime. Introducing such a classification of theories and schools, it must be emphasized that in rare cases, criminologists strictly adhered to any one rigid scheme. Often their research was comprehensive, reflecting recognition and respect for a wide variety of schools. And therefore, this gradation, of course, is conditional and is based only on the predominant tendency of the authors of concepts or on the assessment of innovative judgments.
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